SOCIALISM NOT ZURICH!

The Times said it editorially (January 17), so do we: "The approval of sixteen schemes which may in time provide work for 1,000 people is about as much as could have been expected" from the Tory Government. This generous government intervention "may in time" solve one-sixth of one percent current official unemployment or one-tenth of one percent according to more realistic estimates. As The Times remarks and we, of course, echo: "If the results of the Government's efforts to attract business to the worst pockets of unemployment have so far been meagre... it is hardly a matter for surprise." Hear, hear! And "hear, hear!" too, to that paper's conclusion from the news that nineteen new areas—where unemployment has been over four percent for a year or more—have now been scheduled for aid under the Distribution of Industry (Industrial Finance) Act: "it is all likely to be on a very small scale unless and until the economy as a whole begins to move forward once more."

Let's go back a few weeks to a previous editorial from The Times — the one commenting on convertibility. "The chief internal need of the British economy," they wrote (December 29), "is a measure of stimulus for industrial capital expenditure... And the natural stimulant—lower long-term interest rates or budget investment allowances, or both—might appear to be made rather more difficult by introducing convertibility first."

So there it is. Measures to alleviate unemployment are poppycock without expansion; expansion is poppycock when coupled with convertibility. The Tories' house organ says so. It must be true.

How has our leadership met this situation? Have they exposed this disgusting hypocrisy? Employment is becoming a prisoner to international finance. What is their policy? How are we to fight the consequences of convertibility?

On one thing we should be quite clear. Convertibility, as The Times admits, was not the first priority for the British capitalist economy. There were political reasons which far outweighed anything the economists might have said.

Adjust political power in Europe to the economic facts of life. Pawn France to the German bankers irredeemably. Cash in on the depression in the domestic class in working class activity to lower European standards — and more.

But there is another reason, one which concerns us nearly. Capitalism is firmly in the saddle and confident in its power in Britain today. It is on the offensive. Gone are the days when it had to hide behind the right-wing leadership of our Party and unions—as it did after the War. Gone are the days of concessions and compromises. It has power and wants to exercise it openly and efficiently — through its Tory Party. A Labour Government, even a mouse of a Labour Government, is an embarrassment. Anything that will sabotage its coming to power is good enough and will be and, in fact, has been used.

The pound is convertible. Their business associates abroad — the Zurich bankers, the American businessmen have been told to appoint the Government of this country. As the Daily Mail wrote editorially (December 30): "...if a Socialist Government were returned he (Gaitskell — Ed.) would find it more difficult to restrain the torrent of money which would run out of the country" as a result of convertibility. Not only would they be able to sabotage a Labour Government in power (as they did in 1951) but they could undermine Labour's election campaign. Writes the Economist — faithful mirror of City opinion: "As polling day approaches, some speculators may think that they had better cash in their sterling at the official rates quickly, for fear of being obliged to accept the old discounted transferable rate if Labour should return and not stand steadfastly behind the new system" (January 3).

They need not bother. Our leadership has already surrendered and given its word of honour to obey the dictates of the financial brotherhood. Gaitskell has declared that, however much he dislikes the move, a Labour Government will accept it. Harold Wilson went out of his way on television to assure Zurich, New York and the rest, that a Labour Government would guard the pound as the apple of its eye. British Socialism has already been pawned to the hock-shops of world finance.

But not entirely. British Socialism is not the chattel of Gaitskell, Wilson and the rest. It is not theirs to swap for a capitalist "confidence trick." Rank-and-file Labour must make it clear that there is an alternative to Zurich: nationalize the banks to prevent capital flight; nationalize foreign trade to prevent secret import and export agreements; open the books of capitalist firms to see what resources are used for what purpose; plan the economy under workers' control to eliminate control by Wall Street and Zurich; and, meanwhile, agitate within our Party and Unions to fight this growing unemployment by: refusing to accept sacking; reducing the work-week without loss of pay; and the taking over of shut-down plants by their workers. Wake up, Labour! Socialism not Zurich!
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A BLOW AGAINST OFFICIALDOM

—THE BARKING 'REVOLT'—

Many of the Left greeted the sit-down strikes on London's Underground as a middle-class extravagance, temporary, isolated from the "real, political struggle," something at which toraise a left eyebrow, but no more. Others have condemned the strikers forimputing blame to a nationalized industry and its governing body—the London Transport Executive. We believe that both these approaches are fundamentally wrong.

As we have said time and again, the Tory Government is using the LTE to discredit nationalized enterprise. They are using the capital's travelling public as a guinea pig to see how far they can go in providing less and less service for more and more money. They are using London's transport workers as sparring partners for the fights against bigger bodies in our Labour Movement. They are squeezing workers and passengers alike to pay ex-owners compensation.

The effects of these plans are widespread. They involve everyone working in London Transport, using it or even hearing about it. Every reaction on the part of those affected is potentially a political action, not to be ignored. On the contrary, every reaction should be built on and expanded, organized and directed against the Tories and their system, against a nationalization that is divorced from workers' control, against an apathetic leadership who should be directing this fight.

No one is doing this type of job better than the London busmen's rank-and-file journal, Platform. We are proud to reprint their editorial of last month and consider it to fully represent the views of Socialist Review on the recent sit-down strikes and the way to fight the Tories' campaign against London's transport.

One final word. The article printed herewith is directed at London's busmen. Non-busmen can play their part by getting their local trade-union branches or Labour Parties, Trade Councils and other organizations to protest at the destruction of our transport, by publicising these protests as widely as possible in the local and national Press, by exposing the Tories' attack on the passengerization in public meetings, by pressing for mayors' meetings, by demanding the end of compensation and so on.

And especially, by refusing any unreasonable demand on the part of the LTE, whether by word of inspectors' mouth or over the new system of loudspeakers which is being installed to take the place of trains and buses.—Editor.

WHEN district line passengers hoisted the 'Jolly Roger' and mutinied at Barking station on New Year's Day, they struck a blow in defence of the people's transport services that may well have a greater and more far-reaching effect than all the learned political talk has done for years past.

Within a matter of hours, the mutineers of Barking had been joined by a host of supporters at Mile End and Finchley. In refusing to quit their trains before they had reached their scheduled destination the workers for ten million Londoners—that service should be run to meet the needs of the people—and not merely to suit the whims and fancies of a pompous and autocratic group of sullen men at 55 Broadway.

The swift—two-two-three—blows delivered to the LTE's solar plexus, had old Broadway running round in dazed circles. Mr B H Harbour, operations boss, made frantic efforts to stop the public, in the course of which he delivered himself of the following gong:

"I want to give my personal assurance that we never resort to taking a train out of service absolutely unavoidable in the general interest. Our sole job in life is to serve the public."

Nobody is talking about "taking a train out of service." What is happening is that vehicles—both buses and trains—are being turned short of scheduled destinations as part of a calculated and deliberate drive designed to produce economies and boost revenue. And, to this end, the needs of passengers and the welfare of being of staff alike is completely ignored.

This policy is part and parcel of the whole LTE approach to the running of London Transport. The aim is to squeeze the maximum revenue from the public for the minimum of service, and the greatest possible effort from the staff for the lowest possible wages. So far as old Broadway is concerned, the ten million users of London Transport exist to serve the interests of the LTE—and NOT the other way round.

In challenging this position, the mutineers of Barking are a hundred times right. If their "New Year Resolution" is kept—and extended throughout the whole range of LTE services the autocratic reign of Sir John and his sacked majority may come to an end. The Harbour's and the Bur- nell's will be taught that they are VANITAS—NOT the MASTERS of London.

So far the revolt of the passengers has been confined to the underground railway system. There is equal need for similar action on the bus and trolleybus systems against the growing prac-tice of "turning short," "toollisa-

JACK FROST SERVES BOSSES

writes TRAMP NAVY

"That the Annual Conference of the NBPTO strongly condemns the actions of those employers who have ruthlessly used the powers of discharge given in Working Rule 2B to avoid their undoubted responsibil-ity to properly operate under Work Rule 2A during the severe spell of time in February of this year. Conference reaffirms its belief that Working Rule 2A was incorporated in the agreement so as to minimise the hardship to building operatives during severe weather and calls on the affiliated unions to take the necessary steps immediately to strengthen the provisions of Working Rule 2A, and to eliminate the absolute powers of dismissal given to employers in Working Rule 2B."

Please, readers, do not regard the above resolution as a lot of jargon. It was passed at 1956 Conference of the National Federation of Building Trades Workers because the London Transport Master Builders were interpreting our Working Rule Agreement.

Clause 2A deals with time lost through causes beyond the control of the parties to the Agreement and "short journey" jobs. Pushing forward its policy against the service cuts, our Central Bus Committee advised staff to:

"Refuse to be turned short to cover service gaps and carry out the right to proceed to scheduled terminal points."

When this advice was given, the Fleet Street Press immediately screamed that we were "hitting the public"—that the public itself is insisting on that very principle—i.e., that vehicles proceed to scheduled termini.

This journal has consistently argued that the fight to preserve the people's transport services can only be waged effectively if, and when, the passengers join in. Now they are beginning to do so—and very effectively too. But then the passengers provide the revenue—join forces with the staff for the normal working hours. It also then, and only then—will London get the transport service it needs and deserves.

At long last the public "worn" is turning. Forty thousand bus drivers and conductors can assist the process by rigidly adhering to their trade union agreement—by refusing to be turned short—and by explaining the real facts to the public.

Twenty thousand conductors can talk to literally thousands of people every day. Let us now begin the biggest talking campaign ever on London Transport—and let us back the talk with action.

It is an old business axiom that "The customer is always right." The customer has spoken—and he IS RIGHT.

When you read this you may say what a lot of lucky so-and-so's building workers are. If it rains or snows or frosts for three weeks on a trot they sit and get paid 36 hours guaranteed. This, however, is far from what actual conditions should be. The fact is, and particularly for us there is another clause in our agreement—Clause 2B which deals with the termination of engagement.

Now what this Clause 2B says, among other things, is that termination of service shall be upon...
TRAMP NAVVY—ctd

the tending of two hours’ notice by either employer or workman, such notice to expire at the normal working time. Again, when work is stopped on the instructions of a recognised combined authority, employment may be terminated at two hours’ notice expiring at the end of any day.

If the dock can swallow all that, and I will excuse you all if you do, not, you will see that the employer finds it much more profitable to operate Clause 2A and operate Clause 2B.

Flagrant Attack

In January, 1956, building workers in the London Area were highly organised on the large projects that were going on at that time. A stewards rank-and-file committee was set up to fight our wage claims, and at a meeting in Central Hall, 2,500 building workers, demonstrated for our wages claims. It was a stupendous task for thousands of the lads from the sites marched to the employers’ offices. Even the dockers were in a dusty roar—"one, two, three, four, we want a tanner more." Many of the lads in Liverpool and Manchester and they really had the employers worried. Not for long though. Along comes Jack Falleag and instead of paying the guaranteed 36 hours minimum, the employers of the building workers, that gives them authority to sack on two hours’ notice on a Friday—Clause 2B. The stewards and the men that clause ruthlessly by trying to break the power and strength of the building workers and that period. Whole sites were sacked and later all were started back except, as recent as the National Bank, the stewards and militants.

The attack by the employers was so flagrant that the London Regional Council of the NFBTO was able to carry on the rank- and-file activity of the 1956 Annual Conference of the NFBTO. This resolution was passed unanimously. It is worth noting that Mr (not Brother) Harry Matthews passionately opposed this resolution on the grounds that it was passed, many building employers would go bankrupt.

Leadership wanted

It was Mr Matthews, of course, who gave McAlpine’s the permission to use our four great unions by letting McAlpine’s inform the operators whom they particularly want to get away from the dirty work of their national leaders. I expect again Matthews did not want poor McAlpine’s to go bankrupt.

When this resolution was passed in 1956 I felt our troubles were over and that the NBFO was out of the woods. I was wrong. A Shopin- and-a-quarter workers to really put an end to frost witch hunting. But it still goes on. Last month at Harry Neil Contract Stevenage all the labourers’ stewards were sacked during the severe spell. Again on the Birmingham motorway project months and months of trade union organisation and at us.

IN THIS ISSUE

Peter Berkeley Reviews

MINERS STRUGGLES

MANY YEARS AGO, when I was a kid at school, St. George’s Circus, at the bottom of London Road near the Elephant and Castle, was a favourite spot for political meetings and demonstrations. It was a regular and numerable point for the Unemployed Workers’ Movement whenever they were on the march, the fact of which would be advertised in whitewash, surreptitiously scribbled on the wall at night with lookout watching for the police. I knew it well, in fact I used to carry the bucket and many times ended up smothered in whitewash, which had spilled whilst "on the run."

One of the most touching scenes upon the occasion of these meetings or marches, and I think probably one of the most impressive sights I have ever witnessed, was the point where the Marshal called upon one of the groups of unemployed Welsh miners to sing in their own inimitable style. The result was fantastic, and wonderful to be held. A hush would descend upon the previously noisy crowd as the majestic hymn was poured out by the miners to the sky and, before the song was finished, you could see tears in the eyes of the listeners.

For solidarity

That was a long time ago and much has happened since that time. We’ve been through a war, unemployment and strikes, the full mandated Labour Government, seen the Welfare State in operation, over the last few years, witnessed the determined efforts of a Conservative Government to effect the slight progress made, by trade union legislation.

How well are the Conservatives succeeding? Much better than we should have expected the cost of living is rising, the cost of living is rising and—the signal of their greatest victory. It is interesting to note that the song of the Welsh miner was heard again once and in St. George’s Circus. They were the representatives from miners from the mines in South Wales, assembled for a protest march against the unemployment inevitable with the closure of the pits in their area.

Surely with such unmatchable

at a time we need to be back. We workers should take heed. We must remember, the miners fight the fight for the protection of the test and we must support them to destroyed when over 600 men and their stewards were sacked.

Sir Richard Coppock, our Socialist friend on all our affiliated unions to withdraw their members from employers who are engaged in breaking down trade union organisation. Brother Armstrong, the secretary of the Electrical Engineering Operatives, must give more determined leadership on this question than he gave in the South Bank debate. Building workers up and down the country must demand the implementation of the 1956 resolution.

the full, and give them all the help we can. Mark well, worker. You have been warned.

DOCKLAND AND BBC

AS THE SIGNS of the times and the aims of the present Government become the roadway more discernible, Trades Councils in South London are becoming more disturbed. The attitude of the Government itself, but also by that of the worker whose lanya in many of them, is playing into their hands.

From Deptford, a resolution has gone to the TUC for calling for a campaign against the time and a fairer distribution of work, whilst Bermondsey and Southwark are discussing the question of a South London Area Conference of employment, although they pin one particular difficulty in the fact that last year the employment problem was more or less concentrated in the docks, which were covered by the Dock Labour Scheme, the which are unable to discuss.

That the Trades Councils have reason to be disturbed by the attitude of the worker is more than apparent by events which have taken place in the last few weeks in the Upper Pool area, where normally the dockers is the strongest militant of employment. The defiance of Trade Union agreements which forbids work in such circumstances, workers in this area were responsible for discharging the "Polonia" in pouring rain, with only one scaffold to protect them for a strike by the workers in Southwark, does not disturb the fact that this work was done by one team only and with the most rigorous discipline. 150 workers in the majority of the men in that area, nevertheless, the fact that such a heavy area, believes the worker to wake up and fight to ensure that this doesn’t occur again.

Drinks

Another action on the part of a few men in Tooley Street, which has earned the scorn and derision, not only of the majority of the men there, also of the local publicans and shopkeepers, concerns the production of an item of interest to the docks by the BBC for screening on Television.

A team of BBC camera men descended, without Trade Union permission, on Wills Wharf and immediately commenced operations. Normally, the steward would have asked whether the Union had given permission for these people to act in the manner, but somehow this was overlooked and whilst a number of the men actively resisted the interference, others, Bill Will Engineering Operatives, must give more determined leadership on this question than he gave in the South Bank debate. Building workers up and down the country must demand the implementation of the 1956 resolution.

Some of the more astute dockers however, contacted the local union official, and it is to his eternal credit, that immediately upon hearing of the operation, he contacted the management of Wills Wharf and informed them that they were withdrawing from handling, or doing dock work, Tooley Street would immediately be shut down.

That did the trick insofar as work on the wharf was concerned, but it didn’t stop the men who continued to unload the goods, in the shape of free meals and free beer, and from pursuing the men who told the story. Consequently, any visitor to the "Duke of Clarence" in Tooley Street itself, could have seen unincipient dockers, much the worse for drink, fawning over the "Television Toppers" as they were named, expounding gaudy stories of life in dockland, highly coloured and in the main, spelt out the freely flowing liquor.

All round

What the item will look like when it eventually reaches the Television screen, just simply cannot be imagined, but one thing is certain, the story will most certainly not be truthful in many respects. A question to them, the BBC men and that was, "Where did the tremendous amount of money spent on "embezzlement of drinks, come from?" and again, "Would the licence now go up to £500 a year, was forthcoming in either case, and neither did they accept the information from several of the more conscientious political types to meet them at midday on Saturday, January 17, at the Union Offices. Until there is a full, frank situation in Dockland would be imparted.

The dockers should have included the fact that a "witch-hunt" of extreme intensity, has been started by the Docks Group Executive, to remove from their midst a well respected trade unionist who is presumed to have revealed the story of the resolution which was combined in the last issue of Socialist Review on information laid by a "goody-goody" from one of the London Area Divisional Committees. It is,

Hidden facts

however, the "goody-goody" who has either been misinformed, or else has paid a price for the facts for these have been known to the men in Dockland ever since the "infamous dockers" which has drawn up, and no official of any description was concerned in the production of the previous article.

Additionally, there is the barmess of the docker "b o m p i n g" for considerable time, and quite recently revealed, as could the fact that he is unable to apply for National Assistance, since by drawing his fall-back money of £5 1s. 0d, he is regarded as a fully employed man, and this despite the situa-

- contd. on page 6
Reviewing the recent election

BOB HOWARTH gives an analysis of the

AUSTRALIAN LABOUR PARTY

The recently concluded elections in Australia resulted in the return to power of the extreme right-wing Conservative coalition led by Menzies. The nature of the election campaign and its results throws some interesting light on the condition of the Labour Movement in that country.

Dr Evatt fought the elections on a policy of pacifying the middle-class and attempting to woo the centrist voters supporting the breakaway Catholic Action "Democratic Labour Party." All socialist and radical content was purged from Labour's policy, and, to deny that the campaign was Evatt's offer to capitulate to the DLP on their own terms (which they refused): in effect, to deny that the election fight between Left and Right has rent the Labour Party these last three years, and to deny all the gains the Left has made towards shaping a militant class party out of the split. All this Evatt did in the name of the "need for unity" and a return to the ghost of the old Labour Party, which could unite so many diverse class elements, but which has now gone for ever.

Yet all Evatt's "unity and peace-between-the-factions" policy has achieved is to push the post-election Labour Party to the brink of a new and more savage series of schisms and factional struggles.

Growth of the Left

After the elections Evatt has to explain to the Left how it could be this time the thrust of his leadership comes from the very people who have backed him so far and on whom he was forced to depend to fight Catholic Action. Beyond Evatt and his CP allies a new left leadership group around the extreme-left MP for East Sydney, Ned Ward, is demanding that if Labour has to fight as a minority, then it fights on the militant policy of the group which is its dihedral support, the industrial working-class.

Ward, who has always been popular with the workers and the Left, would long ago have become the natural leader of Left Labour rather than the intellectual Evatt, if it had not been claimed that he would terrify and alienate the middle-class, who look upon him as a rabble-rouser and a demagogue. In the last twelve months he has earned the hatred of the Right by leading the Left opposition in New South Wales against the corrupt and mummery Hall Government of Joe Cahill.

In a position where the party is still riddled with Right-wingers and the Left has grown too strong to be proscribed and put back in its bottle now that it has served its purpose for Evatt, the Labour schism is very far from dead. Even more so now that the Australian economy is continuing its roll downhill, where it has been going in fits and starts since the end of the wool boom and the recession of 1952. In answer to this, while the election was at its height, the workers were stepping up strike action all over the country.

The history of the Labour split is interesting in that it shows that it is being fought over deep-going issues that make an absurdity out of any hope of unity and reconciliation while they remain unresolved. Their solution can only come in the transformation of the Australian Labour Party into a determined anti-status-quo party, prepared to carry political struggle into industry.

Labour and Politics

Politics in Australia, far more in Britain, revolve around the Labour Party, and the open factional struggle of the past three years caught the attention of the entire nation and its overseas friends. It has been the chief concern of most pressure groups, despite the fact that the Tory forces have been the Federal governing power since 1949.

The schism came into the open in 1955 over the role of the Catholic Action-dominated Labour Party Industrial Groups, which were closing in on the constituency parties and the Labour Movement through their co-ordination and in the semi-secret Catholic-dominated "Movement" organisation. This was led by a Catholic lawyer, Santamaria (also head of the Catholic Rural Movement), and inspired by Melbourne's Archbishop Fowles, with the backing and blessing of Big Business and Big Church.

In Industry

But the original aims of the Industrial Groups had been vastly different from their final clerico-fascist perversion. The Industrial Groups had been formed shortly after the war as Labour Party factions in industry, intended by the leadership as a counter to CP influence, but seized upon by the militant socialist elements and in many cases becoming weapons to fight the boss.

Under militant control for a brief period after the war, the Groups showed the direction in which Labour could develop into an industrial vanguard party. They developed a political programme propounded at the first annual conference of the New South Wales Labour Industrial Groups which alarmed the employing class, the Right Wing, and excited Catholic Action into developing its counter-attack. This policy demanded a full-scale strike struggle against the employers, the nationalisation of basic industry under workers' control, requisitioning of all unused dwelling space to solve the chronic housing shortage, and the formation of workers' militia as the foundation of Australia's defence policy.

Catholic Action

The rallying cry was Fight The Boss. To infiltrate and finally swamp the Groups the Catholic Action mobilised its followers in a central National Executive Committee and the CP was also alarmed by the development of the Groups, seeing them as rivals, and undermining the reason for its own existence as they developed a socialist policy, and so launched an attack on the Groups from the start.

Catholic Action could marshal resources which the militant wing of Labour could not in a period of mounting cold war intervention; it had a foothold in the large Catholic element in the Australian working-class, from which it could organise the most backward sections of its workers under the banner of anti-Communism; it could draw in middle-class supporters, and buy exorbitants over to its organisation (both Trotskyist and CP) as anti-Communism became more politically profitable; and it had the more- or-less official backing of the Labour leadership and Government (Chifley and Evatt). These gentlemen were then determined to see that Labour was not to be outdone by the Capitalist Parties in the extent of its anti-Communism, and welcomed the Catholic Movement, which also reprented Big Business the only really stable reactionary bulwark in Australia. Chifley and Evatt also instituted the Commonwealth Security Service, a regular secret political police which was later used by Menzies to spy on all sections of the Labour Movement and the community, and which gave the now CA-dominated Industrial Groups practical aid in seizing power in the Trade Unions.

No Alternative

The Menzies Government seized upon CP malpractices (bullet rigging, strong-arm tactics, etc.) in the Unions to pass laws making Union elections on appeal subject to compulsory and postal voting and arbitration court control; further assistance was tendered to the CA by the Security Police rigging ballots, etc., and savage court fines against so-called "illegal" cases. Even then the main CA victory came only with direct court intervention in deposing the CP
leaders of the key Ironworkers' Union (on charge of ballot rigging) and installing the CA as leaders.

The Labour Party had shown in its post-war period that it could offer no alternative to the Conservative forces with its sterile policy of anti-Communist-fight. (The Chifley-Evatt Government collapsed over New South Wales' attempt at bank nationalisation followed by the use of the Army to smash the nationwide 1949 coal strike.) In opposition and under increasing clerical influence its policy gave little reason for its continued independent existence.

Leader by default

On the other hand, the CA Movement was quite clear in its policy, as revealed by its belated exposure by Evatt in 1955. It demanded the smashing of the Labour Movement to the State, development of a peasantry in the countryside based on mass European Catholic migration, dismantling of cities and industry and as a complement to this clerico-feudal internal program, the complete surrender of Australian foreign policy to the US war-drive.

Finally, the Santamarian Movement became so powerful that Evatt and CA were forced to move against it out of self-protection. In doing this they could only fall back for support on the rank and file. Caught between two fires, the official Labour Party leadership risked the unknown quantity of the Left. The fact was that the CA was so completely and utterly reactionary that in its drive for power it could not even accommodate to the centrist opportunism of the official leadership, Evatt found himself by default the leader of the Left.

• NO MIDDLE WAY

No matter how Evatt vacillates or how far he goes in compromising with the Right, he is not revolutionary enough for them simply because they demand nothing but pure and immediate revolution. Evatt first clashed with the Left as Wing in fighting the Catholic Communist Reference, and when he was later obviously about to be framed as a CPU dupe by Petrov he again had no choice but to defend himself and line up with the Left. After still more flitting with the CA, Evatt's final denunciation provoked the open split, forestalling what was by now an inevitable move from below.

The CA exposure was followed by a clear differentiation of policy forces by the Left "Anti-Groupers" forces. Large numbers of mass Right Wing expulsions and withdrawals occurred, from which was born the Catholic DP. But much of the CA organisation, though now officially proscribed (starting with the Industrial Groups) remained intact, to reconstitute, particularly in New South Wales, and the other heterogenous non-CA Right Wing also remained, often in leading positions.

It was obvious that any continuance and sharpening of the struggle would lead to a clearer differentiation of the Left, both in organisation and policy. Hence once the first wave of fighting was over the leadership tried to drop its new "Left" stance and maintain the status-quo at all costs. There followed feelers for reuniting, for the DLP, though likely to remain a splinter group, could muster enough votes (approximately 12 per cent) to keep Federal Labour permanently out of power under the Australian electoral system.

No real unity

This phoney "unity" was also finally taken up by the CP (for their factional within the Australian Labour Party). Although its influence had increased as an initial result of the split, particularly over the leadership of the Left Wing, it nevertheless had no wish to see a strong Left socialist Labour Party emerge which would draw away much of its support. In fact, even with the small amount of Left swing in Labour, many workers left the CP influence and returned to Labour; the CP has maintained its strength only in N.S.W, where by a bad chain of circumstances no open split took place.

The defeat of the CA on the political field led to their decline in industry and the trade unions, but it was the CP that profited most from this decline. In the absence of Left Labour organisation in the Trade Unions the workers were given the choice of the CA or the CP; naturally, every self-respecting militant preferred the CP.
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The effect also of Evatt's "unity" calls, and the general squashing of the factional struggle, and the playing down of militant policy, led to a growth of cynicism among many workers about the aims of the Left. The CP was only too pleased with this result, and it used its position of influence in the Left Wing leadership to tie the Left to the official policy of discontinuing the struggle against the Right, and making sure that, while no independent Left socialist policy was proclaimed by Labour, Left Labour supporters in industry could not stand on such a policy in the Trade Unions and provide an alternative to the CA and the CP on a genuine Fight The Boss basis.

New developments

But against these obvious sell-out policies of both the official "Left" leaders and the CP there developed a move, particularly from New South Wales, from the more conscious socialist elements, which aimed at synchronising rank and file discontent and disgust by presenting a series of national socialist demands at the annual conferences, combined with demanding the replacement of all officials by outright Leftists, as opposed to the shifting of all positions on a horse-trading basis as advocated by official pacifiers and the CP. Along with this came the demand for Labour supporters groups to be formed in industry, based on a fighting policy. Whether these aims were immediately gained was not so important; what was aimed at developing Left Labour as an independent force in the Party, the Trade Unions and the country as a whole.

These aims were largely successful in the recent New South Wales Labour Conference, and CP influence was diminished, as it was finally forced to fall behind demands which it had condemned "super-militant Trotskyism." The Left appeared as a force with a voice and a policy and continued struggle, and even though the official unity drive gathered strength as the elections approached, the banner had been raised. The increasing election debacle has opened the opportunity for the anti-Right Wing struggle to be opened on a massive scale.

Great battles ahead

Labour's defeat at a time of unemployment and growing industrial unrest came as a result of middle-class alienation (despite the official no-policy). The workers remained solid behind their party. The CP suffered a catastrophic decline. It lost 2400 Senate votes in 1954 (pre-split) to a mere fraction of 1 per cent. The DLP gained no seats; the total official Labour vote was increased, but seats were lost due to the DLP intervention.

Australian Labour is facing another period of great battles both within and without the framework of their organisation. If the present series of strikes develops into a movement to challenge the Menzies regime, as it has been on other occasions in the past nine years, the new Left leadership, if it has the time to crystallise into a broad front, will have the opportunity to give the movement a direction it has not had on previous occasions. Otherwise the magnificent instinctive anarchy of the Australian workers will once again be dissipated, through lack of a genuinely fighting Left leadership.

But this time the consequence of continuing Menzies rule could be far worse, the very future of an effective Labour opposition is at stake. Without it Menzies could consolidate his rule into a virtual dictatorship.

Towards a workers' party

Already Labour supporters' groups have been formed in a few unions, but so long as they cannot stand out firmly on an official independent basis the Boss is right. If the Boss are left open to either renewed CA infiltration or to becoming mere appendages to CP tactics in industry.

Evatt, whose leadership has pleased no one, now serves a useful purpose to none. The logic of events gives to the extreme Left a chance to assert its leadership. If this leadership is given full rein, and particularly through the success of Labour supporters groups in the Trade Unions, there is no reason why it could not lead the Australian Labour Party further along the road to an industrial vanguard party, with a clear and democratic socialist policy which could unleash the potential fighting ability of the Australian workers, and make the Menzies Government mark the end of capitalist rule in Australia.
THE MOVEMENT BILL BRADDOCK recalls THE MERSEYSIDE WOBBLES

This article by BILL BRADDOCK, former Northern Secretary of the International Workers of the World, recounts the stormy struggles of Labour on the Merseyside. The author played a prominent part in them.

The IWW, referred to in this article, was a militant rank-and-file organization. Its forthright, fighting spirit aroused fears in the hearts of employers and trade union bosses. Unfortunately billing—the most vivid section of the IWW—cut it off from the only sources for survival and recruitment. Its influence has now dwindled to nothingness. But many of its members integrated themselves into the Labour Movement and played a valuable part in the left-wing of the 20's and 30's.—Editor.

THE SEEDS of industrial unionism on the Merseyside were sown by Larkin, Connolly and Big Bill Haywood when they held meetings in Liverpool from 1911 to 1913. Their efforts were furthered by the examen who had countered the IWW while in the States and brought back the fervent, revolutionary philosophy to this country.

It quickly took root. Jack Hamilton, a quiet, scholarly Marxist, formed the Building Workers' Industrial Union. While it never grew to any size, the IWW conducted intensive socialist education from its club headquarters at 52 Byron St., Liverpool, the center of militant activity throughout the Merseyside.

In 1917, the discontent caused by war-time hardship was beginning to mount. The British Government began to get alarmed. It decided to take repressive measures against those opposing the war—and that included the IWW.

A visit

Our Liverpool local of the IWW had only been formed a few months. Although a raw recruit, I was appointed secretary. No sympathy from the point of view of the IWW, no sympathy from the point of view of four big, determined-looking CID men visited my flat. While I was kept in the Landlady's parlor, they ransacked my bedroom, even tearing the mattress. They said they were hunting for seditionists documents.

Funnily enough, what they were after was literally under their noses. They used a cardboard box file, containing all the membership minutes and documents of the Liverpool Local IWW as a writing pad.

Undeterred by their fruitless search, the police raidied the Byron Street Club. They hauled us off to Dale Street Police Station. The Liverpool local was represented by local and national CID men—as well as by agents of the FBI.

My interrogation lasted for two and a half hours. I was grilled about class warfare, the struggle for Socialism and on royalty. Being new to the Movement, I did not know much of these notions. But my innocence was mistaken for guilt. After finishing with my broadside, I was cross-questioned. The police believed in fair shares for all!

Ballot fixed?

By this time, the Local was beginning to grow. We acquired a printing press, and decided to print our own stickers. Liverpool was covered with stickers. Even the police couriers were wearing their quota. We carried on our agitation among seamen and firemen. At the dock gates, dock workers with the IWW for industrial unionism led to an official referendum being taken on whether dockers should remain in their existing union or join the IWW. Although unsuccessful, we polled a large number of votes.

There was reason to suspect the ballot had been fixed: dockers in the coal section, still as blowhard, signed a 100-spotless ballot papers—all against the IWW.

Robbery!

All the time we were helping the Shop Stewards Movement. In the Railway wagon shop, where my brother and I worked, we got 90 percent of the men into this unofficial movement—despite opposition from the paid officials of the NUR and craft unions. We also had a wall newspaper in the canteen filled with short articles by the men in industrial news. Papers like Solidarity, edited by Jack Tanner, and Sylvia Pankhurst's Workers Dream were being widely sold in the docks, shipyards and building sites. Wobblies took on an active part in this hard, dangerous work.

Our work was by this time being assisted by IWW deportees from America. The US Government had unleashed a reign of terror— imprisonment, deportation. Among them was the American Wobbly, and throwing all those without American citizenship out of the country. At Liverpool, often possessing only the clothes they wore, and quickly joined in our struggle. They were a fine bunch. There was, for instance, Jimmy Culley, a grand talker. He used to start an open-air meeting shouting, 'I've been robbed; I've been robbed!' A crowd quickly gathered, and Jimmy went on to explain how the capitalist system robbed him and everybody else. There was an ex-convict, 'King of the Idaho, Montana, Wobblies,' who would take on the toughest of employers, and the Shogun, Taro Yoshitari, a burly Jap, who had been Big Bill Haywood's bodyguard. Exiled to Long Way Through China and reached Moscow. There were many examples of self-sacrifice: Algie. While selling his last copy of the dock, gave all his cash to poor children.

A natural American boat docked at Liverpool fresh faces would appear at the Byron Street Club—comrades from the States asking for somewhere to dos down. It was a help with finding a job. They quickly settled down in Liverpool and resumed their political activities. One evening, Tom Rimmer, a refugee from the "land of the free," espied an old friend from his days in the States. "Jesus Christ," he exclaimed, "is it you?" "No," replied the Wobbly, "I'm merely one of his descendents."

All these comrades, and countless thousands of others, all helped to create the Labour Movement on the Merseyside. Their sacrifices, heroism, and tireless efforts were the motive force behind the Movement's development.

STEEL DOLDRUMS

by JOHN CRUTCHLEY

STEEL PRODUCTION in Britain in 1958 was 191 million tons. This was 14 million tons lower than in 1957. A million tons of this decline was in the third quarter. Production in December was 21 percent below October, 19 percent below the average of the first six months, and 18 percent below the total 1957 output. These figures were announced by the Iron and Steel Board on January 15.

There is a threefold reason for this decline—capitalists are running down their surplus stocks of steel, internal consumption of steel has decreased and the international trade in steel products has declined.

Little hope yet

An inventory recently in hand by the producers of the heavy industrial products that form a part of all production, is in steel, is in heavy engineering. When capitalists find they are not selling their output they cut their demand for raw materials. This vibrates throughout the economy, finally reaching the basic heavy industries. This happened in Britain in 1958. Consumers of steel who built up substantial stocks during the post-war shortages began drawing down their stocks rather than ordering more. Twelve to 13 weeks supply is thought to have been the minimum below which steel consumers could not reduce and during the period of shortages stocks have been considerably higher than this minimum. These stocks were substantially reduced in 1958 and it is likely that stocks will be reduced below the bare minimum. These cuts in stocks resulted in a drop in steel production.

Secondly, there has been an absolute decline. They arrive at this conclusion from the Second quarter of 1958 it was seven percent down on the 1957 level. This was mainly caused by the reduction in fixed capital investment. Capital investment has been reduced in the nationalized industries (coal and rail) and 1958 saw the end of the investment boom in the private industries that began in 1957.

The steel industry has also been hit by the cut in conventional armaments. It has been estimated that the steel and engineering industry in Sheffield during the last few years was accounted for by conventional armaments orders. Any cut, such as occurred in 1958 has a large knock-on effect on other heavy engineering industries.

Government investment in 1959 will not substantially increase the demand for steel. Capital investment will be confined to a type of fixed investment that will not consume much steel—roads, electricity and schools. The boom in motor cars as a result of the free import restrictions again will not increase steel consumption as much as might be thought. Motor cars consume less steel than consumer vehicles and these are not booming.

There seems little hope for an increase in steel production until the second quarter of 1959 when steel stocks have been reduced to a minimum and the internal and external prospects of trade may be brighter.

Finally, world trade in steel products declined 20 percent in the first nine months of 1958 below the 1957 level. Britain maintains its share on the declining market. (13 per cent.) However the European Coal and Steel Community and Japan increased their share during the same period while the United States share declined substantially.
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In the Last Socialist Review Ken
Jones outlined what he suggested should be
a socialist foreign policy. He criticised
Zilliacus for assuming that if Britain cut
free from the American base, she could
be able to force or persuade the two major
powers to come to an agreement. But he
took it upon himself to propose a solution to
international antagonisms that was scarcely
less superficial and naive.

Comrade Jones's proposal is to build up
an anti-nuclear association. Within this
association there are to be some quite
reasonable fellows. First, the "uncommitted" countries such as India and Yugoslavia, then the colonies and the other underdeveloped areas. Incidentally, he does not explain how
colonies, i.e., territories ruled by a metro-
politan power, could be free to join such an
association. Add to these other countries
which care to join the anti-nuclear club (Japan and the Scandinavian countries are mentioned). The only link connecting
these countries together is that they either have
not the resources to make nuclear weapons or
are considered not to enter the nuclear race. Is such a collection of rela-
tively weak powers likely to have any influence
on the governments of USA or Russia?
As a deterrent they will be just as illegitimate
as Britain alone.

Frustrated association

Comrade Jones merely states that this
association is needed "as a basis of socialist
and economic pressures" that the two great
powers would be bound to take notice. This
is sheer nonsense. Within the terms of capital-
ist power politics, there is no group of powers
which can hope to rival either USA or Russia.
And is it conceivable that the two great powers
would stand aside to let any formation arise that could come within miles
of challenging them? There are all kinds of
ways of putting up such the "third force" association could be frustrated.
The economic pressures would be exercised by one of the great powers against the
economically weak powers, not the other way
about.

The assumption behind Comrade Jones's
article is absurd, the idea of overthrowing capitalism. He even takes the
United Nations Organization out of its
skull-and-ridden cap inboard, and suggests that
with a bit of cleaning up it will help in the
good work. Comrade Jones does not state
what he thinks are the causes of modern war.
Presumably he would not accept that capitalism
in its decline drives inexorably to war,
that war is as much of its essence as profit-
making. This is of course not a new viewpoint but
is the socialist answer. The only
way of fighting against war is by fighting against
domination and capitalism. And unless
this follows that the only force within
society capable of putting an end to war is
the working class, the class which is obliged
to struggle against capitalism and which
in its international solidarity is powerful
to win the struggle. Russia and America can
afford to despise Britain, India, etc., as they
are at present governed. But it would be a
totally different story if workers' governments
in these countries appealed for the support of
American and Russian workers over the
heads of their governments.

Comrade Jones says that "there is only one
force which can achieve the nuclear dis-
armament of our huge giants, and that is
humanity organized on a world scale." But
under capitalism humanity is so deeply
divided by class antagonisms that it is mis-
leading and indeed meaningless to speak of
"humanity" as if it were a unified social
force.

Comrade Jones criticizes socialists who
under the slogans of "black the bases and
ban the bomb" argue for industrial action
against war preparations. He says that indus-
trial action is circular argument and that
pursuing this objective can only "divide
and confuse the Labour movement and waste
(time and energy)." It is unfortunate that the
majority of the workers do not at present accept the need for industrial action
against the manufacture of the bombs. But
this is not an argument against pro-
fusing this step. This Comrade Jones
suggest that a slogan should never be put forward unless it is likely to win the
minority of the majorities of the workers at once.
In other words, Socialists should never aim
to give a lead. They should always try to
hold the majority. By putting forward a
slogan like this and discussing it, Socialists
can advance towards political action.
The majority that may reject the policy
of today can be persuaded to change their
minds and accept it tomorrow.

Why should this slogan in particular be
accused of dividing and confusing the
movement? Of course there were many
different slogans put forward on this
point, but this one was not. It was
sent on what is by far the most serious
and terrifying problem facing us. The correct slogan was "Close the
clash of discussion than from dumper it
down in the name of "unity." Those who
support the black the bases slogan are equally and much more correctly
charged Comrade Jones and those who agree with
him with introducing division and confusion.

The point of production

By calling for industrial action, we appeal
directly to the working class to take action
WHICH LIES IN THEIR POWER. Indus-
trial action is the only power in the workers'
hands and by using it to the full they can
both win their immediate struggle and
strengthen themselves for future struggles
and the ultimate overthrow of capitalism.
The true allies of the working class are the
Japanese imperialism and Yugoslavian state
capitalism but the workers of other
countries, above all the workers of USA and
Russia.

Comrade Jones on the other hand is re-
garding the workers as essentially passive.
In some vague way—by the pressure of "public
opinion," presumably—they are going to
persuade a British government (either Mac-
millan or Gaitskell) to join NATO and
build up a third force. How is this persua-
sion to work? Through the devious channels
of the workers of the working class, it has been through
officially pledged to support NATO and the
leaders of neither have shown any desire to
break with Moscow. The Moscowlite opinion
exists in favour of Comrade Jones's policy, how
would it make it work through purely political machinery? There are an
infinite number of ways in which to advertise
"public opinion" can be side-tracked or
frustrated. At every crucial point in the his-
tory of the working class, it has been through
the workers' own action, and more often
than not at the point of production, that the
significant working class demands have been
met and the real advances made. This will be no less true
of this issue of the H-bomb, Only when the
workers begin to demand that the money to make the bombs, will the bombs stop
being made.

"Lay Down Your Head Peter Sedgwick"
says Patrick Macarthy

Reading Peter Sedgwick's cynical
distribre was like listening to that skilful
classic "Poor Tom Dooley." What solution
does he give to take leadership from the
"Bungling reformist hands" and replace it
by rank and file control?

Does he condemn those who say that the
working class movement in this country
needs people of the calibre of Hardie, Luxemburg, Trotsky, and Morris?

Shifting his ground, he makes the further
charge that there are those who are claiming that some are doing the real
movement—of these great departed have fallen upon
them. Does Peter Sedgwick really believe that
there are any in the Labour Party who are not doing anything so postpreposteous?
If any of the groups condemned are fit
to be described as "Pretenders," Victory For
Socialism is the best candidate, a product of
the militant proletariat of Parliament
Square. In the eyes of the demonstrators
and the grave digger, they are both in the movement
but which one is on top?
The University and Left Review group is
quite unfairly condemned. Although these
people are by nature not closely
connected with the working class, in the main
they are aware of this defect and are anxious
to listen to genuine industrial workers who are
prepared to discuss their problems with them. Workers who are not part in the
strike and the South Bank lock-out were
given a welcome opportunity of putting their
diffs to the UAL, but the report has been so
nerveous and the realisation of the중앙
have been too long in coming to speak on more general problems. Are
these students who are prepared to learn
from the workers? "I hate labels and
Against labels

If people with Socialist aspirations are
sincere, and in an honest way are trying
to reach out to the masses, why condemn
and label them "Pretenders"? I hate labels
and label-stickers. This new one disgusts me.

It does not mean anything. It is an attitude
comparable with that of those who claim that
Communism has broken down like a sick
fruit or that mental disorder. The only advantage is:
that by painting "Pretender" megalomaniac
Feynman of their shoes: the whole movement
has saved the arduous task of examining and
discussing their contribution.

There are many different points in Peter
Sedgwick's book which are worth
considering. But this categorisation is
sterile. Too easily it becomes a conven-
tional cover for cynicism and defeatism.

Let this "Pretender" cancer sets in I say:
"Lay down your head Peter Sedgwick,
Lay down your head and cry,
Lay down your head Peter Sedgwick,
Poor boy, you're going to die."
GRAHAM RICHARDS writes on
MAN, MONEY AND MORALES

SUPPORTERS of the Tory Government's bill, proposing
heavier fines and imprisonment for prostitutes, over- look one im-
portant fact. Flossie and her friends on their beat are not the
people who are likely to be thrown out of prostitution. It is the Press
Lords. These eminently respect-
able people like to indulge in "vice" exposures to give a boost to their papers' sagging circulation. It always pays a big
dividend.

The Press Lords do this be-
cause they realise that there is almost a universal psychic lobby in this subject. And we should ask ourselves, therefore, why are people so interested in prostitu-
tion? The answer is, I think, that
the prostitute symbolizes the pre-
sent 'British way of life'.

She shows, in the most striking way possible, that everything
— and everybody has a price tag that can be bought and sold. Her actions are not only those of Salome's—for when she drops her veils the nakedness of despair and hopelessness are revealed. And we must never see the nakedness of despair and hopelessness as anything but money—the master of con-
temporary capitalist society.

That most people do anything to avoid having to confront that, shows some time ago by Dr E. L. Thorn-
dike in his book, Adult Interests. He says that boys could be taught to go on a diet which would induce men and women to do things that are nor-
mal, but which would be immune to the temptation that the average woman would prac-
tise cannibalism for 750,000 dol-
ars, because she can eat that much without feeling hungry. It would do it for 50,000 dollars. Women, on the other hand, would renounce all hope of life after death for 10 dollars whereas men would want 1,000 dollars. Thorn-dike goes on to say that a sense of temporary insanity, blindness, eat-
ing beetles and earthworms, cut-
ting yourself with a razor, straying to death, and spitting on a crucifix and pictures of Charles Darwin, George Washington and one's own mother.

But this has not always been the case. Money has not always been the slave of the rich. Under feudalism Man had a cer-
tain kinship, loyalty and respect for his fellow. He worked hard to create a work
pleasure and fulfillment from the
labor that he satiated some human need. But capitalism has serious these ties that bound man to man. It has replaced them with a market creed. Man is bound to a thing, money.

Profit motive

While capitalism has greatly in-
creased the material wealth of
wealth, it has been the expense of
spiritual impoverishment. Work and degrading drudgery, a forced labour that left the worker physically debra-
husted. It has stultified his crea-
tive powers. Nor have the profes-
sional classes been exempt from this process. Capitalism, as Marx points out in the Manifesto, "has stripped of its halo every occupa-
tion; it has scattered in the name of science and godliness and looked up to with reverence aw.

It has converted the physician, the
lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man into the existence of its paid
laborers.'

For all workers, whether they
work by hand or brain, labour
often becomes the burning con-
trol of the capitalist class. Prod-
cution takes place only to one thing—take the whole thing, and the whole point of it is that profit is made. Therefore, even the consumer is quite irrelevant. Whether "Bobblo", the new detergent, contains a few parts of the most toxic chemicals that threatens him with death does not matter, one title so long as the housewife uses it to make the clothes look bigger. And to persuade her to use it on her undies—which are small en-
ough without the corrosive effect of "Bobblo"—we have that intrici-
cate system of public deception known as advertising.

Buy, buy, buy

The advertisers, using every conceivable gimmick, aim to squeeze the maximum amount of money out of the customers. By half-truths, curious cuties and handfuls of manhood are all employed without qual-
ity to beat down consumer resistance, to make him buy, buy, BUY !

With his eyes firmly focused on the rising sales curve, the capitalist
is quite unconcerned about the social consequences. His sole con-
cern is with the figures. But he is not the only person 'on the make',
concerned with Number One. A class society must, to be stable, have a certain unity: the ideas of the ruling class must be accepted by the ruled. And this is the case with capitalism.

The working class, reflecting the capitalists' concern about money, also tend to forget the social consequences of their produ-
cion. Whether a worker happens to be employed on a building site or a rocket is a matter of no difference. He is not concerned
with the end result of his actions, but with immediate quantitative result. Will I earn a higher wage at the rocket site or at the building site?

Man and machine

Capitalist culture tries to con-
dition the worker, to blunt his
sensibility, so that he is not aware of actually what he is, in the long run, helping to do. Ultimate effects are made to seem remote, too distant to have any emotional impact or be of any concern. That is why a decent man, who would be revolted by the idea of seeing one of the street with a knife and stabbing the first child he sees, is prepared, flying in a bomber 20,000 feet above the earth, to drop bombs that will kill not one but thousands of children—and in a far more painful way. Capitalism, in its continuous and inevitable evolives an increasing brutalization of Man. This pro-
cede to the point, in the case of horror comics, horror films, horror
books, the commercialization of violence, murder. But also, at its first instan-
tiation, in the scientific exploitation of the worker at the point of
production. The speed-up of production, the gear of man to the machine

intensively exploits and makes work an even greater burden.

Collective action

But capitalism, creating these social problems, offers no or ineffective basis for their solution. The ex-
aggerated importance of money—a direct result of capitalism—leads to a whole strict cash basis—leads the worker to take more than a passing interest in his work. The worker who, if he is looking 'after Number One'—a direct result of the rigid in-
dustrial discipline imposed on the self. The capitalist employers—leads the workers increasingly to the conclu-
son that he can only 'look after Number One', that is, im-
prove his own conditions, by handing together with his fellow workers.

And, most important of all, the process of not being concerned with the effects that they pro-
duce on other human beings, creates an increased awareness of the effects of production upon themselves.

Collective ownership

Robert Tressell admirably de-
scribes this in his book, The
Ragged-Trousered Philanthropist;
"When the workers arrived in the morning they wished it was
breakfast time. When they started their fourth breakfast they wished it was dinner time. After dinner they wished it was one o'clock on Saturday. So they went on, day after day, year after year, wishing their time was over and, without realising it, really wishing that they were dead.

Whether on Tresell's building site or on Swaffham's rocket site, in capitalism is the same—death, sapping life of its vitality, purposelessness and creativeness, and preparing for mass, radiant, living execution. It brings into being its dialectical opposite—a doctrine of life, Socialist Humanism--

This doctrine argues that Man, with his immense present and future potentialities, can only be liberated when he controls production collectively and can creatively develop his own facul-
ties.

Until this occurs, and Man, got money, has become the measure of all things, people's energies and talents will be perverted and re-
sult increasingly in their own misery. The prostitute is an ex-
ample of this process: how some-
thing that is a valuable part of the human personality, like sex, which can up-lift individuals, is used to degrade.

It is unfortunate that the Wol-
fenden Commission, so anxious to fine and imprisonment, has not given the most profound and original statement on the whole business. It was made by Marx, in his essay on the work of the Commission, which he wrote: - "Prostitution is only the particular expression of the rational proletarian, work and since prostitution takes in not only the prostituted but all human beings, (that is, all) so the capitalist, etc., falls into this category."

WHAT WE STAND FOR

The Socialist Review stands for international Socialist democracy. Only a mass movement of the working class in the industrial and political arena can win the программ of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

The Socialist Review believes that a really consistent Labour Government has to put power on the basis of the fol-

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land with compensation, not concessions based on a means test. Re-
nationalisation of all de-

- The establishment of workers' committees to control all state industries within a framework of a planned economy. In all in-
stance representatives must be directly elected by the elector-
ate, immediate recall and receive
c the average skilled wage.

- The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control buying, firing, working conditions.

- The establishment of the principle of work or full main-
tenance.

- The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pension on a non-contributory basis, the abolition of all payments for the National Health Service and the development of a real industrial health service.

- The expansion of the housing programme by lowering interest free loans to local authorities and the right to re-
quisition private property.

- Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fee paying schools. For comprehen-

- Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protec-
tion for all Irish irrespective of their country of origin. Free-

- Freedom from political and economic oppression to all the Irish. The ex-

- A Socialist foreign policy independent of both Wash-
ington and Moscow.