The problem facing any political minority is how to convert itself into a majority by persuading more and more people of the correctness of its views and policy. For any individual or group that claims to serve the interests of the working class the problem is how to appeal to wider sections of workers and therefore how to orientate one's self towards the mass political and industrial organisations of the working class. Hence for left-wing socialists a key question is their attitude towards the Labour Party and their understanding of its nature.

The Labour Party came into existence as the political arm of the trade unions. The date of its birth—the turn of the century—is significant because this was in the heyday of British imperialism. Compared with the earlier period of its growth, capitalism seemed stable and likely to go from strength to strength. From the profits of world exploitation, the British capitalists were able to make limited concessions to the workers without undermining their own position.

Salvation in reform

The benefits of trade union organisation were no longer confined, as in the middle years of the century, to a small elite of skilled workers but were beginning to spread to the mass of the unskilled. In such circumstances, it was hardly surprising that the great majority of the workers looked for salvation to the reform of capitalism rather than its overthrow. They believed that through the use of the vote, which had become practically universal (except to women) in the '80s, more and more improvements could be secured, the worst abuses of capitalism curtailed, greater equality achieved, etc. These views were particularly widespread among the leaders of the established trade unions, who saw their function as being to win concessions for their members within the framework of capitalism, but not to lead an all-out onslaught against it.

They slowly came to see the need for a Labour Party, as a more reliable and more easily controlled political instrument than their traditionally loyal, the Liberal Party, which found difficulty in committing itself simultaneously to the workers and to sections of the capitalist class. But although some of these groups were successfully weaned away from the Liberal Party they brought with them into the Labour Party the characteristic Liberal attitude of limited reforms.

Other organisations

From the beginning of the Labour Party, the attitudes towards it of the various Socialist groups have fallen into two broad categories. On the one hand, there were those who remained outside and aloof. Most conspicuous of these was the Social Democratic Federation. They took their stand on what they claimed was pure Marxist doctrine. They refused to associate with any group which did not accept the whole of their ideology. If the Labour Party would not proclaim the class war as an article of faith in its foundation document, then the SDF would not ally its purity by affiliation to the new party.

Faults of sectarianism

The SDF saw as its task the constant proclamation of its Socialist ideas without relating them to the day-to-day struggles of the workers. In this way it might keep itself free from any taint of compromising with reformism but at the price of complete political sterility.

Thus although individual SDF-ers played notable parts in many industrial and other struggles, the party never became a real force. Its history should serve as an awful warning to any Socialist who is so confident of his own righteousness that he thinks he can despise the majority of the workers.

It is easy to see the faults in the sectarianism of the SDF. But what of the Socialists who tried to influence the Labour Party from within? The ILP was admirably placed to act as a 'ginger group' within the Labour Party. It had immense prestige, for the part it had played in forming the Labour Party and from the fame of its pioneering leaders like Keir Hardie. Yet it had only a very limited success in pushing the Labour Party in a leftwards direction. While the ILP was still affiliated to the Labour Party there was the experience of the first two Labour Governments, neither of which did very much about reforming capitalism, far less introducing socialism.

When the majority of the ILP decided to disaffiliate from the Labour Party in 1912, at a time when the leadership of the party was discredited by the 1912 debacle, it failed to establish itself as any real alternative, or as a political force of any strength. The minority who remained inside the Labour Party quickly lost their identity and became completely merged.

Main tasks for Socialists

In other words history so far has provided no conclusive proof of how best a Socialist group can make headway at the present stage. What it does prove without the shade of a doubt is that reformist ideas are very strong and very widespread throughout the working-class movement. It is utterly misleading to assume that the majority of the workers are impregnated with revolutionary fervour, prepared at once to dispense with capitalist illusion if only a firm and consistent Socialist leadership is offered to them. This is a view that has been only too easily accepted in the last 20 or more years by left-wing Socialists. They have argued that reformist ideas have taken root only among the top leadership of the Labour Party and trade unions and a thin layer of the more highly skilled 'aristocrats of labour.' From this it follows that the main task of Socialists is to show up the deficiencies and betrayals of the leaders and expose the gulf between their ideology and policies and those of the mass of their followers. The hollow shell of reformism will be cracked, the workers recognise where their true interests lie, and capitalism and its lackeys will be swept away.

If this analysis were correct, then surely (turn to back page)
WHILST ACCEPTING a great deal of what your correspondent Nero says about the ETU (the report of which is typical of the CP that one wonders why he is an ex-member), it strengthens the case of a section of the ETU leadership to the non-Stalinist left in the E.T.U. The Socialists Review points to the need to call the policy of opposition to both the Right-wing Stalins and the Communist Party. However, we cannot agree with the tactics proposed by Bro. Fred Walters. Nevertheless, we believe that only good can come from an exchange of views. In the next issue of the paper a reply, which for reasons of space could not be included here, will be published — The Editor.

The following very interesting article by Bro. Fred Walters continues the discussion on the problems facing the non-Stalinist left in the E.T.U. of the Labour Party. The Socialists Review points to the need for a policy of opposition to both the Right-wing Stalins and the Communist Party. However, we cannot agree with the tactics proposed by Bro. Fred Walters. Nevertheless, we believe that only good can come from an exchange of views. In the next issue of the paper a reply, which for reasons of space could not be included here, will be published — The Editor.

Extreme case

So much of your correspondent Nero’s arguments and reasoning is typical of the CP that one wonders why he is an ex-member. In fact, his arguments support the recent change of role in relation to unemployment benefits paid by the ETU as an extreme case. But he only tells half the story, making it plausible by citing an extreme case which can be seen in any year. He suggests no particular motive for this change of role, but it is a matter of record that the extreme case suggests that he may feel that it is directed against the militancy of the leftists in the relatively casual sections of the industry, such as contracting, upholstery, etc., perhaps it is their ‘embarrassing activity’. Whilst it is true that it is members of these sections that will be affected most, it is something of an exaggeration to suggest that active members of such sections are obliged to seek fresh employment every two months as a result of inevitable unemployment.

Benefits

If this is the reason for his opposition to the new scales, then he is not to be more than a speculative special pleading, when one considers the fact that the sections of the ETU that will be affected are no more than a section of the sections of the ETU, and the whole of the benefits will be no more than a section of the ETU.

What your correspondent fails to mention is that whilst the ETU has been a little watched in recent times, day-to-day payments, and that a six-day waiting period is in force, the unemployment benefit of 10s 6d per week has been reduced from 15s to 10s 6d in fact doubled. It is surely an unaccustomed question that the first week of unemployment is not the most difficult, and that the only week of unemployment lasts. It would appear that the time and effort is doubting the benefit for the period when it is most needed.

That it affects the member who has periods of unemployment of a week or less is not questioned, but surely a union’s rules cannot be framed to satisfy the requirements of one small section, but must conform with that which is in the best interests of the union as a whole. Even if this section contains the most militant, and therefore the most valuable, members (a fact which is always rate questionable) the members having only limited periods of employment or limited contact with another group of members, do the most good? Must militancy always be equated with kicking-up as much fuss as possible, and is it really getting kick-up (I do not suggest that this is Nero’s idea of militancy, but I know it is prevalent among the left, who he rightly criticizes). One last point on unemployment benefit, the correspondent prefers to continue with the old rule, payment of 15s per week, including the first. But where is the money to come from? The ETU has been in financial difficulties and is just beginning to get on its feet again, mainly as a result of long-ovride increases in contributions.

No substitute

The problem of changing the leadership cannot be realistically considered, without taking into account the whole of the rank and file, not just the minority who vote and take an active interest in the union. A change of leadership which is not the direct result of a desire for change on the part of the majority of members, will merely be to substitute one leadership for another. The new leadership would be subject to the same restraints and restrictions as any leadership based on a minority. It cannot set as it would wish, because of the unfitness and unavailability of the majority of the membership. Whatever the ballot returns show, when only 10% of the membership is voting, whatever leadership is in office, the fact remains that it is the membership who don’t vote, who determine the effective policy of the union. If only because of their negative attitude.

Why haven’t electricians got a forty-hour week, a sick pay scheme financed by the employer, etc., isn’t it the union policy on overtime put into effect? Because the leadership don’t want it? No, because the only people that can put these policies into effect are the rank and file themselves, and unless there is a substitute for the rank and file, this is not to say a change in leadership is not desirable, but to believe that a socialist leadership will solve our problems is unrealistic. A change at the top without a change at the bottom is really no change at all.

Press influence

It may be objected that in considering the problem of establishing a socialist leadership we can only concern ourselves with the members who vote and who are active, which is perfectly true. But we shall hope to remember that all members are potential voters and that in future elections a larger percentage of the membership may be encouraged to vote, by the Press, and there is no reason to believe that this increased vote will be a socialist one. Under these circumstances, relatively small groups within the ETU, competing for the leadership, on the basis of organizational ability, entails at least one very serious danger. That of letting in the Right Wing.

Press attacks on the union leadership in recent years have been comparatively ineffective, at any rate in so far as influencing voting sufficiently to dislodge the leadership. This is because of the fact that as capitalist Press is concerned, candidates like Holmwood, Cameron, Clayton, Repco, Chappell and Sullivan are just as much anathema as the CP themselves. But the ground has been cleared, and in the event of a reactionary candidates being nominated in future elections, the influence of the Press may be decisive, if the left is split. Both the General President and the General Secretary stand for re-election each year together with the eleven rank and file members of the Executive Council. Nominations for the EC take place in June and for the other two positions in September or December, and it is almost certain that Right Wing candidates will be forthcoming in the by-elections. Glasgow contested the General Secretarieship five years ago and will, no doubt, be encouraged to do so again. In a recent (January 26) article about the ETU, the Labour Correspondent of the Manchester Guardian noted the existence of opposition groups in different parts of the country, but that at the moment, there is imperfect liaison between them. But he suggests, "There is plenty of time to negotiate still," and the task of members who want an integrated opposition to apply to the EC and get together the traditional elements of dissent like Mr Byrne with the AC Committee, would work the ‘gimme’ in the recent disputes around London. "£1,000 a year", if these groups do in fact exist, is to be hoped that this conflict will not be needled. Bro J T Byrne is a member of Catholic Action and if the AC Committee reaches an agreement between that organization and the CP there is no question that it is the CP which must be supported. The question of changing the leadership in the present period, is the question of how we can work towards the splitting of the left in the union, then it must not be attempted. Far better the CP than the Right Wing ETU leaders wanting neither the CP or a Right Wing reactionary leadership but a socialist leadership must be supported. Perhaps for short cuts or quick results, but must combine their efforts and must the CP and see the mass support which any leadership must have if it is to be in any sense real and effective.

Your correspondent Nero attacks the increase of officials’ wages, and rightly so, but curiously enough does not attack the principle, or lack of it, of officials’ wages being in excess of the wages they represent, and again rather curiously, suggests that “a militant … is normally a person dedicated to rationality, and therefore difficult to corrupt.” Is this really true, are socialists a special breed, unaffected by the laws of human nature? Many Knights of the TUC, not to mention the Garets, have reached that in their enthusiasm for socialist, how many transplanted to the House of Lords having set up all first-rate organizations, would Nero siddle to keep an officials’ job worth a £1,000 a year? Surely the real issue here is not contd. next pag.
that officials get their increases by "EC recommendation to conference," but whether in fact, officials should grant the raise and file? Few normally aspired people, dedicated or not, can withold the effects of the change from the workshops, factory, building site, etc., to the comparative ease of an officials' job plus an extra 30% in pay in several a pounds a week. If you accept the idea that officials should add the raise to their rank and file, you accept the fact of regular increases, granted by contract. If you deny that the annual increases were really earned as the increase (the first in three years) was passed at a conference to consider the state of the union's finances is irrelevant.

If officials got no wages at all it wouldn't be quite a problem. But if they got no more than the average paid to electricians, it would certainly do a lot to reduce the ranks of the rank and file, many of whom are of the opinion that the officials are only in it for the money they can get out of it. And as often as not they are right. Nero's suggestion that "attempts to curtail officials' wages increases in the ETU have by-passed the members and the Labour Government's EC recommendation to Conference," is only true in so far as the majority of members are unaware of the wage level and therefore have no part in the election of Conference delegates. This is another example of the EC recommendation's basis for slandering. It’s not enough to criticise the CP just because it is the CP. Here, as everywhere there is a ridiculous attitude which won't get us anywhere. We could as well say if Bro Nero, proclaiming a national strike at a socialist dominated conference representative 10 per cent of the membership of the CP and the converted socialists to endorse EC recommendations.

**Tactics**

It is to be hoped that in the coming election file and is not misplaced and that in fact "we will get back to fundamental discussion on the question of ownership and control in industry," and "produce a leadership worthy of the members, elected democratically and not fiddled into position as now," in the words of Bro. The question is what will be the future of the immediate future in this short term, that is now, is the new leadership of success or leadership of the ETU.

The question we have got to answer is whether to oppose the CP with a new militancy in the forthcoming elections, and in the event of this, whether to support their candidates, their leadership has already been outlined and it is my opinion that it is too great, and that this is a question of leadership. Foulkes nor Hasell should be opposed for the following reasons. The Left has already been fought and democratic, and the fact that the Press will have too uncertain to make an attempt to unite the CP with the alternate. With three candidates the vote will be split, thus the majority in favor of the left will split, to the advantage of the Right.

A further inestimable factor will be the percentage of the membership that will vote. The percentage vote may remain the same, which favours the CP, or, what is more likely, it will increase as a result of the capital's Press and propaganda against the elections, and this will most certainly benefit the Right Wing. The Right Wing stresses against the leadership by promoting group patriotism, and for example, at any rate in the case of CP led union. If it was certain that the issue would not be determined by the individual candidate (i.e. no candidate would have a larger vote than the combined votes of the other candidates) and that a second ballot would be held between the two candidates with the highest vote, then the risk would possibly be taken.

This last factor is, I think, the point upon which the issue turns. Many objections will be raised against this line of argument, one being that unless there is an alternative to the CP and the Right Wing the Right Wing will win. This presupposes that the undecided voter and those induced by the Press, are looking for a social union. This is unlikely to be the case. For the most part the vote is a simple one to make and not pro anything. A further objection will be that having made the CP's choice, that is true. But I'd sooner work for the CP than the other parties in Smith Square and Great Russell Street.

It will be far better to spend the next few years working only in the branches getting control of area committees and gaining support at the meetings. The party conferences in preparation for the next elections and the biennial elections for the EC, with a CP leadership, face in five critical years under what I think is the only possible present alternative to the Right Wing and the Catholics.

**TRAMP/PAYVY DISCUSS ORGANIZATION AND WAGES IN BUILDING**

ON FEBRUARY 20 next a panel of the Civil Engineering Construction Board is being asked to consider the re-employment of the victimized stewards on the Shell-Mex (McAlpine's) site. In view of the fact that stewards have been re-employed to date, we feel that branches should submit resolutions to their annual meetings mandating their leaders to accept nothing but the re-employment of the boys.

Declaring membership is making the ASW call Area Branch Delegate Conferences, Joe roadway, the New London Divisional Secretary of the AUBTW, is, together with his officers, launching a vigorous AUBTW campaign again on the question of declining membership.

There is a rumour that Igor mortis has set in on the 58th ad hoc conference discussing the 40-hour week, I hope that the ad hoc conference now set up to discuss our 4x an hour wage claim does not act like tortoises on a go-slow.

A small deputation of building workers lobbied Members of Parliament, the question of unemployment, and Labour Members on the extension of Direct Labour and the AUBTW recommendation to Conference," is only true in so far as the majority of members are unaware of the wage level and therefore have no part in the election of Conference delegates. This is another example of the EC recommendation's basis for slandering. It's not enough to criticise the CP just because it is the CP. Here, as everywhere there is a ridiculous attitude which won't get us anywhere. We could as well say if Bro Nero, proclaiming a national strike at a socialist dominated conference representative 10 per cent of the membership of the CP and the converted socialists to endorse EC recommendations.

**Militant action**

What, when, where is the opposition to blast or take militant action? The membership of the whole trade union movement is certainly in some cases thirty-three cent of the whole of the working population of the country. What can be achieved will be a force is much accord to the strengthening of the CP and the Right Wing. With the new leadership that will really put up a strong fight for working class standards until something better, and I hope that the top level of the trade unions.

I refer to the TUC. No trade unionist should allow himself to hold any official position in any union or the TUC if he is in a managerial position or on the Board of Directors of any industry, for a socialist organised people should make work or poverty and all over the trade unions. The National Federation of Building Trade Organises, for instance, patched themselves on the back for getting 1d an hour in increase, while they did nothing at all about the 40-hour week. You have been robbed of that 1d, and you should not allow yourselves to be robbed off again.

I mean you, and you, and you. If you are a trade unionist, go to your branch and demand by way of resolution that your union take more militant action than maintain the 4x an hour week and the 4d an hour rise.

How are calls for militant action treated by the Press? The Brixton L/S branch of the Amalgamated Union of Building Trades Workers sent a resolution to the executive calling upon it to organize demonstrations and public meetings in different a strong support of the claim and the 40-hour week.

The following is a resolution by the Edinburgh (1) Branch of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers:

This branch calls upon the Executive Council to press the General Council of the TUC to convene an emergency conference of the Executive Committee of affiliated unions that are at present pressing demands for increased wages and reductions of the working week to support the purpose of the Conference of short lives, and a stronger campaign in support of these claims and to bring a 10 million demonstrations by the unions in all large towns and cities.

The response, or lack of it, is really amazing. More often than not the number of branches sending in similar resolutions to their Executives or General Councils. The following AUBTW Executive resolution in reply to the two branches resolutions is typical.

That the communications from branches relative to wages be referred to the Council. Whilst the Council is not in principle opposed to the idea suggested by the Edinburgh (1) branch that wage stage reached in wage claims in various trades a demonstration that the present is an opportune time to make representations to the TUC.
We are late in paying our respects to G D H Cole who died at the begin-
n ing of this year. Nevertheless, we present this appreciation of his work
within the British Labour Movement as a token of respect to his
integrity and sense of purpose, knowing well that he would have taken
our criticism of some of his views and actions in the spirit they were
intended.—Editor.

G D H COLE
AN APPRAISAL OF HIS LIFE AND WORK
by ERIC HEFFER

My acquaintanceship with G D H Cole is solely through his books. I cannot, therefore,
pretend to know anything of his personal life, and know only a
little of his general political
work. I wish to write about him as a political theorist, which he
undoubtedly was; a very rare bird
indeed, as far as the English
scene is concerned.

Often contradictory

Cole probably wrote more
books than any other Socialist of
his generation. On my book-
shelves there are at least 24 dif-
f erent volumes, and about a score of pamphlets. He certainly wrote
many more. Cole was a member of
the Labour Party, but it seems
was never really happy in it. He
rejected the Communist Party as
being undemocratic and an agent
of the Soviet Union, yet he con-
sistently advocated a policy of
unity in action with the Commu-
nists, especially in Western Europe.
His position on many things was
often contradictory, but on most
questions he retained a perfect
clearity of vision. Cole in some
ways idealised the working class (a common fault amongst intel-
lectuals) yet on certain occasions
abused them for being stupid
and servile.

Guild socialist

It seems to me, from a careful
reading of Cole, that he was con-
stantly being pulled in a number
of directions at the same time. He
could never quite make up his
mind in which direction to travel,
apart from the very broad direc-
tion of a socialist goal. He knew
what he wanted, but did not quite
know how to get to his destina-
tion. To the very last (as far as
I can see) he called himself a
Guild Socialist, and it is in this
sphere that he made his biggest
contribution to socialist thought.
In fact no one who is really seri-
ous about how socialism should
operate, can afford to overlook
his work. On the question of
workers' control, and the work-
ners' place in industry, no one in
Britain has given greater atten-
tion than Cole. We can all learn
something of value from his writ-
  
ing on this subject.

The writer

His other great achievement
was as a Labour Historian.
Everyone irrespective of their
political position in the movement
owes Cole a debt in that direc-
tion. From his pen, came such
standard works as the History of
the Labour Party, An Introduc-
tion to Trade Unionism and his
monumental work on the History
of Socialist Thought. These
latter volumes are in themselves
a justification for Cole's existence
and future Labour historians
will be eternally grateful. If one
wishes to know the real struggle
between Marx and the Anarchists
then Cole's work provides the
material; if one wishes to know
the Second International in greater detail than is given
in James Joll's slim volume, then
turn to Cole, his two volumes on the
subject are well documented.

disillusioned

I am certain that Cole lived his
last years in great disillusion-
ment. It was obvious to him that
the Labour Party had failed as a
Socialist body. In fact his con-
clusions were that the Labour
Party was not, and could not be
called a Socialist Party, and
equally the Welfare State was not
Socialism or anything approach-
ing it. He was doing his best
to revive Socialism as an Inter-
national force, and was instru-
mental in establishing an inter-
national socialist centre known as

the World Socialist Movement.

Cole rejected what he called
Reformism, yet never embraced
genuine revolutionary politics.
He was very much a reformer
himself and his struggle to change
society never got beyond the
channels of constitutionalism.
This was the greatest weakness
of Cole, and sprang from his re-
jection of Marxism, although he
accepted many Marxist views.

Three stages

In evolution, Cole probably
had three main stages: his early
period of Guild Socialism, his
middle period which was still un-
doubtedly left-wing but becoming
more blurred in outline, as against
his clear-cut perspectives of the
early period, and his last
period which was a return to his
radical youth but still a little less
positive in relation to Guild
Socialism. I suppose if one wishes
to label him he could be called a
Left Social-Democrat, but essen-
tially a social-democrat.

Let us, therefore, look a little
more closely at his evolutionary
stages.

THE THEORIST

COLE defines Guild Socialism
as a proposal for the co-
management of industry by the
State and the Trade Unions. The
ownership of the means of pro-
duction had to rest with the com-

munity, i.e. through the State,
but the trade unions were to be
recognised as the controllers of
industry. Production would be
determined by demand, this de-
mand being made through
national and local consumers'
organisations. The methods of
production were to be the con-
cern of the people in the Guilds,
the workers would elect their own
officials, and these would oper-
ate through self-governing cor-
porations with very wide powers.

The Guilds would include everyone in the industry from the
general labourer to the general
manager, and would therefore be
an association of independent
producers. Cole developed this
general theory a little further, and
argued that the State and the
Guilds should at national level
establish a joint board. These
bodies in turn were to be linked up
on the consumers' side with
Parliament, and with a Govern-
ment department, but must not
come directly under a Govern-
ment Department and a Cabinet
Minister.

The state

This theory really was an at-
tempt to marry syndicalism
with social-democracy. It accepted
the syndicalist conception of electing
officials, and the workers' bodies
to direct and control industry,
but at the same time saw the con-
tinuation of Parliament and Par-
liamentary Democracy. Cole put
it this way: "Syndicalism, like
most theories that have something
vital behind them, is right in
what it affirms, and wrong in
what it denies." Cole saw the
State as a necessity at all times,
and argued it always had a right
to intervene. However, he did
want to change the character of the
State, and make it a genuine
democratic organism.

The trade unions

To the early Cole, the functions of
the trade unions had to be
twofold. Firstly, as a weapon to
combat the employers, but
equally, and just as important, to develop as a self-governing industrial creation with its own organizations of its own, which would both destroy and succeed capitalism.

These theories had much in common with the later views of the "Workers' Opposition" in Russia, the difference being that as the Workers' Opposition were not wedded to constitutional change they naturally accepted the need for revolutionary action, NW 9. the throw of the ruling-class, a position that Cole could not bring himself to accept.

Producers guild

Cole rejected the idea of "Trade Unions," and put forward most vigorously the Industrial Union concept. These "Greater Unions," as he called them, would be more useful to the workers than "trade" unionism in many ways. Firstly, they would be able more easily to recruit all workers into a union. Secondly, they would help break down sectionalism, and would lead to a better fighting organization; and thirdly, they could more easily translate their strength into the Workers' Producur Guilds. Howe1er, they were not to wait until we had industrial unions in all industries, as soon as possible the whole of industry should be nationalized, and then the workers should be assisted to set up the Guilds. Here Cole gives warning, he says: "There is, however, a grave danger that, when nationalization comes, the State will not realise its responsibilities and the industry will be run on bureaucratic instead of autocratic principles."

Partnership

Cole sums up his view on the Trade Unions in the following terms: "The Trade Unions must fight in order that they may control. It is in warring with capitalism that they will learn to do with it, how to control it, but they must realise their freedom in partnership with, and not in opposition to, the State." (World of Labour.)

With the collapse of the Guild Socialist movement, and the period of class collaboration following the General Strike, Cole turned his efforts more towards the Labour Party as such.

THE TACTITON

COLE could well be considered a forerunner in theory of the present "theories" of the Communist Party.

During the "middle period" he wrote his book, "What Party really meant," and in it he developed a theory on the State not unlike that which today emerges from the British Road to Socialism. Cole says that undoubtedly Lenin was right in saying that Marx was for the destruction of the bourgeois State-machine, but then proceeds to say: "The case is different in the parliamentary countries as long as they remain parliamentary. For these States, while they retain their essentially bourgeois character, do embody considerable elements of democratic service, as well as of coercive capitalist authority, and have been labelled to such an extent as to accrue, for the present, to the public the rights to the opposition. If they can be seized and controlled there are forces in operation within them that are fully consistent with the purposes Socialists have in view."

There is very little difference here with Gollan's theories, yet at the time the entire Communist Press made an onslaught on Cole, and of that old warrior, TA Jackson: "Assuming that the theory some heavy hammer blows, but later when the Communist Party deserted them and took the position, TA unfortunately was conspicuous by his silence.

"People's front"

It was during this time (1937) that Cole supported the idea of a "People's front," dedicating a book by that name to Sir Stafford Cripps, Cole proposes in the book that the Communist Party be allowed to affiliate to the Labour Party, or if that is unacceptable to be allowed in as individuals. However, as an illustration of what I said earlier, he makes it perfectly clear that he has no intention of stupidly jeopardising his membership of the Labour Party.

Unity

He in fact took the Communist Party's position in the Socialist League, saying it ought to be disbanded, and that the individuals continue to fight, as individuals inside the Labour Party. In 1935, he wrote a pamphlet, "The simple case for Socialism," which he calls, "A plain statement of the reasons for his faith." Again in this Cole returns to advocacy of a Socialist Union as well as closer ties with the Communist Party. It is clear from his writings of that period that Cole could not envisage a healthy organisation without the Socialist-Democracy on the one hand and the Communist Party on the other. There is no doubt that without intention he greatly helped to strengthen the position of the Communist Party, playing down his criticisms of Soviet policy. I think this was due to Cole, like most people at the time, being bewitched by the growth of Fascism on the one hand and Soviet industrial success on the other.

Now let us turn to the later Cole.

COLE was completely disillusioned with the efforts of the 1945-51 Labour Governments. Some have suggested that this was due to the fact that the leaders failed to use his talents, but doubt that very much, as much more likely is that his bitterness was due to the failure of the Labour Party to make any real inroads against the power of the capitalist class. What really happened was that all Cole's old Socialist beliefs welded up and forced him to speak out, perhaps despite himself. One has only to contrast his pamphlet "A Guide to the Elements of Socialism" written in 1947, couched as it was in moderate terms, full of hope, with his bitter onslaught of 1954 in his pamphlet "Is this Socialism?" to the extent of his shift in feeling. In his 1947 pamphlet Cole deludes himself by believing that the pattern of take-over of industry was transitory in character, and hopes that stage by stage real power will be transferred to the workers through their Trade Unions. In 1954, he says, "It is not so easy as it was to contemplate with ecstasy, or even with equanimity, the prospect of all or most of the means of production, etc., being nationalized, if that is to mean their administration by a series of public boards on the model of the Coal Board, the Transport Commission, and the BEA."

He then raises the whole question of State power, and says that experience in Russia and in Britain now gives rise to a fear of putting too much power into the State's hands. The "bottom dogs still remain" and further declares that "if the State is concerned I cannot feel that it is even on the way to becoming Socialist.

Control

Cole then again (and this is his main theme throughout all his works) returns to the question of Industrial Democracy, the actual position of the worker in controlled industry and society. He makes the vital point, so often overlooked today, that "Neither Trade Union bargaining nor joint consultation makes the worker a responsible partner in industry." "Social ownership," he says, "is only half the battle; the other half is real participation by the workers in control—not only at the top, but at every level from the work group upwards." To make this absolutely clear he emphasises, "By participation, I do not mean a mass consultation; I mean real control."

New vigour

Cole uses his pamphlet by saying he realises that what he says may be bad electioneering, that does not worry him. Why be elected, he argues unless one intends to introduce socialism, if not, then tell the people what you do stand for, but do not pretend to be socialist.

Cole further developed his view in two further pamphlets in 1956: 1. What is wrong with the Socialism Restated. Cole keeps to his basic themes, but with a reemphasis of the need he felt he had not too much time left to begin to rebuild.

Great humanit

GDPH COLE was essentially an honest man, who, despite his limitations in theory, made a great contribution to the working-class movement. It must be remembered that during a period when practically everyone had abandoned the field in relation to Workers' Control and Industrial Democracy, he kept it alive. His pre-Stalinist approach to the development of the Soviet forms of bureaucratic rule or industrial control, but mainly dictated by the need to control, as he saw it, was in a front to fight Fascism and reaction. He undoubtedly helped to lead many astray, both in theory and practice, but despite all that, despite severe criticism we must have, let it be remembered one whose faith was with the workers. Despite his class background and financial position, he was a great humanist. We must accept the positive in his work, whilst rejecting that which might be considered piddly and negative.
PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY — A SHAM

WRITES

JOHN COMLEY

VERY OFTEN we hear politicians telling us that we live in a Free Country. They have a catchword, too, the Free World, (Spain, Portugal, Cyprus, South Africa?), which they contrast with the Communist, and tell us how lucky we are and how happy we ought to be. It's easy enough to call Britain Free — but what exactly does it mean?

If we push hard for an answer we may get something like this—Britain has parliamentary democracy, which means that everyone is equally entitled to one vote. Even infants under 21 years and convicts, has the right, at certain specified intervals of time, to have some kind of say in electing a Member to represent him or her, that noble institute just up the river from Victoria Station. This is popularly believed to ensure that the country is governed by popular will. But one person, one vote is the best and fairest way of demonstrating what the popular will actually is. If most of the country vote for Sir Algry Crumpet, then a Tory Government gets in; if Bill Stokes achieves that majority, then we are jolted along by a “Labour” Government. From then on we haven’t any further part in the proceedings; Members and Cabinet carry on a lot better without us.

Consulted?

Hitler once wrote that the bigger the lie, the greater the number of people who could be duped. I believe he’s right. Now this — the belief that the actual governing of a capitalist country is in any important sense directed by the “popular will” — I consider the great lie of this century. There has always been a tendency—increasingly obvious today—for Parliament to be used simply to cover up the political and economic activities of a numerically insignificant minority. Was Parliament consulted before Britain attacked Egypt? How many members of the Cabinet, even, knew what was going to happen? Two? Three? Half a dozen? Was the sanction of Parliament ever asked before bombing planes flew against Port Said? Never, not once. Hostilities were declared by a handful of men — the same handful who might well plunge us into the Third World War.

Private war

It’s sometimes argued that “on-the-spot” decisions are necessary, that we can’t always wait for a full argument, slogging all the pros and cons, before acting on a question of peace or war. But let’s look back a little further. In 1914 Britain went to war against Germany, a war which reflected little credit on either side. On the evening hostilities were declared, the people of this country were astounded to read in the newspapers of a whole series of political and military commitments, hitherto strictly secret, which had never been mentioned debated, or even questioned in the Commons, on more than one occasion. Was he a deliberate liar, or merely the dupe of his own General Staff?

Later still there was the time when Churchill, that paragon of international virtue, was Home Secretary, conducting his own private war against the Russian Bolsheviks. Both Lloyd George and Bonar Law, under heavy public pressure, claimed that the troops were being withdrawn from Russian territory—when in fact they were advancing in a desperate attempt to aid the action of General Korniloff. Again the Commons were bombarded by deliberate lies from the highest sources.

High policy!

I have tried to suggest that “parliamentary democracy” is a sham, and that Parliamentary processes are, in really important questions, merely used as a blind for the men who really exert control. Only rarely is their hand shown in public. The so-called “Church Mutiny” affords a clear example. The Liberal Government passed a Bill affording Home Rule to Ireland, and British officers paraded there refused point-blank to obey orders from Westminster. In this act of sedition they were actively encouraged by the House of Lords. Yet, instead of facing the fact that these officers were encouraged; action against them (according to Asquith) was unthinkably ground of “high policy!” The popular will of both Britain and Ireland had been directly floated by a handful of uniformed bourgeois—Parliament, the representatives of the electorate, was powerless, too afraid, to act.

The facade

And so it goes on. Secret treaties, military pacts, “gentlemen’s agreements,” which never reach the attention of our Westminster representatives, when was the question of the building of rocket-bases debated in Parliament? Has the electorate ever been asked? Not that the occupation of Number Ten by a Gaitskell instead of an Eden would have made any difference to that particular question. The facade of Government may change, but the machinery ticks on behind it. To oil its course there is always the vigilance of the Official Secrets Act. An awkward ques-

tion in Parliament is shelved on the grounds that an answer... "would not be in the national interest!" — only too true, if by national interest we understand the interests of British monopoly-capitalism. The Secrets Act is a useful gag for Members of Parliament and private individuals alike.

Remember the Iasi article, which resulted in the jailing of two undergraduates?

When the fleet paid a "goodwill" mission to Danzig in 1955 they (the monitoring spies) were aboard... A plane "loss" its

cont. next page

TUNE — TIPPERARY

1. The British economy’s in a really shocking mess, The miners and the railwaymen are doing less and less, The shipyard men do nothing, for they’re far too fond of tea.

It’s a good thing that we still possess an Aristocracy.

Chorus

It’s a long way to the Riviera, It’s a long way to go, It’s a long way to the Riviera, And to dear old Monaco.

Good-bye to dear old England, God save the King: And to prove that we are patriotic We’ll be back next spring.

2. The unemployment figures are increasing, it is true, There’s more than half a million of the blighters on the “Bru”!

A few months unemployment and these workers are in tears, But you won’t find us complaining we’ve been unemployed for years.

Chorus

It’s a long way to the Riviera, It’s a long way to go, It’s a long way to the Riviera, And to dear old Monaco.

If there is an election, We’ll send you on your X. In the meantime try and keep things going, Send us on your cheques.

3. The price of corned beef is awfully high, we’ve heard it said, The bakers say that they will have to raise the price of bread.

Because the British worker is behaving like a clown; So we’ll go on eating pheasant till they bring the prices down.

Chorus

It’s a long way to the Riviera, It’s a long way to go, It’s a long way to the Riviera, And to dear old Monaco.

Good-bye to dear old England, God save the King: And to prove that we are patriotic We’ll be back next spring.

MATT McGINN.
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ECONOMICS

UNCERTAIN FUTURE FOR CAR INDUSTRY
says JOHN CRUTCHLEY

UNEMPLOYMENT last year rose and production in most sectors of the economy declined. The major exception was the car industry. Last year for the first time over a million cars were produced. This topped the previous record of 898,000 in 1955 by 12 per cent. Commercial vehicles were not so successful. Although 123 per cent above the 1957 figure was still below the 1955 total.

PERMANENT WAR ECONOMY

Engineering people in Sheffield are prepared to guess that at the peak of rearmament 15 per cent or more of its output went into armaments, specialised vehicles for the Ministry of Supply, and into the aircraft that were cut off in mid¬stroke at the beginning of this year.

Last year's defence cuts essentially marked the beginning of the recession for Sheffield. They have indeed left some industrialists ready to say: 'Unless the Government starts equipping a traditional army again, and the Navy begins to believe in ships once more, we shan't see the average level of activity of the last five years for a very long time.'

The main reason for the boom was increased export sales although the ending of HP restrictions gave an extra boost in the closing months of the year.

The greatest increase was in exports to the Dollar Area. In the American market Britain regained the lead over Western Germany which she lost in 1957. There has been a swing away from the gigantic American cars to smaller family cars in America. This has benefited European exporters. It is estimated that 400,000 foreign cars were sold in America in 1958. Nine per cent of the total (Economist, October 25, 1958).

Markets problem

It does not seem possible that imports of cars into America will continue to increase. Already American manufacturers are planning to bring small cars into production this autumn. This means British car exports will not increase as rapidly as they did in 1958.

The only important export markets remaining to Britain are
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WHAT WE STAND FOR

The SOCIALIST REVIEW stands for International Socialism, only the mass mobilisation of the working class in the industrial and commercial areas can prevent the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

The SOCIALIST REVIEW believes in the complete and total nationalisation of all means of production, the banks, insurance and the land and with compensation payments based on a reasonable basis of nationalisation of all denationalised industries without compensation. Workers control of all enterprises and industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in a means test for all university students.

Workers control in all nationalised industries, i.e., a majority of workers representing the trade unions, workers boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and rotation. Workers control of the armed forces of the nation. Workers control all private enterprises within the framework of a planning authority. All nationalised industries and the workers representatives on boards must be subject to frequent election, immediate recall and rotation. The average wage as a guideline wage in the industry.

The establishment of some democratic methods of control in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions.

The establishment of the principle of work or full maintenance.

The extension of the social services, e.g., free education, free National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.

The nationalisation of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities. Workers control of the nationalisation privately held land.

Free State education up to age 16. Abolition of fee paying schools. For comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants—without a means test—for all university students.

Opposition to all forms of nationalisation, equal rights and trade union protection to all workers whatever the cause of original freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.

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

The unification of an international socialist movement.

The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from over¬ seas bases. The withdrawal of all British weapons of mass destruction.

A Socialist foreign policy independent of both Washington and Moscow.
LABOUR MUST WIN!
continued from page one

one or other of the left-wing movements that have been in the process of working the trick. It is useless to blame their failure entirely on subjective factors such as personal shortcomings of individuals. If a mass Socialist movement were so near the surface it would not have been frustrated by such accidental factors (This is not, of course, to say that errors and shortcomings did not exist).

But on the contrary, we see that the Labour Party is still firmly entrenched as the mass party of the workers. There may be no great enthusiasm in its ranks at the present time. But there is even less enthusiasm for any other workers’ party. Moreover, the leadership today is probably more openly right-wing than at any time in its history. Even Ramsay MacDonald in the 20s felt constrained to use all the “socialist” phraseology that Gattakell adopts.

Labour Governments

Looked at by a Socialist, the record of the Labour Party leadership in the last 40 or so years is wide open to criticism. There were the miserable records of the first two Labour Governments. It would be fair to class the policy to the Tories’ drift to war; coalition with the Tories in the pursuit of an imperialist war and then the return to power with a thumping majority in 1945 when there was every opportunity to take an opponent of capitalism by surprise, but nothing of the sort was achieved. It seems incredible that any party could emerge untouched from its apparently shaken from a period of tremendous convulsions in which it had played so inglorious a role.

Yet if the viewpoint is shifted to that of the average worker or rank-and-file member of the party, does the record look so black? The failures of the first two Labour Governments are excused on the grounds that they were minority governments, barely able to keep their heads above water and with no energy to spare for far-reaching reforms. Even the collapse of 1931 can be interpreted in terms of the treachery of one or two individuals. Enough of the leaders associated themselves in time from MacDonald to save from ignominy the policy that had led to disaster. The second world war appeared to most people in this country not as a war for British imperialism but as a necessary means of checking the march of Fascism, and the Labour Party was regarded as doing more than its obvious duty in sinking its differences with the Tories in the prosecution of the war. The socialist Labour Governments are regarded as having laid the foundation for an advance to Socialism by rationalizing some of the country’s basic industries and the full employment which accompanied the boom conditions was gratefully attributed to Labour policies. It is not surprising that there are still millions of workers who accept the view that capitalism can be gradually changed. And so the theme of piecemeal reforms and see in the Labour Party the instrument for doing precisely this. Socialists believe that these illusions are the result of the illusions and dangerous illusions, because they disarm the workers psychologically and confuse them, never having revealed their true form. An ostrich-like attitude is fatal. Before reformist ideas are shattered, the working class will have to undergo a whole series of experiences. It is the task of socialists to analyse these experiences and show, in the course of the workers’ struggle, why and how reformist policies can never succeed, and the work of education for socialists as much as for any other section of the movement.

Today the left wing must accept a limited perspective and a period of slow growth. In the future the principal task must be to ensure the return of a Labour Government at the next General Election. It will be catastrophic from all points of view if the Tories get back first. But a Tory Government is always bad for the workers. Second, because another defeat for Labour would have a terribly demoralizing effect on the party and on the working-class movement generally. Third, because this is essential that the Labour Party learn how to face the challenge of office again. Let us see where ‘the Future Labour Offers You’ looks to solve the most pressing of workers’ problems. If it does not, the education of the workers will be advanced much more rapidly and much further than by any amount of anti-reformist agitation.

TELEVISION KNOWS

Concern on advertising

THIS MORNING as I battered the frozen butter with the handle of a knife my daughter informed me that if I used ‘Stucko margarine’ it would spread like cream and she added: ‘give me all the vitamins I need.’ All this was delivered with the preciseness of a television announcer. Later on when she saw that I was cooking sausages she said: ‘I hope they’re Walls’ and then: ‘Mummy why don’t you use Omo when you wash my clothes? It’s whiter than white and if she tells me that ‘television knows.’

Yes, Television knows how best to get to the chief buyers of most goods, I have been thinking a lot about television lately, I suppose we all have. Through that middle-aged neighbour is the culprit) I can feel its presence, and its threat on my private life or is it any longer private?

However, I tell myself that I am a progressive person. I make use of the clinic, I think carefully before voting, on affair of sex education, universal suffrage, brotherhood, etc. But... But the discoveries of the application of medicines come the discoveries of wider screens, with better hygiene conditions in factories, collective ownership of factories, and then—the advertising. Didn’t my grandfather swear that the wireless could corrupt the home and haven’t there been, in the wake of every progressive move, those who cling to their childhood and refuse to admit the new? The time has come, however, when one can no longer say: ‘When time comes whether one disagrees or agrees with the invasion of the latest inventions, into our society things are changing with us.

And here now is the television set to ‘corrupt the home,’ where does my progressiveness end? Or where can I resist it? If I keep my children away from it there will come a time when they will no longer be able to talk to other children, not knowing the new television language or what was on the night before.

We cannot ignore it, or its influence, neither can we expect our children to be discriminated with its use. (Cinemas soon will not bother to mark their films with an X or an A, children will be able to see them on television any day.) It has been said that ‘Evil communications corrupt good manners,’ this by a man who had to shout through a rusty telephone. I am all for good manners, they are keys to our progress. But my communications from the world in general seem to be in the control of a few, very few men (we must never forget that they are men and not just organisations) whose one aim is selling something—anything it seems.

I have decided that one day there might be thousands of small television stations, not owned by anybody but there will be in the country and I will be able to dial in on my set and see perhaps my great aunt Emily dancing the quadrille, or someone in Africa talking on a wireless and a man in a phone box showing me what he looks like, how he smiles, and something of his country.

Yes, better and better communications but from and to people who want to know about each other, not simply from a seller to a buyer.

CRESSIDA LINDSAY.

UNCERTAIN FUTURE FOR CARS — CONTD

the ‘white Dominions.’ These markets are not expanding as rapidly as those of Western Europe or America. Because they are driven by the middle class, producing counties they are the first to be hit by fluctuations in international trade and the last to see them cut their imports. In an attempt to increase their industrial capacity they are placing orders in the downworn car industries.

More cars

More cars will be sold at home in 1959 because HP terms have been eased and banks are more willing to give their middle-class customers credit to buy cars. Nearly 100 per cent more cars were sold under HP terms in November than in October last year and nearly 60 per cent more than in November, 1957. (Observer, December 21, 1958.) This increase is only a temporary boost and will not continue at this rate throughout 1959.

Moreover, 25 per cent of new cars sold in Britain are subject to HP agreements. 25 per cent of total British car production or 50 per cent of cars produced in Britain rank in capital investment (Economist, October 25, 1958). These cars are bought, for the use of the top bosses. These sales are influenced by business prospects not HP agreements.

Trouble ahead

Therefore, unless exports can be increased for purchase tax revenue, produced, the British car industry will run into trouble by the summer of this year.

Finals, the increased output

Sparks in Florence !

The management of the Galileo Company, a well-known firm making optical instruments and electrical equipment, reacted to an action taken by the police 400 workers for illegally occupying the company’s factory interiors. The workers took action on Friday of last week to prevent notices of dismissal from them being carried out.

Times, January 16.