Labour must give the lead and,  
FIGHT THE RACE THUGS!

THE thugs that killed Kelso Cochrane this Whitsun will be caught and tried. The cell doors will clang behind them, the ritual sacrifice will have been made, but the real murderers will have got away and racial murder will go on.

Cochrane died for his colour. Thieves neither shout "Jim Crow" at a prospective victim nor return an emptied wallet. He died because the young hooligans who carved him had permissive authority to do so. He died because a "spade" is less human than any other, because housing is crowded an expensive and therefore nerve-racking. He died because landlords batten on the insecurities, exploit the weaknesses of immigrants and locals, foment violence and rack rents. He died because the landlord class in Government—the Tories—refuse to relieve the crowding, refuse to build houses, refuse to give back the jobs and security they filched.

He died because colonies are gold-mines for the mighty monopolists who want them and keep them weak and their people backward, ignorant, poor and uncultured. He died because every boy and girl is fed on superiority to this backwardness, ignorance, poverty and lack of culture, because the pinched souls and chests of our exploited seem less pinched at the sight of the even more miserable colonial migrant, because the maddened underdog of capitalism can bite a "spade" and not get kicked, because Mosley and his Fascist supporters and competitors are there to blow these sparks into a steady flame. He was a victim of capitalism's attempt to buy class peace with race hatred. The murderer is still at large.

As long as capitalism exists, so long will racial violence continue, so long will sections of the exploited replace class battles with racial battles, so long will colour solidarity mar class solidarity.
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FORTNIGHTLY for the Industrial Militant—for International Socialism

Labour must be clear!—silence is complicity! First, in Notting Hill. Let us wipe out the stains of racial prejudice in our local party; let Rogers, our MP, repudiate his past remarks and come out not only in condemnation of this and any other incident, but with a positive program to break with white solidarity and choose workers' solidarity, to lead the fight against Fascism and hooliganism and save the small coloured minority from physical and mental ghettos for the Labour movement. Let Union branches and other Constituency Parties press our comrades in Notting Hill to lead the fight against Fascism and racialism and for class solidarity.

PS.—At the time of writing, the whole work force at the Tokens, city site, is out on strike in defence of four coloured brothers, sacked for "redundancy". This is class solidarity in action.

A delegate previews the ETU CONFERENCE

IT IS towards Conference time that we should draw up a balance sheet of our Executive's policies, and make suggestions for the course of our future activities.

On balance our Executive is found to be lacking. On the industrial front there is its lamentable failure to support the businessmen in the only effective way possible by the withdrawal of ETU labour from the underground and the blocking of juice from the power stations. Despite their constant criticism of the inadequacy of the general unions in struggle, they here showed a remarkable capacity to talk left and act right.

Again we well remember in an article in Electro's Bro. Foulkes castigating Bro. Carron for negotiating on the basis of a twelve month wage-freeze a couple of years back, and then calmly reaching agreement on a similar basis for the electrical contracting industry.

More recently we have witnesed the cowardly retreat of the leadership in the South Bank dispute, in sending the ETU lads across the picket lines, betraying one of the first principles of trade unionism, the defence of the shop stewards and job organization.

On the international front the much-publicized agreement signed jointly by the ETU and the French Electrical Workers on rocket bases has had little or no effect, because of the failure of the EC to put teeth into it by encouraging the membership to black the bases.

Through their opposition at the 1957 and 1958 Annual Conferences to motions calling for the legalization of independent working-class parties in Eastern Germany and the release of Harich and other working-class leaders in that country they demonstrated their Stalinist contempt for international working class solidarity.

The recent press statements on the situation inside the ETU turn to back page
DEADLOCK IN THE PRINTING DISPUTE

BOSSES of the print employers' federation and printing unions have failed to come to any agreement. Both over the proposals and counter-proposals on conditions, etc. in the printing industry.

Nine unions—all members of the Printing and Kindred Trades Federation—put forward a claim to the Master Printers and the Newspaper Society—toking for more than 10 per cent wage increase, a 40-hour week and other improvements.

The National Society of Operative Printers and Assistants have presented similar, but not identical, claims for higher wages and a shorter working week.

Separate

The print bosses promptly turned down these claims in February and March. This precipitated the unions' executives holding a national ballot asking their members if they would like to endorse their executives' policy. This policy, giving the executive authority to bind over time, limit shift work, stop the introduction of new apprentices, introduce "non-co-operation" campaigns, withdraw from incentive schemes and, if they wish, call a strike.

Some eighty per cent of returned ballot papers gave support to this policy.

Early on in the discussions, NATSOPA agreed on a unified front with PKTF. Two days later, NATSOPA had separate discussions with the employers and have since decided to go it alone on the issue. The national press wrote rather gleefully of this "disenchantment" as being due to the 'clip on' approach of employers.

And Volume & Son (colour and art printers and publishers) increased their trading profit for the same period from £13,774 to £73,723. Staves in a prevailing wind?

Disappointment

Meanwhile, the employers continued to press for a year's standstill and for union co-operation in achieving efficiency. Although they were trying to put on a bold face they couldn't hide the fact that about 400 non-federated firms, mostly small, had agreed with the unions to shorten hours and concede any pay increase eventually negotiated.

When the employers' reply did come, however, the employers expressed the "keen disappointment" at the content. It stated that it should be possible to introduce new machinery by the "earliest date" provided that the unions agree to ease their restrictions on the employers' machinery policies.

The reply went on to say that they thought it would be possible to work out with a little delay, ways and means of improving efficiency which would allow for higher wages without increasing costs.

The employers also headed over a "tentative list" of 22 suggestions dealing with the supply of labour, demarcation problems, etc. Some of the main points were:

- More investment training for apprentices (at present it lasts six years).
- The elimination of demarcation difficulties.
- The economical running of machines.
- More participation in incentive schemes.
- The encouragement of increased shift work.
- The recognition of "certain principles" relating to method study.

Speaking in reply to the employers' proposals, a NATSOPA official said, "the employers' suggestions are just out of range. They mean eventual job loss to employment, printing workers having 'worked themselves out of a job'. Printworkers are already doing a full week's work. Productivity per man and woman had advanced tremendously of average for the past ten years. In printing, taken as a whole, there was 'tremendous scope' for cutting away dead wood at high level.

PROFITS IN PRINT

Thomas Skinner & Co. (Publishers) (controlled by Mr. Kelly's Directors and therefore now in the Mirror-Pictorial Empire) showed an increased net profit in the year to 32th February, 1959. Profits came out at £63,875 after a tax of £21,371 compared with a net profit of £5,167 after tax of £5,079. And Volume & Son (colour and art printers and publishers) increased their trading profit for the same period from £13,774 to £73,723. Staves in a prevailing wind?

FOOTNOTE

In the event of a strike, it is believed that sympathetic action by transport workers engaged in transport supplies could not be ruled out. (We heard that at South Bank, too)

Also it is reported that the employers have contacted Continental firms about contracts in the event of a strike, but print workers are already seeking ways to maintain a full financial appreciation of the vital work they are doing by some means to introduce in wage talks a fuller appreciation of the broad social and economic conditions of the printing and allied trades taken in a particular sector of industry. There should be a fuller.

NEWS IN BRIEF

Just to make sure the workers get both sides of the story... "workers pressing for a rise would contend that as a mean event the granting of their claims would benefit the bosses... the vital work was by some means to introduce in wage talks a fuller appreciation of the broad social and economic conditions of the printing and allied trades taken in a particular sector of industry. There should be a fuller appreciation, too, of the long term harm of continuing increases in the price level."

MR HEATHCOATE AMORY

And...

Unions could only go so far in enforcing discipline. In those places of employment were there were un-judged disputes, with orders being instigated by outside forces deliberately to raise trouble, they could be met by administrative difficulties.

The progressive employer had not only brought the country and his business with this greater equality, but had gained advantage from it.

MR ALAN BIRCH

Chairman of the TUC.

This article first appeared in "LABOUR REPORT" Kensington L P monthly journal.

TAKE ACTION AGAINST OMO by councillor P O'HEA

NOW, when I first heard people talking of OMO I thought it was some kind of detergent. I now know better. I think the latest evil the London Transport Executive is going to foist on the people of Central London if we don't wake up and fight.

OMO is the LTI's latest brainwave to make London Transport pay — OMO is a one man operated bus.

Complaints

It has been apparent, particularly with the recent bus cuts that OMO has lost all consideration towards exercising its first legislative duty, the duty of providing the people of London with a transport service. Unfortunately, up to now the suffering public has with wanton venom directed its shower of complaints on the unfortunate London Transport instead of at the LTI and its Tory masters whose real purpose is, of course, to spread all forms of Nationalization.

Double decker

The LTI is now to spend millions on a fleet of one man operated single decker buses holding thirty passengers. You and I, as usual, are expected to provide the 'olly'. How long is it going to take the OMO to collect the fares at each stop? To give the change to the "Sorry, you only got a note type"? To answer all questions in Thomas Cook fashion? To shoulder abuses when he is ten or more minutes late? Will these extra duties and abuses impair the skill and concentration needed to drive us safely through London today? OMO will force many people to provide their own transport, causing more congestion and making it much more difficult to use the Underground than a tortoise's death march.

Our double decker now holds over four times as many people in the space that twenty cars carrying this equivalent number of passengers. The "London" argument cannot be flung at us.

Action! You may ask, how soon can we expect the introduction of OMO? Judge for yourselves the fact that negotiations are now in progress between the LTI and the London Central — repeat central—Bus Committee of the T&GWU. They are deliberating on extra pay for "OMS" and the fate of the unfortunate conductors. Are the people of London being consulted by the LTI of the suffering OMO's will cause them? Are the LTI considering the millions of productive hours lost queuing? Are they considering the economic effects of paralysing London's traffic? I wonder.

Action! Action! That is the only answer. Let us fight through our Ward's, our Co-ops, our Trade Unions and Public representatives. Let us inform the LTI, and their overlords that Kensigton will not stand by and watch what we proudly once boasted of as the finest transport service in the world integrate before our eyes. Let us ban OMO.
from Nan Milton

Scottish trade union congress

Reports of the recent annual conference of the Scottish TUC meeting were read by an old-fashioned Socialist like myself. Many excellent resolutions were passed, of which the most important to me would be quite acceptable to any progressive Liberal. The General Council referred to Scotland's grim and urgent problem, unemployment, and many Government subsidies for private industry. In support of its motion, "Scotland's Industrial Needs," General Secretary, George Middleton uttered this gem:

If you disregard this particular aspect of private investment or assistance to private investment, then you disregard Colville's £50 million, the demand for £4 million to build the gravin dock... That is the road to Socialism—inasmuch as you get the Government intervening in private enterprise.*

Days past

It's a far cry from the days when George, then one of Glasgow's leading Communists, was vehemently denouncing members of the Labour Party and the ILP, as social-fascist traitors. Now he makes Transport House seem left-wing, for this is what they have to say about the £30 million for Colville's.* (Pamphlet "Big Pools Win" issued by Transport House.)

One big steelworks is to be built in Scotland. Good. It should have been started long ago, it would have been if the bungling de-nationalisers had not got to work... The steelworks.... The steelworks is a blessing to the British taxpayer—you will guarantee the money for the new steelworks, all £50 million of it, at specially reduced rates of interest lower than the rates at which most local authorities can borrow.

But a private company, Colville Ltd, will get the gravy. Sir Andrew McCance, Chairman and Managing Director of the company, has just told his shareholders that the new mill should "contribute to the general profits of the company."

Now you know why THEY want to keep the present set-up. But what about the rest of us...?

L T E: Seven Lean Years

The seven-year-long Tory Government—run by London Transport is graphically illustrated by the following figures tracing the decline of staff and road operations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Drivers &amp; Conductors</th>
<th>Inside Staffs</th>
<th>VEHICLES</th>
<th>CAR MILES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>47,101</td>
<td>8,875</td>
<td>18,216</td>
<td>420,729,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>35,818</td>
<td>5,495</td>
<td>8,557</td>
<td>320,194,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOSS</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,665(26.2%)</td>
<td>199,535,000(25.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than one in every four of operating staff have gone. One in every four miles run have been wiped off the slate.

If the whole national labour force had been reduced in the same proportion as L.T.E., there would have been an army of six million unemployed in Britain today.

Maintenance staffs in the garages, which in 1952, were allocated in the proportion of five men to every six vehicles, now service more than eight vehicles, to the obvious detriment of the cleanliness, roadworthiness and safety of the vehicles.

In sharp contrast to operating staff, figures for supervisory grades are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SUPERVISORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>2,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INCREASE 360 (14.04%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Had the supervisory grades been reduced in the same proportion as the operating staffs, there would have been 1,023 less supervisors employed today—at a saving in annual salaries of £767,000 or enough to pay the wages of 750 bus crews per week on the roads 375 buses for two scheduled duties per day.

Finally, while the period since 1952 has been the "Seven Lean Years" for staff and public alike, the five members of the L.T.E. have waxed fat. Here are their salaries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>L.T.E. MEMBERS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lord Latham £5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. H. Grainger £3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. P. Hopkins £3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. W. Harbour £3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthony Bull £3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1953 Lord Latham went back to "big business" and made a great success of it, with his blushing honours thick upon him, Sir John hands over to Mr. A. B. B. Valentine, a pale skeleton of what was once the finest transport system in the world. Once again the L.T.E. is "Under Entirely New Management" but, as the new chairman has already made clear, the same old medicine is to be dished out to staff and public.

Union aims

But what aim should the Union set itself or the ultimate end and purpose of all its endeavours? Our reply is: "The common ownership of the mines and direct control of production by the people". As for the mining industry... So far as is compatible with majority rule in society and final political control by the delegates of all the minorities, we desire that the workers in each industry should have an autonomous control over their own work. Only in that way can economic freedom be realised...

Democracy

We want an industrial democracy in which the means of production shall be owned by the community and largely controlled by the workers in each industry.

Future society

We conceive of our Union as the embryo of the future society. The organization that we are building now must be patterned to some extent with two requirements in view: first, that it can be made into an effective weapon in the present every day struggle; and, second, the necessity of the Union being formed in such a way that in the day of the triumph of the working class it will be easy for us to replace the capitalist, productive administration with our own democratic method, and to carry on production uninterrupted.

The intelligent reader will readily see that nationalization of mines in no way meets our demand. So far from welcoming any proposals for nationalization, the Reform Committee opposed them. While recognizing that the necessary evolution of society, we do not think that this need not necessarily be accompanied by any amelioration of the workers' lot and in fact, as we have seen, the best experiences have shown, almost sure to lead to the increased exploitation and subjection of the workers.

Freedom

We of the Industrial Union movement demand clearly and unambiguously control of the mines by the miners, limited only by the right of the social majority to have the final word upon all vital questions of production. No half measures, no cunningly devised, self-deceived, self-satisfied solutions, no proposals for the workers to share with the employing class or their State will satisfy us. Our aim is freedom at our work, and only direct control by ourselves can ensure this:

Amalgamation

This year's President, Alex Moffat, who resigned from the Communist party because of the Hungarian Revolt (all honour to him.) made a firm and fair chairman... Amongst the clashes which arose between left and right, but in his presidential address he was able to give room for his own personal opinions. He stressed the need for STUC's initiative in trying to end the craft and sectional outlook which undermined the unity and power of the movement, by amalgamation and better forms of organization. Marxists have, of course, been emphasising this for over 50 years, and I can think of no better comment than a little bit of Scottish Socialist history.

J McDougall

One of the most notable pioneers of pre-Communist Party Marxism in Scotland was brilliantly young J. McDougall, who forfeited his career as a bankclerk rather than give up his extensive socialist activities. He it was who delivered the inaugural address at the foundation conference of the Scottish Labour College in 1916. He was killed in action, with the exception of one year, McDougall himself was arrested shortly afterwards along with ILP leader James Maxton, and sentenced to 18 months imprisonment for anti-militarist activities.

Reform movement

On his release he worked as a miner in Lanarkshire, and immediately set about organizing a Reform Movement in Scotland after the style of the one in South Wales. The movement was organized before the war by Lab- our College pioneers such as Cook, Abbert and Mainwaring. Most of the immediate demands of the movement have now been realized, but the pamphlet written by McDougall, Manifesto of the Lanarkshire Miners Reform Committee could still be an inspiration to all Trade Unions. Here are a few quotations:
FORUM

REPLYING TO ERIC HEFFER'S CRITICISM, KEN ALEXANDER

Sociologist Review
defends his
SOCIALIST WAGES PLAN

Sociologist Review disagrees fundamentally with Ken Alexander's approach and with the arguments he uses in replying to Eric Heffer's criticism (SR mid-April) of his and John Hughes' pamphlet, A Socialist Wages Policy. However, we welcome this contribution to an important discussion and hope that readers will signify their concurrence by participating.—Editor.

ERIC HAFFER'S critical review (Sociologist Review mid-April, 1959) of the pamphlet Socialist Wages Plan by John Hughes and myself was a piece of good old-fashioned left-wing demagoguery work. He questioned our right to call ourselves socialists; he imputed motives—"the object is to soften the struggle"; he used political swear-words—"reformist method of thinking", "complete break with Marxism"; he poured scorn on Hughes and Alexander having never heard of the class nature of the usual arbitrations and he was surprised and with hesitation assumed the worst—"they do not, however, carry any clear, rationalization and expanding public ownership as part of policy" (please refer to pages 7 and 40 of our pamphlet).

Stalemate

With the sound of all this tumbling machinery in their ears, standing somewhat dazed amongst the rubble, Hughes and Alexander are now filtering through the dust looking for just one thing—the signs of some new, alternative building going on. But instead, when the dust settles all they see is a pure white sheet. Inserted on one finger of this signpost is "Forward to Socialism!" and on the other is "Back to Fundamentalism!"

Eric Heffer would probably argue that both signs point in the same direction and that to draw attention to the fact is worth much more than a pamphlet "which can only confuse and divert the worker". But the fact remains that this signpost has been standing largely ignored for a very long time by those not steeped in the traditions of workers seeking out the road to socialism which goes by way of "the fundamentalists".

Our pamphlet starts from this fact and tries to suggest a means by which the "politics of stalemate" which at present chokes the British labour movement can be avoided. The most effective means suggested is the development of an alliance between the industrial and political wings of the movement aimed at increasing labour's share of national income and securing a greater growth in working class consumption.

The state

Much of Eric Heffer's opposition to our proposals arise from what he has concluded is our view of the State under capitalism. He quotes: "The State in a mixed economy is involved in responsibility for a wide range of economic policies which decisively influence the size and distribution of the national product. It will carry out policies either primarily in the interests of capitalists, or in the interests of wage earners". Then he goes on to ask: "What is the same State? Isn't it a State?" to which Hughes and Alexander reply: "a State created by and for the British ruling class".

pressures

I accept that John Hughes and I could be seen more explicitly and thoroughly in our treatment of this crucial issue. We did not put it quite that way. I think it is an important distinction—between the policies that can be wrung out of the capitalist State which can favour the working class relative to other sections of the community, and the ultimate policy question of the abolition of capitalism and exploitation: the defence of which is the main function of the capitalist State.

Making this distinction it seems perfectly possible to argue as we do in Wages Plan that government power could be thrown in behind an egalitarian income policy if sufficient political pressure were built up to insist that it were, and yet not to indulge in woolly thinking about the character of State power under capitalism of the kind properly objected to by Eric Heffer.

Reforms won

In a short article in a recent New Reasoner (No?) I put this point as follows; "at some point to come to a demand being made upon it would be impossible without disrupting the working of the profit system and at that point democracy must retrench or capitalism must be replaced... The State conceives or resists according to the logic of capitalist class interest and would have to be radically transformed at some point... although considerable reforms can still be won within capitalism a sticking point will eventually be reached...". Eric Heffer is right in this with the unequivocal position taken up by Eric Heffer: "Before we can look to real change in the re-distribution of income, a steady growth in the national product, and a stabilization of prices, the power of the capitalist class must be completely broken..." and that surely means taking their real power, not just their hands. Industry must become the property of the public, under the control of the workers.

Here is a very important difference of opinion. Eric Heffer seems to hold the view that none of the things we suggest as policy aims can be achieved this side of a thoroughly-going socialist revolution. Our view is that this seriously underestimates the strength and character of the political pressures which the British labour movement is capable of exercising. Does Eric Heffer deny that working class political pressures have made considerable inroads into the arbitrary exercise of economic power by capitalists? Or does he argue that such inroads have been made but that at this particular juncture of time, now, we find ourselves at the end of the road: that the capitalist class has no further room for manoeuvre? This would seem a very doubtful proposition, but it is a logical possibility.

No concessions?

So how do we deal with it (assuming for the moment that it represents reality)? We could either preach the theory that capitalism is no longer capable of making concessions or we could demand concessions that put the theory to the test, demonstrate it and carry the struggle forward on the basis of that demonstration. In our pamphlet we adopt the last approach. In doing this we do not believe that we are still concessions to be won and that the winning of these will bring socialism nearer. Eric Heffer does not believe in the possibility of winning these concessions, it appears. But what has he against putting our respective analyses to the test by helping to make these demands upon the capitalist system? The practical alternative would appear to be to preach "the final solution as the only thing worth bothering with". So it would be if millions were theoretically convinced of the need for socialism; but this would be even if all them. But millions are unconvincing, and this is a political fact which hard-headed socialists of the calibre of Eric Heffer must surely fit into their scheme of things.

Can I ask Eric Heffer, and readers of Socialist Review, to have another look at the arguments of A Socialist Wages Plan? And I think it is worth remembering as they do so that the demands of the program "What We Stand For" adds up to at least as radical a break with capitalism as we know it as do our proposals in Wages Plan. Yet "What We Stand For" is advanced within the context of "a really consistent Labour Government..." Socialism could only follow upon "the power of the capitalist class being completely broken". Comrades, you are either as "guilty" as we are of "reformist illusions", or much more guilty of obscuring as how they and capitalism will have another go at the pamphlet, this time in an open minded and comradely spirit.

The pamphlet

The pamphlet A Socialist Wages Plan is available 2/4d. post free from New Reasoner Pamphlets, 52 Marlborough Avenue, Hull, Yorkshire.

Socialist Review

Fighting Fund

We need £20 an issue

During the last fortnight we have received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.S. (Bristol)</td>
<td>£1 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in N. Kensington</td>
<td>£4 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.R. (Liverpool)</td>
<td>£1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Harlow</td>
<td>£2 8 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers in Shoreditch</td>
<td>£1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers in Ilford</td>
<td>£4 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.H. (Willesden)</td>
<td>£4 12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers in Hampstead</td>
<td>£4 5 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 24 13 6

THANKS! and KEEP IT UP, COMRADES!

I enclose a contribution of £ s. d. to the SOCIALIST REVIEW Fighting Fund.

Name

Address

Send to SOCIALIST REVIEW APPEAL FUND, 358 Priory Terrace, London, NW6.
LABOUR'S CRISIS OF 1931

P Mansell

In 1931 the Labour Party took one of the severest knocks in its history. The memory of that year is still vivid in the recollection of its older members and has passed in to the consciousness of the younger generation. For most, it signifies the betrayal of the Party and of the working class by a handful of their leaders. MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas are the villains of the piece. There is no doubt about the guilt of these men. It was they and a few others who openly sided with the Tories, in the guise of forming a "National Government", who divided the party and led to its confusion and weakness in the following decade. But it is wrong to see in 1931 only the exposure of this clique of leaders. The causes of the crisis are far more profound and need to be learnt to-day, long after the MacDonalds and Snowdens are safely in their graves. 1931 was not an isolated phenomenon. It must be seen as the culmination of a whole trend of development — the product in the shorter term of the immediately preceding period and in the longer term of the nature of the Labour Party itself.

Starved

When the Labour Government took office in 1929, it had behind it a period of successive defeats for the working class. The wave of strikes that had culminated in the General Strike of 1926, when the workers betrayed by their leaders had been defeated by a confident and determined ruling class before they had an opportunity to put their strength to the test, the miners, the most militant group of workers, were starved into submission after a solitary and bitter struggle of 6 months. Rank and file trade unionists were disheartened and disoriented, the militants discredited. The right-wing leadership was correspondingly strengthened. Open class collaboration took the place of class struggle. Ideas of joint consultation were peddled in discussion between political and monopoly capitalists like Sir Alfred Mond.

On the political as on the industrial front, the right wing within the movement was on the offensive. From the late 'twenties dates the practice, still very much with us, of issuing lists of proscribed organizations with which party members were forbidden to have any dealings. Revulsion was punished by wholesale suspension of constituency labour parties. There were frequent clashes between the leadership and the League of Youth that demanded full political rights within the party. The ILP, the main spearhead of the left within the party, was becoming more and more openly critical of the drift to the right and demanding a far more radical program for Labour than the leaders were prepared to accept.

Vague program

Divisions within the left unfortunately played into the hands of the right wing because the Communist Party was just entering on its wildly successful "third period" and, on orders from Moscow, denouncing all social democratic parties as "social-fascist".

It is hardly surprising that Labour fought the general election of 1929 on a programme of vague general principles that could not be held to commit any one to any definite course of action. The biggest problem facing the government was bound to be unemployment. Already over a million workers or nearly 10 per cent. of the insured population were idle. But faced with this fundamental problem of capitalist crisis the workers were offered only a vague program of "National Reform" on Liberal Keynesian lines.

Labour returned

Nevertheless, so completely were the Tories identified with reaction that Labour was returned as the largest single party. It had a majority in Parliament of 27 over the Tories, but this majority was smaller than the 57 Liberal MPs. In such a situation, the Labour Government could either refuse to take office at all; or take office and start implementing a full Socialist program and if defeat in the House of Commons, have a coalition of Tories and Liberals go back to the country on a clear issue (be it social or take office and aim to keep in office by doing nothing to antagonise the Liberals who held the balance. For a government really intent on achieving Socialism, the only possible course would have been the clear declaration that the government preferred the third.

Slump

In the Cabinet all the key positions were held by right-wingers. George Lansbury was the only man of the left and he was in a comparatively minor position. Home Office affairs were dominated by MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas. On all matters of economics, Snowden, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was regarded as the unquestioned expert.

During the period of office of the Labour government the slump deepened. The figures of unemployment employed compared to those in 1930 were very nearly two million in 1930 and two and three-quarter million in 1931. Capitalism could hardly have exposed itself more completely. The ripeness of society for Socialism could hardly have been more plainly demonstrated.

But the Labour cabinet could not think beyond a few minor palliative measures. They were totally unprepared for sweeping changes.

Because of the limited measures of public works advocated by Lansbury and Mosley (then a left-winger) founded on the rock of Snowden's financial orthodoxy. His horizon was limited by what he believed to be the essential need to balance the budget and so demonstrate to the capitalists of the world the traditional financial "soundness" of the country. He set his face against any increase in taxation as this would discourage capitalist enterprise. Savings had to come from public expenditure and particularly from expenditure on unemployment allowances.

Benefit cuts

To help in putting across to their own supporters the monstrous doctrine that the poorest section of the workers should bear the heaviest burden, the government set up early in February 1931 the famous "May Committee". Its report, in July, painted the gloomiest possible prospects for the economy. It advocated a 20 per cent. cut in unemployment benefit (already at a miniscule level) and cuts in the pay of public servants and reductions in expenditure on public works. This report played a major part in creating an atmosphere of crisis and so strengthened the hand of the government for any drastic measures it care to take.

Then, superimposed on the chronic economic crisis, came the financial crisis of the summer of 1931. European banks, including the great Austrian Creditanstalt, went into liquidation. Foreign investments were withdrawn at an increasing rate. The British government of the time, saying that England advised the government that loans could not be negotiated from foreign bankers unless government was provided with a balanced budget. Armed with this advice and with pressure in the same direction from the Tory and Liberal leaders, MacDonald and Snowden then set about persuading their colleagues in the cabinet to agree to a series of economy measures.

It was estimated that savings of some £78 million were needed. The significant fact is that the whole cabinet agreed to savings of £60 million. Without the introduction of the means test for applicants for "transitional benefits" (paid to unemployed workers before unemployment benefit proper began) and to increase the rates of savings to which that is, making the employed workers carry more of the burden. For maintaining savings, MacDonald and Snowden argued that there must be a cut in the unemployment rate, in the unemployment benefit. Nothing less would satisfy the international bankers and the other parties, with whom negotiations were under way. This last demand proved too much for the majority of the cabinet. The Labour government, after the TUC had made its opposition clear. MacDonald made an appeal to the workers, in a last-ditch and irrevocable by agreeing to head a so-called coalition government with the other two parties. By doing so, he not only covered himself with ignominy but salvaged the tarnished repuation of his cabinet colleagues. By refusing to take this step with them, they were able to divert attention from the working class and were prepared to go so far along the road with him in "solving" the crisis at the expense of the workers.

Lessons

What was on trial in 1931 was not just a group of Labour Party politicians, some already corrupted by association with the capitalist class, others probably more confused than corrupt. What was on trial was the whole conception of reformism. The idea that a working class party should compromise with the capitalist state, which in total would add up to a socialist transformation, might have some chance of technical success in a period of capitalist boom. But in a period of slump, the bankruptcy of this conception could not be avoided. Labour government had either to be better capitalists than the capitalists or else to take over the whole system and substitute a workers state for a capitalist state. Inevitably, granted the assumptions that dominated the thinking of the Labour party leaders it was the first alternative that was chosen.
CLASS IN EDUCATION 2
LABOUR AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL
by Peter Ibbotson

This is the second of a series of extracts from 'Class in English Education' by Peter Ibbotson, which first appeared in the October 1958 issue of Labour Teacher, quarterly journal of the National Association of Labour Teachers.

Readers are invited to send their queries on educational matters (enclosing a stamped addressed envelope) to us. Those of general interest may be published in our columns: those of interest to the sender alone will be answered by post. Whatever the question, we shall be glad to help.—Editor.

NOT only do the public schools "lie at the root of the failure to unify the nation," but their existence denies equality of educational opportunity to all. The public school pupil enjoys special advantages, due solely to the fact of his going to an elite school, over his LEA contemporaries. Opportunities for higher education are greater for the public school boy and girl, giving them opportunity to secure lucrative executive positions.

In a 1953 report (p. 30) of the Ministry of Education's Youth Committee, for example, one of the fears of many teachers that industry has little opportunity to offer the main stream in grammar school boys and girls the executive side. Yet two pages further on the report says that there are "many opportunities for the public school boy in industry and commerce—on the executive side!"

Rejected.

And in a circular letter to parents from the headmaster of a successful and expensive boys' prep school in Sussex, referring to the report, who "maintains that all education should be free and that all schools should be state controlled," says that "many big business concerns, such as the tobacco and petroleum companies," would greatly resent the public school system of education.

Since the continued existence of the public schools is socially and educationally unsound, being antagonistic to the success of the LEA secondary school, it follows that we who believe in democracy must do something to bring that situation to the boil. A number of "solutions" have been propounded in Labour Party circles to what is called "the public school problem": four were canvassed among the education working party, though only three are referred to in Learning to Live (my first and second being telescoped), and all are rejected except the tepid non-interventionist No 3.

Solutions

1. The public schools are good, and their bequests should be given instead of only to those who can afford the fees. Therefore the public schools should be compulsorily given 1 per cent. of their places to LEA's who will, presumably, select children to fill them on the basis of the 11+ exam.

2. As above except that the percentage of places to be sold is to be 10 per cent.

3. Leave the public schools alone and improve the LEA schools so much that no-one will want to send his children to a fee-paying school.

4. Abolish fee-paying in all schools and hand over the hitherto independent schools to the LEA.

Notable advocates of each solution are, respectively, Michael Steward, Hugh Gaitskell, the late George Tomlinson, the NALT; whose pamphlet A Policy for the Public Schools (9d by post from NALT, 30 Hartham Rd., London, N.9) entails a comprehensive and reasoned programme for abolishing fee-paying and incorporating LEA system. The salient points of these proposals have, by the way, been incorporated by Steward for Socialism in its Equality in Education. . . .

A man who pays fees for his son's education at a public school is, in present circumstances, buying a position of power—perhaps, social, perhaps economic, perhaps political—in adult life. It is altogether more reasonable to suppose that positions of power should be able to be bought. The true Socialist approves of improving on principle; unlike Aneurin Bevan who has said in Tribune that he would not prohibit private education: "to do so would introduce State interference at too sensitive a point in the relation of the citizen and the community."

Definition

It is also equally amazing to find fee-paying also described as the Labour Party itself. In Learning to Live we read that it would be "an unjustifiable invasion of liberty to prohibit a citizen from spending money on private school fees," and it goes on "the citizen has a right to decide for himself. If he wishes to buy private education, he cannot in a free society be prohibited from so doing."

This is of course pure sophistry. Socialists take their cue from the Richardson who carefully distinguished between property and what he called 'impropriety'. Property means, in the field of personal expenditure (clothes, furniture, gardens, etc.) which is personal to ourselves and our families; whereas impropriety covers that field of expenditure which has an impact upon society as a whole as well as the individual. Expenditure on education falls within the category of 'impropriety', and we should no more allow it to be bought and sold than we would allow the sale of commissions in the forces, or seats in Parliament.

TEJUNE over simplification and inability to present the conflict of basic ideas behind the position of Labour Party politicians—"we have to prevent the Road to Brighton Pier" (Arthur Baker, 16s.) from rising above the mud-slinging level. In this book Les- lie Hunter—ex-Daily Herald Lobby correspondent and friend of Macmillan and Stewart (News Chronicle) industrial correspondent featured in Anti-Steel Report (financial and campaign advice) has given an account of tensions, enmities and open virulence in general Labor which will warm the cockles of every Tory heart.

As Mr Hunter was privileged to entertain, he receive favorable and extensive information of an often confidential nature from many Top People in the Labour Party (notably, in particular, from Mr Morrison's camp), it is said that in his disclosures he has also provided a standard with a squadre left politicians on all sides with nothing but a strategy of shadow and fading again in any political journalist.

Show down

Few would deny that the Labour Party's future, is and has been, is a ponderous and allows leaders who are an inadequate reflection of the face of the Party. This is not the issue brought within the Parliamentary Party rather than elected by the mass of the Party. However it is just not true that recent Labour Party history has developed almost entirely through the ambitious careers of anjaesthetic and, indeed, often unappreciative personalities.

Mr Hunter's book, because of the importance of further right-wing meetings at Mr Stokes house in Westminster, with their celebration of an approach to Mr Morrison to attempt to persuade him to a show-down with the Party to use his retirement and believe in Morrison subsequently sacrificing his career rather than split the Party further (p 147).

We are told in this resulted in a decisive interference of support to Mr Gaitskell who was already beginning to enjoy the limelight following the publication of Attlee's now famous remark to Percy Cudlipp during the summer recess of 1955:

"I have had a long innings and I shall go when I can hand over to a younger man" (p 134), and his "fine showing" at the Sedgefield Constituency, October. So it is inferred that Gaitskell's eventual rise to the Party leadership was due to a direct result of Morrison's sacrifice.

To imagine that this travesty of the facts about the last two years or so, which explains the rise of Gaitskell in these terms of Morrison's refusal to co-operate with himself becoming a right-wing lackey to take advantage of Bevan's isolation, is anything more than a crude, impudent and uncharitable example of prejudice, would be to indict Hunter with political illiteracy quite inconsistent with his position in the Daily Herald at the time.

It's interesting that having been a mouthpiece for Morrison, Hunter, should set down without comment Bevan's indication on the eve of the 1950 General Election of the "irreconcilable conflict of views here and the policy of reassurance was ana- thema to him:

"I am not interested in the election of another Labour Government, I am interested in the election of a Government that will make Britain a socialist country" (p 22).

Judging from the book as a whole, the author is just not interested in fundamental differences of faith, but only in the clash of personal ambitions and the more sensational they appear the better.

Of course the story of Bevan's preoccupation with power, his conflicts with the Morrison-Dea- dard balancing position of Attlee in the centre is not new. Nor is the idea that mutual trust between Attlee and Morrison was lacking a new one. However we are presented with a picture of Attlee hanging on to the leadership in the midst of growing quarrels which injured them both. We doubt whether he was determined to stay until he was too weak to attempt to hold his place—a situation about which Morrison (according to Hunter) could do nothing to tackle Attlee face-to-face.

As the Party did ultimately put Morrison at the bottom of the poll, it is the chaos of the Party after Attlee able to judge his Deputy's fitness to lead at that stage of Labour's history a little in ad- vices, or policies, or in the interest for the mass will of the Party to show over. But, to suggest as Hunter does, that Attlee deliber- ately contrived Morrison's de- feast insults the intelligence of anyone who cares to dodge the mud flung from the pages before him in order to see the whole episode in context. Small wonder to find in the preface the defensive statement:

"Attlee has shown he is more than capable of defending his past actions if he considers them unjustly interpreted." (p 14).

One wonders whether Hunter is as capable of defending his party's past as he is of considering them unjustly interpreted.

The lesson is in this book—let us make sure we learn and act on it.
by Michael Millett

PARLIAMENT

THURSO and Holá are both
British, they are both the re-
ponsibility of Parliament. On
the evening of the Whitby
recess, Thurso engaged the at-tention of the Lords and Holá the
attention of the Commons. These
minor similarities apart, they
might be in different parts of
the universe.

In Thurso, an errant boy had
his nose bled by a policeman.
Unusually, the local author-
ities decided to take no action.
Parliament, the newspapers and
the public consider this such an
affront to justice that an elabo-
rate and expensive tribunal has
to make a judicial investigation of
the case.

In Scotland and in England,
people are proud of, one might
say encomium about, the stan-
dard of justice. Some people are
so proud that no effort has been
too great — particularly when in-
expensive native troops were
available — to spread the light to
the whole country. With Chris-
tianity, taxation and "suitable"
standards, of education British
Justice was exported for trilling
returning later, like diamonds, oil,
and crops. "Practical training in
mining and agricultural tech-
niques were provided gratis.
After many years an academy
was set up at Holá in Kenya for
the welfare of the unregenerate.

At this place it has become
evident that, unlike motor cars,
the local standard of justice
have been exported, whilst the
superior sort stays at home.
In this concentration of in-
iquity in Kenya has disclosed
that: Prisoners were beaten with
sticks to force them to work.
Eleven men died under these
beatings.

The soap was riddled with
curvy, a disease caused by
malnutrition.

Some of the affairs in, say,
Dartmoor, would be quite un-
thinkable. The situation would
never be allowed to get that bad.
And it should be remembered
that some of the forty or so
prisoned at Holá have not com-
mitted serious crimes at all. If
they had, they would have been
executed under the emergency
regulations. Their only offence
was in belonging to illegal
organizations.

However, the Government in
Kenya will not prosecute any-
body because there is "insufficient
evidence". Only eleven murder-
ed men.

The opposition is going to
demand a full-scale enquiry after
the recess, and with luck, and
after considerable agitation, those
responsible will stand a chance with
superiors in the Kenya Civil Ser-
vice may be punished. It would
be a dream thing if the person
who has any responsibility for
this affair should hold a Govern-
ment post again.

But their dismissal will not
solve anything. Absuses of this
sort are not due to the excess-
ses or inefficiency of individuals
at Holá camp is the latest example of History's clearest lesson, that
when rule others without
defiling their own hands.

Unnearly lies the head that bears
the crown.

Mr. Marples, the Post-Master
General, said the "Post Office
had spent more on advertising in the
past two years than in the previous
tree, he added — sometimes we
get advertising without spending
money.

Mr. Marples was talking in the
United States of AT&T and
the Bell Telephone system, they
had a television program which
was shown for an hour in that
program they got a plug of about
two and a half to three minutes.
In the case of the Queen,
which was broadcast to Bristol,
we got far more than that free of
charge.

RUSSIA:

King is dead; long live the

Comrades! The cult of the individual has caused the employment
of faulty principles in party work and in social activity... Party and Soviet democracy, sterile
administration, deviations of all sorts, the covering up of short-
comings and the vanishing of reality. Our nation gave birth to many
talents before the revolution. We must abolish the cult of the individual decisively, once and for all.

—From Khrushchev's "secret speech" at the 20th CPSU congress, Feb. 25, 1956.

From speeches at the 21st Congress of the CPSU, January 27—
February 5, 1959:

NS Khrushchev's report to the present congress constitutes a new,
fruitful contribution to the Marxian-Leninist bases and comprehensive analysis of the tremendous constructive work
which has been done in the country...since the 20th Party Congress.

...It fills the heart of every Soviet man with a sense of joy and
pride—V Semichasty, Secretary of the CC of the Komsomol.

I should like to suggest that much of what has been achieved along
the path shown by the great Lenin is the result of the unflagging
initiative and personal example of Comrade Khrushchev, his profound
practical knowledge, and theory, and his close ties with the broad
working masses. (Applause)—El Andrayeva, Chairman of the Kom-
intern collective farm, Tambov oblast.

I owe the successes in the launching of artificial earth satellites and
cosmic rockets, above all, to the Presidium of our party's Central Committee and to Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev
personally, which determines the scope and the activities conducted in this direction. (Applause)—DF Utinov, Deputy Chair-
mam of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The theses of Comrade Khrushchev's report...point a clear road
toward biology. —AN Neumann, President of the USSR Academy of
Sciences.

Comrade NS Khrushchev drew the attention of hydro-builders,
scientists, engineers, draftsmen and managers needed to achieve
building of electric power plants less costly. In order to fulfill
the tremendous task linked with the building of electric power plants
in power lines, we must in the very near future implement the ad-
vise and instructions of Comrade Khrushchev. —IT Novikov, USSR
Minister, Construction of Power Stations.

Now, as is known, we have already set about the fulfillment of the
program for the accelerated development of the chemical industry,
worked out on the initiative of NS Khrushchev.—IJ Brezhnev,
Secretary of the CC of the CPSU.

The questions relating to the reorganization of education raised
at NS Khrushchev's initiative are a new striking example of the
Leninist, attentive, keen, and careful approach to the needs, desires
and peculiarities of each nation. —IR Razzakov, First Secretary of
the CC of the Kirgizia.

I consider it necessary to state that thanks to the daily solicitude
of the Communist Party, its Central Committee, and Nikita Serge-
yevich personally, our armed forces fully meet present-day military
requirements. —Marchal K Malinovsky, Minister of Defense.

We know full well that the coexistence of the Communist Party and
the Soviet Union, its Presidium, and Comrade NS Khrushchev
personally pay exceptional attention daily to foreign political problems,
and concretely guide our foreign policy—

Gromyko, Foreign Minister.

The problem of training universally-developed and well-prepared
builders of a Communist society...was raised by Comrade Nikita
Sergeyevich Khrushchev and was worked out under his personal
leadership. —Life showed...the correctness of Comrade NS
Khrushchev's proposals relating to the reorganization of the engi-
neering in industry and construction. (Applause)—II Kuzmin, Chair-
mam of the USSR Gosplan.

...within a short time Comrade NS Khrushchev twice visited our
socialist and gave us much useful advice concerning the development
of the economy and culture of the republic. Just for the fact alone
that the further upsurge of cotton-growing has been insured in our
country, we owe it to the indefatigable activity of the Pres-
idium if the CC and Comrade NS Khrushchev personally. (Applause)

—Uldzhazayev, First Secretary of the CC of the Tadzhik CP.

We must say: Khrushchev's ideas and methods...are...the
theoretical, and organization work that has been carried out in all
spheres by our Leninist Central Committee, beginning with the
theoretical, and organization work that has been carried out in all
spheres by our Leninist Central Committee, beginning with the
theoretical, and organization work that has been carried out in all
spheres by our Leninist Central Committee, beginning with the

Soft soap and... votes

CRESSIDA LINDSAY

MOST of the sales talk these days is aimed at women, for, as we know, women mainly do the shopping. And it is easy
to become so saturated by sales talk that you lose the plot of what is being said, save the soap. I mean sweet manufactur-
ers, have come across the real thing, then. The real thing. Once you have tasted it, you must be, for now you can eat to
your heart's content and not get hung up on the fact that you are absorbing it. And maybe you will feel that your appetite because it isn't food, I mean it doesn't... well you know the rest.

It struck me on last local election polling day that the can-
puter-housewives against the black soap man (or is it the soap white
man — doesn't matter...!), or the beautiful girl who wakes (unruffled, remember) to a sparking cup of whiskey — I mean
tea — in the morning. For he is still got wrapped up in a carton, but a plain votew, ad

The vote is one thing that cannot be ignored. Especially by women, who have once shouted for: independence, for acting as it best serves... for being safe
housing. The vote is the really independent act of a woman. And no
time like the present when, with clear day, and a pencil, and a ticket, and a party, the people who will really effect
their lives and best serve their interests. For me, at any rate, I find it a most thrilling and satisf-
ing thing, to go, and with a dirty black cross (not been in the
house I notice) I think destroy
my choice.
CIVIL DEFENCE received a thorough trouncing when they staged their first mass evacuation exercise—Operation Exodus in North Staffordshire recently. The Authorities supposed that an H-bomb had been dropped on the Manchester area. In a flash the unsuspecting population, caught off its guard, fanned by a southerly wind, had carried the deadly radioactive dust through Cheshire and into Northern Staffordshire. On the fringe of the gas-laden area the New-castle General unionist Group pointed out that too many civilians could only be saved if they were evacuated quickly. Civil Defence was in charge of how more than 2,000 civilians could be transported, taken to rest centres, and fed. The exercise was based upon a number of weird assumptions that might easily have come out of Alice in Wonderland. They said much for the Authorities' powers of imagination, but little for their capacity for organisation. They supposed that, in the eventuality of war, the enemy would drop over 300,000 bombs. And, to give the British people a sporting chance, this would be of only ONE megaton. If the enemy were so naive and so incon- siderate as to drop an H-bomb of ten megaton, the new evacuation plan would be up to 500 miles in length and 100 miles across. In which case, "Operation Exodus" would be completely futile.

Picketing

Our newly formed Stoke and District group of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament was about exposing Operation Exodus for the expensive piece of tomfoolery. It actually was started by picketing the New-castle Council meeting and, much to our own amazement, got the majority of the Labour Group to come out spontaneously against allowing CD to use the Corporation premises for their exercise. Only an unholy alliance of right-wing Labourites and Tories saved the day.

BOOKS!

BUY YOUR BOOKS THROUGH S R BOOK SERVICE

35b Priory Terrace
London N W 6

Then, Stoke CND turned its attention to the Defence Ministry to be evacuated. An intensive campaign, aimed at showing the pub- lic that only when the bomb had been banned would there be effective protection was begun. They were shown that the main function of Civil Defence was to act as a tranquiliser, a sedative that took the public's mind away from the very real dangers of the Government's nuclear policy inevitably involved.

Effective

The villagers were surprisingly sympathetic to us. We found them in general agreement with our objectives and some passed us in signs in their windows. But we felt, that even so, we would make little impact upon the 25 volunteers to the Civil Defence Authorities.

But the day showed us to be wrong. When the buses went to collect the volunteers, they came back with an average of ten people aboard. We had the impression of the world's last seats that should have been full coming in completely empty.

Cars packed with CND supporters travelled the buses. When they arrived at pick-up points, our comrades jumped out and tried to prevent people moving to co-operate with the CD Authori- ties. Women, having put their children on the bus, took them off again after they had read our leaflets. And of those who came on the exercise, many expressed their sympathy with Nuclear Disarmament.

Miscalculated

Things were not going very well for the Authorities. Besides having to contend with the CND- ers at pick-up points and outside rest centres, their own organiza- tion fell down on the job. A whole convoy of army trucks twice lost its way, had to turn back and retrac its steps. When it eventually reached its destination Kidsgrove, Mur- ray Jones of Kidsgrove, told the crowd of the convoy's circular tour. A further annoyance for CD Authorities was that one or two pickets at Kidsgrove was accidentally dropped on the Book Service vehicle. It would seem that in practice have been impossible for them to have known what Kidsgrove was inside or outside the belt of radiation.

First . . . . . last

The net result of the exercise was that Civil Defence transport- ed about 700, not more than 3,200 as they originally calculated. And, another ominous thing from their standards was that a number of their own CD workers were far from immune to the curse of over-rapid disarmament. Indeed, although Civil Defence had to bear the financial burden of the exercise, it was a complete and unparalleled success for CND.

This was the first national exercise of its kind. If the authori- ties are foolish enough to hold further ones, there is no reason why the result should not be the same. It is important to remem- ber that CD workers are, on the whole, sincere and conscientious. Nothing should be done to alien- ate them. It should always be stressed that our quarrel is not with them but with the Tory Government and the British people at the front-line in the eventuality of a Third World War, without providing the least protection.