FORTNIGHTLY
for the
Industrial Militant —
for International
Socialism

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

SOCIALIST REVIEW

9th YEAR No 11 MID JUNE 1959 SIXPENCE

Labour’s Annual Conference must show the WORKERS’ ANSWER TO RACISTS

THIS MONTH local Parties are discussing draft resolutions to be submitted at the October Annual Conference. As in past years there will be many vital topics considered—nationalization, foreign policy, disarmament, colonial policy. But there is one major problem Labour cannot afford to ignore—racial tension in Britain.

Once again Notting Hill is in the public eye; a murder has been committed and once again the Tory press has to admit that a problem exists. But it is not only London that has to be watched. A potential problem exists also in Nottingham, Manchester, Liverpool and other centres where West Indian migrants are to be found.

No one is better at smelling out potential trouble-spots than the Fascists. In Notting Hill they agitate ceaselessly—desperately trying to build and sharpen race antagonisms. It is no coincidence that Mosley has chosen North Kensington in which to stand for the coming General Election. And it is no coincidence that one of his henchmen stood, at the recent municipal elections, in the Moss Side ward of Manchester where there is the largest West Indian concentration.

Who can solve the problem of racial tension in Britain? Not the Fascists, certainly. Not, either, the Tories and the Tory press. And the well-meaning “liberals” who “de-plore” what is going on.

The responsibility lies fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the organised labour movement. The vast majority of the West Indian immigrants are workers. True, they have different backgrounds and customs, a different colour skin. But workers nevertheless.

For this reason no one but labour can have their genuine interests at heart. Our job is to work consciously to break down all the barriers, to integrate our immigrants into the ranks of the British working class and the labour movement.
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The best defence against Fascist provocations and hooligan attacks is by a joint front of worker, white and black. Together, and only together, can we win, and in so doing, lay a foundation for harmonious living, side by side.

The Labour Party must give this question serious and urgent attention. It must be raised at Conference, and before. Local Parties in trouble areas must be given every encouragement and assistance. Above all, the initiative lies with labour. We must seize it, quickly and firmly.

Life is bitter with the Conservatives say The Unemployed

THE TORIES have never denied, indeed they have claimed credit for the fact that they deliberately “damped down demand” through the medium of this that has been more clearly expressed by non-politicians. “In our opinion,” said the Cohen Council:

“it is impossible to have a free and flexible economic system can work efficiently without a perceptible (though in effect not a catastrophe) margin of unemployment of this kind.”

The decline in the intensity of demand, working through a decline in real and anticipated profits, must certainly be expected to stiffen the resistance of employers to claims for increased wage rates.

To say that the Tories meant to start it, however, is not to say that they know how to stop it. The drop in unemployment in the last few months has been hailed as if it were the end of the recession. But unemployment is still higher, the relation between numbers out of work and jobs available worse (particularly for young people) and the proportion of longer-term unemployment greater than in any other year since the Tories came in.

How much?

Moreover, a large proportion of the small decrease in unemployment between March and April was seasonal—i.e. building, hotels and catering, etc. It is significant that in some industries unemployment has gone on increasing—e.g. engineering, shipbuilding and electrical goods, and furniture. Even in the south there are now more workers out of work than there are jobs available, but for those who fall out of work in the north or in Wales it is a different world. In London and the south-east there are about 13 workers out of work for every job available, in the south-west and the midlands, about 14, but in the East and West Ridings of Yorkshire and in the north-west there are 34, in the north* and in Wales 51 and in Scotland 93.

Over all the post-war years there have normally been far more jobs for young people than could be filled. For girls in most areas except Wales there still are. But there are two boys looking for every job that is going in the north, nearly four in Wales and nearly six in Scotland. And the peak of school leavers will not be reached till 1962.

How deep?

Apart from the big question of whether unemployment in general is going to fall to more normal levels there is cause for alarm in the fact that some factors have been worsening even over the last few months when the total out of work has been falling. The proportion out for more than eight weeks has been rising steadily (in March nearly 124,000 had been out for more than six months) and it seems to be becoming

* Durham, Northumberland, Cumber-
land, Westmorland, North Riding of
Yorkshire.
TU COMMENTARY

- Railway cuts and wounds

A NOTHER of our fine democratic public services is being squashed out of existence by Tory Policy.

The latest conspiracy against the nationalized industry has been exposed by a report of the British Transport Commission in which it "modestly estimates" that 3,000 of 127,000 workers in the British Transport workshops are to be made redundant within three years. In 1956 the Commission prophesied that with minor exceptions the workshops would be full employed in three or five years. But since then "various factors, some of them outside the Commission's control, have necessitated an acceleration ... in the process of shaping workshops' policy to meet the requirements of the future".

And what a future. The report goes on to say that the workshops will be used "on the proviso that the strike is competitive" for the manufacture of certain equipment and components and for repair work. But new diesel and electric power equipment will be bought from outside industry, and "complete replacement or running stock from industry as programmes require, and when circumstances justify such a course".

John Phillips

This is the way

The shopmen's section of the National Union of Railwaymen opposed unanimously at its conference at Southport to take strike action unless the British Transport Commission stops contracting work out to private firms, which is forcing the closure of railway workshops.

A similar motion will be put forward at the union's conference in July, and the national executive is being asked to demand a change in the commission's policy.

If Jimmy Porter were in the Labour Party he would look back on 1945 as well as anger at 1945 Labour Government for putting the nationalized industries on such a basis as to allow the big shareholders to ride the boards and suck the industry dry by passing the gravy to their old school friends and not to the workers as well as to their own firms.

Every year from 1948 to 1955 British Railways made a working surplus. But this was not enough to meet the annual 40 million pounds still being paid out to shareholders. Of the estimated 85 million pounds deficit for 1958, 30 million is due to the fall in coal, iron and steel traffic—a direct result of Tory policy which cut industrial demand for all three materials. Of course we've been told that we weren't minding just passing on the pound!

If any further proof is needed for this betrayal of our public services just look at the sentence in the report which demands competitive costs from the railway workshops. In other words everything in our society, whether a public service or not, is to be run according to a profit and loss balance sheet. Never mind the workshops; it's their fault for wanting nationalization in the first place.

No compensation

How can we stop the rot that is fast setting in under the onslaught of both parties—

First of all I think by passing a resolution at this year's Labour Party conference to end the pay-ment of money to the ex-shareholders in nationalized industries. This would be one in the eye for the old-guard, the type of the party who still insist that the true decent British thing to do is to think of the poor widows who have their hard earned life savings tied up in shares and who would simply whither if they were taken away.

Secondly we must continue to press for full workers control of getting support from other unions, all this flannel about giving officials to regulate time-and-motion studies is clouding the issue.

The Union's general secretary, Mr Leonard Sharp, said that the "executive believes it is the culmination of unrest concerning work schedules which has been growing for some time".Come now Mr Sharp, what about a more definite statement that? The workers in the cotton mills, and anywhere else for that matter, know full well that time-and-motion study benefits nobody but the boss. This is more apparent in the areas of high unemployment as in Scotland. The Tory Government has not a deliberate attempt to exploit the situation to introduce speed-ups, etc.

With the cotton industry in such a precarious state it is too easy to believe that the union will demand a reduction in the working week as well as perhaps? ?

ECONOMICS

John Crutchley on Monopolies 

THE intention behind the Tories Restrictive Trade Practices Act is most clearly shown in the cotton and cable industries. The "official" intention of the act is to bust price rings. The actual effect is to increase the power of the big firms and drive the small ones to the wall.

Amalgamations in the cable industry are the result of this. Enfield Rolling Mills and Enfield Cables have been merged into a single unit. AEI the giant armament firm have recently increased their grip on the cable industry as is shown by the Economist, April 18, "the announced association Electrical Industries as one of the largest units in the industry, by adding WT Henley's Telegraph Works and the London Electric Wire Co and Smiths to their original cablemaking subsidiary, Siemens Edison Swan, has been the chief beneficiary. AEI is a more significant factor in encouraging weaker companies to amalgamate is greater than the effect of two of the four main price-fixing agreements of the Cable Manufacturers' Association. AEI was on April 30th, those covering chiefly domestic electrical wires and mains cables.

The article goes on to show how the two big boys, AEI and British Insulated Callender Cables are preparing to drive out the little firms that have only survived till now because of price-fixing. So much for free competition.

The Horse's Mouth

The Restrictive Practices Act will tend greatly to curtail the use of bargaining power in the cotton industry but that it will lead to amalgamations and larger units to face keenest competition seems certain. (Lord Chandos, Chairman AEI, letter in Financial Times, April 20).

Cotton

The Government have no doubts that the circumstances of the cotton industry . . . justify the exceptional course of direct financial assistance from public funds. David Eccles, April, 23, 1959.

WITH these words the President of the Board of Trade promised £30 million to the Lancashire Cotton industry to scrap its excess capacity and obsolete equipment and equip itself with modern machinery. This £30 million is in addition to the £33 million given to cotton between 1927-57.
Engineering Employers—no change

by Karl Dunbar A E U

IT seems to me a terrible tragedy that a society of nearly one million workers can be so ill used by their elected representatives. Never since the days of John Tanner has there been such a spate of anti-leader- ship feeling in the branches and factories. The situation is the almost contemptuous attitude that is being adopted towards the executive, taken, for example, one of the latest incidents. On the instructions of the executive coun- cil the engineering employers furnished sufficient copies of their anti trades unions document into the Industrial Relations (quoted in SR, May/1) for every branch of the AEU to receive one. In addition, a circular letter from the General Secretary, made it perfectly clear that no correspondence whatever was to be issued on this document. In other words, we have before us a two page document based on deliberate lies, half truths, smears and distortions and we are not allowed to make any comment.

Two lockouts

What earthly use is there in circulating such a piece of trash, as this document is, which waste the precious funds of our union in such a manner, if our natural inclination to sort out the truth and expose the employers’ errors did not prevail?

Let us examine, briefly, the documents for such highlights as will show just how impossibly arrogant the employers can become, if once we give them the opportunity.

Firstly, let us find the statement, “the industry has an enviable record of industrial peace”. From the first page of the document, if we, in recounting the history of the two great lockouts 1898 and 1922, “the employers imposed a lockout which ended with a re- sumption on their terms”. These lockouts lasted for thirty and three months respectively and it is true that industrial peace was secured, after the employers had made the workers into submission.

The employers claim that both these lockouts were imposed sim- ply because the Union challenged their “right to manage their fac- tories as they see fit”. This “princi- piple” is quoted no less than eleven times in the document, and it is true that the employers see every dispute, every chal- lenge from the workers as an attempt to put an end to the “right to manage as they see fit”.

At the time of the 1898 lockout which was imposed by the employers in order because the Unions were seeking the reduction in working hours, the Glasgow District Committee old machinery is the main cause of the industry’s troubles. The mill owners for years did not modernize their plants, because the cost of their old machinery had been written off. This, and

Since 1955, 435 cotton mills have closed. Between 1954 and 1958 workers employed fell from 333,000 to 250,000.

The British cotton industry has been hit from many directions. The re-birth of the Indian cotton industry after 150 years if imperialism continued and the growth of Hong Kong’s growing output. And the Lancashire bosses own mismanage- ment of the industry has anything to do with how to hold their share in the West African and Australian markets in face of such competition despite the added ad- vantage of Imperial preference. In face of these blows, Lancashire since the war has staggered from crisis to crisis.

This perpetual crisis was cli- maxed by the decision of the Re- strictive Practices Court in January to end price fixing in spinning. As shown below the COTV’s decisions are aimed at creating larger industrial units, that is, a greater degree of mono- poly.

Compensation terms

Three months after this deci- sion, Eccles, the abominable showman of coronation fame an- nonced the terms. The basic terms of compensation: each mill owner will be given by the gov- ernment classes B & C receive 50% of his loss of destroying his mill. He will also be given one quarter towards modernizing existing mills and installing new ones. Later this was increased to one-third.

The two-thirds redundancy compensation is shot through. As we have seen the original costs of the mills was covered years ago; in fact the 7,800,000 households in this country have no bath of their own, according to the latest figures available.

8,000,000 households in this country have no bath of their own, according to the latest figures available.

the absence of technological in- novation in the 1930’s meant the cotton mills paid its way. Meanwhile the rest of the world built new cotton mills while the cotton bosses failed to re-invest their profits. Maybe they knew a Tory government would come along one nice day and give them £30 million for doing nothing.

A month later the agreement the cotton spinning and weaving unions had reached with the bosses was announced. It should be remembered that the Tories sold the bosses to the bosses was dependent on the displaced workers being considered “redundant” and that the bosses slice the workers com- pensation is a farce.

A worker aged 23 gets one week’s pay per year as compensation. That’s 58 if he is a ring spinner. Approximately, for every two years work you get one week’s pay. Thus a 44 year old worker gets ten weeks’ wages. A 54 year man 16 weeks and over 65, hand of starvation and dire pov- erty.

Having dealt with two of the most savage employers’ attacks upon the engineering workers it is now up to those of us who have fallen behind to bring up to date, as it were, the present attitude of the engineer- ing unions under the new administra- tion of the一天’s work. The object of the lockout was to get rid of trades unionism altogether.

Some tactics

The employers adopted the very same tactics in the 1922 lockout as they had in 1898. The document states that the employers were forced to take action when their right to manage their estab- lishments as they saw fit”, was challenged by the Unions. They claim in this document, that the objections of the unions was, “a managerial functions dis- pute”. The truth is made evident in a statement issued by the EC of the AEU on the eve of the 1922 lockout, “the real position is that unless we are prepared to negotiate on the two points, we are to be threatened with a national lockout of Federation firms.”

The employers’ claim to be the sole arbiters as to when overtime shall be worked at a time when over 57,000 of our members are unemployed, indicates that they have learnt nothing, that circumstances are of no account, that they still harbour the old idea of master and man.

What the document fails to tell us is firstly that there were over 50,000 engineers unemployed, secondly that the kind of employ- ers were still demanding that overtime be work and third that they had posted notices on every Federation factory on March 11 and one year to the effects that from that date no member of the union would be employed in a Federation firm. The employ- ers do not wish to remember that they had not the slightest compunctions in locking out 260,000 workers for thirteen weeks, in losing 13,6500,000 work- ing days and more important, in bringing into every home the 30 weeks.

But this isn’t the end of the story. If you get another job at your old rate of pay your “compen- sation” ends. If your new job is less than your old rate you get the difference. You think the Cotton Spinners lack of compensation is as soon as he re- invents his money? Of course not. He dispossses of everything except cotton. But remember he gets one-third of a new mill where he does.

Even the top management will get a flat rate of compensation which won’t be taken from them then nor, not if they get new jobs. Conservative freedom works but it makes some a lot more free than others.

7,800,000 households in this country have no bath of their own, according to the latest figures available.

It is just as easy to say, damn the consequences, we can hold out long enough to smash the unions and then to ruin the industry and bring misery into thousands of homes. There it is, the employers’ real intentions so far as the workers’ economic Welfare are concerned. “Twice in four years the Federation had been forced to lock out the members of the trade unions. Clearly the unions capcity to pay strike benefit was limited enough to small houses. If it would have done the virtual closing down of the industry that would have been a calculated risk. It was no occasion for the kind of compromise which would inevitably emerge from a voluntary lockout.”

Let every engineering worker be warned from this document that they face a coming struggle no less bitter and prolonged than that of 1922. In that coming struggle they must have an elec- tion of the leadership which is thinking and acting decisively on behalf of the membership. I put it to my brothers in the trade, have we got that leadership today? To defeat the aims of the employ- ers class we must prepare, fighting policy, which includes equal pay, a forty-hour-week and more jobs for the workers without a struggle. Let us waste no more time, put for- ward a PLAN for all the trade unions as FULL MAINTENANCE as the rallying call for the whole move- ment. This is what we must have, this is what we must believe the rank and file of our movement will, as always rise to the occasion. If we cannot get the lead we want from the leader- ship then we must act for our- selves.
THE LIMITS OF REFORM: a reply to Ken Alexander
by Michael Kidron

KEN ALEXANDER'S arguments amount to an overall strategy for the Labour Movement and go beyond the simple plan, as I think he is immediately sub-
ject under discussion. The strategy is simple and plausible: "A radical social change is the most that does or can be practised or, in terms of a socialist wages policy, how is it to come about? What is the mechanism?". Alexander means by the "an alliance of government and trade unions" to obtain tax reform of 'unearned incomes', to maintain "fair" prices and to raise real wages and salaries by "at least" 3 per cent annually (pamphlet, pp. 7, 33).

This is not the finer constitutional details, such as the formation of a National Wages Advisory Council representing "three sides of industry" - Government, TUC and British Employers' Conference - or the provisions for "moral pressure" and "public opinion" to be brought to bear on any of the reluctant "sides" by the others and by other members of the same "side". We can ignore, likewise - for the moment at least - the extraordinary modesty of the plan. If a 2 per cent plus steady prices is an example of capitalism's "sticking point" beyond which "democracy must really be replaced", we are wrong, very wrong, in thinking capitalism in one form or another rules the world.

Goal and achievement

Compare Alexander's goal with the actual achievement by, say, the Labour Party, which in its "socialist working class" of a 7 per cent per annum increase in real wages while prices remained steady between 1951 and 1956 (GC Allen, Japan's Economic Recovery, Oxford, 1958, p. 201), or by the Germans of 8 per cent annually or the Dutch of 5 per cent between 1950 and 1955 (United Nations, Economic Survey of Europe in 1956, Chapter IX, p. 4) - and all this without the benefit of a Labour Government pledged to a socialist wages plan.

But these are incidents. Let's accept as desirable the aims of the socialist plan - limited. Let's forget the finer points of con-

stitution-mongering. What we are after is an appraisal of the overall strategy of "prohibiting" to "prevent" what it does or can be practised or, in terms of a socialist wages policy, how is it to come about? What is the mechanism?". These are fundamental questions. Their answers will help to explain the differences between SR's "What we Stand For" and Alexander's strategy, between a tranquilisation of revolutionist reformism, if you like, and a re-formist program of accepting the status quo.

The agent

Alexander is quite explicit about this method, the agent of reform. It is a Labour Government that has worked out a wages policy with the unions and obtained a promise of support for its implementation; that has, besides, obtained a clear mandate for it from the country (pamphlet p. 58 and elsewhere).

Then he stops: nowhere does he so much as suggest that a Labour Government will be able to say to any of the reluctant "sides" by the others and by other members of the same "side". We can ignore, likewise - for the moment at least - the extraordinary modesty of the plan. If a 2 per cent plus steady prices is an example of capitalism's "sticking point" beyond which "democracy must really be replaced", we are wrong, very wrong, in thinking capitalism in one form or another rules the world.

Capital flight

No answer. Not the briefest reference to the last attempt.

It is worth recalling. As long as the Labour Government was leading to the balance of payments problem, it was the most "progressive" government of the time. The Cabinet was originally thought of as the government, not as a mere "name" or "title" for the firm of the government. It shows clearly enough how monopolies profits and profit margins soared throughout Labour's last administration (pamphlet, pp. 60-5). He does not outline a guarantee against repetition.

Trust busting

The plan rests on the Labour Government's ability to squeeze monopolies profits, to prevent prices from rising. A strengthened Monopolies Commission, government fiscal measures - differential taxes, investment allowances will be used to induce big business to keep profits below "prescribed maxima" (pamphlet pp. 43-5). That is all. Whether a Commission can bust monopolies which are capitalism's new formal organization today, is left vague. Whether profits can be controlled (if presumes) that the government without destroying private capitalism, is neither asked nor answered.

Alexander does recognize that capital might offer opposition. "Clearly", he argues, "it would be dangerous to rule out the possibility of 'strike of capital' at some point ... But what should we do? Of course, to keep the capitalist machine running despite the capitalists? Ah, "it would be necessary for a Labour government embarking on such policies to prepare public opinion in advance, to make clear that it would know how to meet such a crisis". And how would it meet such a crisis? How the country had a Labour government, pledged to pushing capitalism to its "sticking point" without retaining the "basic fabric of class control, lack of planning and so on, prevent, a mass dejection of capital from Britain". Can a program of redistribu-
tion, unacceptable to the ruling class, tally with recognition of the charter of paper and other capitalist property conventions which are dynamite for a 'legalistic', "constitutional" Labour government?

Subsequently it was shown that in the same year £315 million (£101 million more than was estimated at the time) was shipped abroad in 'hot' and 'cold' investments and that stocks worth £610 million (a full £370 million more than was estimated at the time) were laid up during the same period (T. Balogh, 'Pitfalls for a Labour Government', New Statesman, December 19th, 1953). The extra £470 million spent abroad illegally and semi-legally was more than enough to cover the balance of payments deficits.

Did not know

But the Labour government did not know. It could not know, not without infringing capitalist 'property rights' by opening the books of companies and by using the information so obtained to control their activities in detail. At a later date, Gaiteskell could do no more than look back re- gretfully, "without the real and negligible ignorance about stocks and works in progress. I have little doubt", he wrote, "that our policy in 1950 and 1951 would have been more successful had we had adequate and up-to-date information on this point". (Fabian Journal, No. 14, November 1954).

In the light of this, would Alexander agree to nationalize the basic industries? No! Open the books of capitalist concerns? Oh no! Appeal to workers to report on destination and source of all goods, to take control? Certainly not! That would not do. Remember, we are pro-

ving the limits of reform, not clearing to the heart of revolution. Therefore, "prepare public opinion" and make it clear that Labour "would know how to meet such a crisis" as, presumably it knew in 1931 or 1951 or 1961(7). Once again, inducements will be lavished on business to "restore confidence" and Britain turned into a haven for Capital. What then of the wages plan? The 3 per cent. The stabilizing price.

The state

The handcuffs Alexander prepared for capital have turned into cuffslinks. And no wonder. His executive agent, the next Labour Government, can no more cur-
tail the workings of the capitalist system than a butler dismiss his Lord. This Alexander refuses to ad-
mit. His whole analysis tends to give the state independent power, above and beyond the classes.
G. R. White, an official of the United Textile Federation, accused leather controller at the Board of Trade. The match controller was employed by Bryant and May, whose profits were based on that firm's premises. The paper controller was Sir Ralph Keelpied, a director of one of the largest paper manufacturing firms in the country. Major F. J. Bodkin, president of the boot and footwear controller, and the hostess, furniture and tobacco controllers or advisers were trade representatives, while companies of Distillers Ltd, occupied the top posts in the Molasses and Industrial Alcohol Control of the Board of Trade, and Liverpool's cotton firms supplied the bulk of Cotton Control. The controller of the textiles of the largest of the lot, was almost completely staffed by industry men, who helped the controller to have a large say, on an honorary basis, i.e., paid by private industry.

Newspaper was allocated to a trade body, the Newspaper Rating and Classification Committee. The importers' National Defence Association and the Wholesale Meat Supply Association distrusted imported meat. Rationing of clothing was the concern of trade association controllers. Over the 'sweets' trade was in the hands of the cocoa and confectionery trade associations who, by 1950, were able to classify and distribute the raw materials without further authority from the Ministry of Food.

The Mond Nickel Co. imported all nickel and rationed it to users through "an unofficial system working between the Mond Nickel Co. and the Ministry of Supply." Sulphur was purchased by the National Sulphuric Acid Association which consisted of three sulphuric acid producers. When the Ministry of Materials became the sole importer of tungsten ores and concentrates it proposed to form a company whose management would include representatives of three private firms in the trade.

The Ministry of Food worked closely with the trade and companies in a big way... But why go on?

Alexander and workers

This was a Labour government, a government supposedly dedicated to working-class democracy; a government supposedly ridding itself of the twin ills of socialism, that is a detailed exposition of a more general strategy: 'probing the limits... We have found that it is not necessary to exploit the workers to serve their ends. At most, they can hope to lessen its bite, to force it to retreat a bit here and there.'

Reforms

It is going to be impossible to reform the system, given the opposition of the electorate in the form of the political parties. The only way to achieve reform is through direct action.
ON THE BORDER of Paddington and North Kensington the 28 buses have a remarkably irritating habit of taking long rests at Westbourne Park Station while, it is said, staff conduct a desperate search for the cause. On a recent occasion while a somewhat incohherent middle-class man harangued the inspector for what was not the inspector’s fault, three miles away a gruff candidate won 48 per cent of the votes. The Union candidate was second with 32 per cent of the votes, and the Conservative was nowhere with 16 per cent.

Moisy active

In North Kensington, Moisy’s electoral machine is already active urging unionists even those that moan away.

A crowded meeting was described by a local newspaper in the following terms: Moisy thought “it was the triumph of a cup-of-tea crowd by bril- liant political oratory. At the conclusion of each speech, every man present rose to his feet and cheered louder than at Lottus Road roar when the Kangers have nettet.

“Hats were thrown into the air. People stamped their feet in approbation. A few men even stood on their chairs and jumped for joy.” (Shepherd’s Bush Gazette.)

The first fascist movement in England was founded 28 years ago, under the name of the British Fascists League. Signifi- cantly, its main object was the closing of Britain to the “immi- grants” and thousands of grandi- pappers ... taking the bread out of English mouths.”

Apart from various rumbles against “Labour Jews” little move was made until 1926, when an organization called “British Fascis- casi Ltd.” was formed, probably in an effort which had been toward producing a “British Front” to counteract the strength of the Labour Party.

The Great Strike of 1926 was a field day for the miscel- laneous fascists of the time. Strike-breaker-in-chief, Winston Churchill, had said the year be- fore: “I could not help being charmed by his thoughtfulness and simple bearing and by his calm, detached pose in spite of the excitement around him. Secondly, anyone could see that he thought of nothing but the last good, as he understood it, the last good, and that no less interest was of the slightest consequence to him. If I had been an Italian, I am sure that I should have been whole-heartedly with you from the start to finish in your triumphtant struggle against the bootlicking appetites and passions of Leninism. I will, however, say a word on the international aspect of the situation. Externally, the movement has rendered service to the whole world. The great fear which has always been that a democratic leader or working class leader has been that of be- ing undermined by some sinister influence. Italy has shown that there is a way of fighting the subversive forces which can rally the masses of the people, properly led, to value and wish to defend the honour and stability of the civilised society. She has provided the necessary antidote to the Rus- sian poison. Hereafter no great nation can be unprovided with the ultimate means of protection against the cancerous growth of Bolshevism.”

Churchill I. Adolph

Right up to the outbreak of war the ‘great anti-fascist’ was content with the same proof that a book published in 1939, he said of Hitler that: “The story of that struggle cannot be read without admiration for the solidarity, discipline, the power force which enabled him to challenge, defy, conciliate, or overcome, all authorities or ren- ters his path ... I have always said that if Great Britain were defeated in war, I hoped we should find a Hitler to lead us back to our rightful position amongst the nations.”

Racialism, however, was never dormant. One splinter group pub- lished this remarkable manifesto: “The Jewish question has touched any other part of the globe and for that reason we are attacking, and originating the nucleus of a world Jewish League.”
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The British Union of Fascists, led by Moisy, was formed in 1932. The ground had been well prepared for such an organiza- tion and membership grew at an unprecedented rate.

The movement set out to impress the British public with its aggressiveness and “vitality.”

Twenty years after

At great national gatherings, if one heck- le was bold enough to interrupt, Moisy would stop speaking, the loud speakers would be silenced and the arc lights turned upon the interrupter who would be pounced upon and beaten up by a dozen or more blackshirts. This was generally the way the blackshirts had been treated in the past.
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The book has a much greater value, however. It meets the pre-

Angry

We had always wondered how an angry young man could be really angry. After the 20th Congress as well as disillusionment with the West. After all, many genera-

The U.S. Government has a stockpile of 75,000 nuclear weapons, enough to wipe out all the people in the world 20 times over, according to Nobel Prize - winning scientist, Dr. Linus Pauling.

Daily Worker, April 30

The nuclear war, Mills then fails to give anything but the palest suggestions for a policy to stop this madness.

The book has a much greater value, however. It meets the pre-

Our artists’ revolts that were supposed to swell the corn of Western civilisation, is being hailed as the 19th century prophet of the present. Hlasco’s artistic intuition when exercised on questions of power politics, have an oddly familiar ring, the final role of the party system he set out to challenge.

Dostoevsky appears in Stalinist garb with his side~the West has justice. But the East has strength. I am a Slav, I admire strength.

There are a number of techni-

class elements and unskilled workers (farmers and workers in Lyons and a week on the National) can be the rabble-raisers’ dream road to prosperity and property.

At the height of the fascist campaigns of the ‘thirties there were plenty of beatings up, but so far as is known, no killings.

There has been one already in North Kensington.
war and its causes

vailing official American mythology on its own ground, establishes that beneath the formal façade of democracy, the US is ruled by a power elite, which has successfully tamed labour and peace can be kept by a tightrope liberal opposition, and dominates the emerging mass society of present-day USA. This ruling class, driven by its own fanatical ideology, which can only stabilise itself by a permanent war build-up, and threatened by imminent disrup and a superior Soviet alternative, consciously and unconsciously becomes one of the major causes of World War III.

The audience

A partisan policy of division is needed within the US. Against a background of domestic politics, Mills addresses himself to his colleagues, so many of whom are complacently engaged in the "Great American Celebration." He sets out a series of demands, some of them rather whimsical, for the intellectuals who serve on Washington. It is plain that his principal aim is to meet the people he is trying to influence on their present level, combating the current ruling class ideology by taking its logic to its own conclusion of world nuclear destruction. He suggests a policy of opposition, of speaking out against official policy, which could begin a wider mass opposition. He points to the courage shown by some writers, scientists and "culture workers" of Europe and the Soviet bloc, whose ferment was able to stir deeper chemistry in the masses below.

But Wright Mills has also pointed some observations for a non-American audience.

"We, 1 British or German or Danish, I should demand that my Government 'contract out' of NATO in its present form. I should certainly demand that the US should not be allowed to place in my territory launching bases for intermediate-range missiles, and I should encourage the view that the only sensible defence is a citizen army of rifles." It is with the system which is itself the main cause of World War II that Wright Mills seriously suggests we should find an alternative to, before the peace of mutual fright drives us all over the brink to nuclear war.

J. FOURROW

As simple as black and white
(by Cressida Lindsay)

"You are too soft," says Grandma. "Why in my day..."

"All right," I say. "We're too soft, but we survive better, and that doesn't mean to say that wasn't our problem."

"Problems, what problems? You have enough vitamins, entertainment, even false teeth free."

"We have many problems," I continue. "In fact, we have one mighty problem now."

"Oh, what's that?"

"A colour problem."

"A what?"

"You know, colour—black and white."

"They're not colours."

"Well then, pink and brown."

"Should they all be well together," sighs Grandma, settling down in her chair and covering herself with a patchwork blanket.

"But they don't," I say.

"People always want to fight over something these days, it's all the communications, if you start breaking down the barriers one way, you've got to do the lot of them. Begin with the telephone and you'll end up with a common language. Oh yes, people want to travel all right, but they don't like the foreigners."

"It's not that," I say. "It's when the foreigners come over here that the trouble starts."

"There were quite a few Germans in my day," says Grandma reminiscently. "They had street bands..."

"It's not foreigners I'm speaking about," I interrupt. "It's coloured people.

"What's the difference?"

"Some people say they're inferior."

"Every civilized race is inferior until it is liberated. Anyway you can't go on occupying a country unless you think that you are the superior lot. Women were considered inferior until...

As Grandma seemed to be getting indignant, I went on—"Others say that once you start mixing the races, you get a kind of mongrel, an impure man."

"But at least," boasted Grandma, "they're not mad, like the inbred tory of my day."

"But some of them live like animals, in mud huts and disease everywhere, terribly primitive."

"Reminds me," said Grandma, reminiscing again, "of the industrial revolution. Anyway, what are we doing for these so-called primitives, liberating or exterminating them?"

"Neither—just tolerating them.

Grandma is plainly irritated. "Why are they here, anyway? she asks.

"Oh, that's a long story, most people have forgotten, or just don't know."

"That's education for you!"

"Anyway," I continue, ignoring Grandma's remark as I have no answer for it, "The main cause for this intolerance, apart from inherited prejudices of course, is the fact that these coloured people are not only taking up room in already overcrowded areas, but also need work, which leads to a great deal of friction when it comes to apply for jobs."

Grandma waves her hand at me. "Once it was the Finnish weavers, a short while ago it was the Irish, now it's the coloured people."

"Exactly, it seems that we really have to face it now, there is no hiding behind a mask for these people, we have finally to face up to the fact that they exist as nations and are not merely either just cannibals, or peoples of occupied territories. It is a great fundamental barrier we have to negotiate, to eventually pull down."

"But you still haven't told me why they're here," exploded Grandma.

"Well, in return for exploiting and monopolizing the product of their country we allow them to settle here with the same rights...

"OK, and then ACCEPT THEM."

"We don't seem to be able to; we have been brought up to believe they are inferior, possibly we're a little afraid of them too, anyway people forget the reasons when it comes to jobs, houses and the rest."

"Well then, get out of their country, that's all I can say."

"If only things were as simple as that."

"They are," sighed Grandma, "As simple as black and white."

Bob Haworth.

We need £20 an issue
During the last fortnight we have received from:

E & DC (Ipswich) 12 0
Readers in N Kensington 1 9 0
Readers in Harrow 1 9 0
Readers in Islington 8 17 6

Total 13 8 0
TABLE I UNEMPLOYMENT, APRIL 1951-9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Youth*</th>
<th>Unemployed over 8 weeks</th>
<th>All Youth*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Under 18.

TABLE II UNEMPLOYED BOYS

| Year | Over 8 weeks | Unemployed as %
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sagging Profits?

The DOORKEEPER

Mr. Wilson: Control is not ownership. We will not go by back door methods, if we need to control firms, we shall do it honestly and squarely in Parliament.

Of course, if the Labour Party were really proposing that the State should take over the 500 largest firms in the country, by back-door or front-door method, that would indeed benews.

This move would have our wholehearted support, for it would mean that the drastic change in domestic policy, in the direction of Socialism—Daily Worker, May 8.

What the SOCIALIST REVIEWS stand for international Socialism. Only the mass mobilisation of the working class in the political arena can lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

The SOCIALIST REVIEWS believe that the real constant threat to the future of the workers is the nationalisation of everything. Government must be brought to bear on the basis of the following programme:

- The complete nationalisation of the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments based on a means test.
- The nationalisation of all denationalised industries without compensation.
- The nationalisation of all industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.
- Workers' control in all nationalised industries is a majority of workers' representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and removal of any who act against the interests of the workers.
- The establishment of a welfare state which will control all private enterprises within the framework of a planned economy. In all instances representation must be subject to frequent election, immediate recall, and removal of any who act against the interests of the workers.
- The establishment of a workers' committee to have full powers of control concerning wages and working conditions.
- The establishment of an independent body to consider all questions of work and full maintenance.
- The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions for the aged and the abolition of all payments for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.
- The expansion of the existing programmes for giving interest free loans to local authorities and the right to requisition privately held land.
- The Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fee paying schools. Comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants without a means test—for all university students.
- Freedom from all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection to all workers whatever their country of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain. Freedom from all political and economic oppression to all colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to the people of the under-developed countries.
- The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas.
- The abolition of the H-bomb and all weapons of mass destruction. Britain to pave the way with unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb.
- A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington nor Moscow.