WITH MACMILLAN tripping off to Moscow we can expect the Gallup Poll once again to tip in favour of his Party. Let us not forget then the reason for the popularity of his visit, ie, the preparation for Summit Talks to solve the German and other matters, and why such a prospect, previously hailed by some Left-Wingers, could possibly ensure for us another five dreary years of Tory rule.

A reasonable question to ask: Suppose, thanks to Macmillan, we have our Summit Talks, or the Premier looks as if he wants them, and the resulting popularity is just enough to get the Government back, will all the socialists who plumped for the talks for so long consider the five years a fair enough price to pay for their precious talks?

MISTAKES ON THE LEFT

Apart from those hopeless sectarian extremists (like supporters of this journal) who hold that nothing could be worse than having the Tories back with us after the elections to go their happy H-bomb-strewn way, the supporters of Summit Conferences could perhaps justify their past stand from future expectations of the results of the Top People’s Conference.

Because it is true that a sizeable portion of the British people have some faith in the outcome of a meeting of the top warmongers, certain Leftists have taken it on themselves to blow hot and cold on the subject. Some suggest that it is necessary to go along with supposed popular feeling, avoid hurting feelings, and say that Summit Talks could very well be a good thing; it would expose the warlike intent of the West; or if the smaller nations were included we could have a more “democratic” Summit.

It is doubtful whether the ruling class of the smaller nations would be any more inclined to look after the interests of the Labour movement in power politics than the larger nations; we can only judge the neutrals on their past activities. Nehru uses troops against strikers on every occasion. Tito supported the UN in Korea and white-washed Hungary on varying occasions. Nasser sent the last Egyptian strike leader to the gallows. It will not be the anti-imperialist revolts (which brought these men to power) which would speak at an international conference, but the men themselves and their shifting opportunist policies. Is their any reason to suppose that these men, any more than the Soviet or its followers, will attempt to speak for German or British labour?

It is much more honest to take a stand against trust in Summit Talks from the start, and if events prove one to be wrong, then admit it, than to find oneself washed up in a Tory election campaign.

And how strong is the popular feeling for Summit Talks that we must follow Macmillan and the masses to our Bloody Sunday? It is true that a sizeable portion of the bourgeois Press, along with the Stalinists, along with various Left-Centrist leaders, and some honest Radicals and workers feel that a Summit Meeting could do some good to their various and diametrically-opposed interests. But is there really a deep-going bread and butter feeling so strong in the Labour movement that workers would kick us to death or brand us sectarian if we suggested that more good could come from, for instance, an international gathering of workers’ representatives, scientific warmongers, certain Leftists have taken it upon itself, Labour leaders, etc, than another of the interminable thieves’ kitchens of carping and cynical power politicians? After all, there is also a sizeable portion of the population who would be inclined to agree with our estimation of the motives of those set in power above us, and we would be doing our little bit if we propagandized with the aim of encouraging these healthy sentiments of the Labour movement, rather than for “pressure on the world governments.”

CASUAL LABOUR IN BUILDING

WHY DO we need a form of registration for the General Operatives employed within the Building and Civil Engineering Industries?

The answer is a brief and simple one; to end casualization; to provide the operatives with a measure of economic security. Of all the major industries in society, none other is plagued to the same extent with casual labour.

This need not be. The main problem is to reconcile an irregular demand for houses, schools, hospitals, factories; roads, bridges and other building projects with the available supply of labour.

The volume of building work is not constant; it depends on a number of varying factors. These are conditioned in the main by external forces and not, as so often imagined, from the inside.

Government policy has been, and still is, responsible for the rise and fall in the number of men employed in the industry. This is frequently conditioned by the general economic state of the nation.

IN WINTER

Whatever the cause, the operative is the sufferer. In addition, the best laid schemes of men often go adrift through the fickleness of the weather.

Winter, in particular, with its rain, hail, snow and frost inflicts a heavy toll on the personnel of the industry; to an extent, without parallel in any other industry.

All these have an adverse effect on page 8.
We apologize for the unfortunate confusion that occurred in our building column last issue. The main article entitled "Organization and Wages in Building" was wrongly attributed to Tramp Navvy. It was written by Chippy. Tramp Navvy's contribution was limited to the few factual notes at the head of the column — Editor.

The idea was that the Shell-Mex was changing over from Civil Engineering to Building anyway, and that this would provide a wonderful "get out." The site (Shell-Mex) was changed over from the working conditions of the Civil Engineering Conciliation Board to the conditions of the National Federation of Building Trades, or the NBFTO for short. Then the Civil Engineering Board, said Mr. Armstrong, Mills, Weaver and Mr. Matthews, to the Executive Council of the NBFTO, said Mr. Armstrong, Mills, Weaver and Mr. Matthews: "What about the case for the re-employment of the victimized stewards?"

Bros Armstrong, Mills, Weaver and Mr. Matthews of the NBFTO repeated: "He's back! he's back! He's back! No decision of the Civil Engineering Board is binding on the NBFTO. The matter is up to the unions (we mean ultra vires) as far as we're concerned. Bros Armstrong, Mills, Weaver and Mr. Matthews of the NBFTO are concerned, and furthermore we demand you, the NBFTO, the NBFTO, Mills, Weaver and Mr. Matthews of the Civil Engineering Board not to bother us any more with your nasty problems."

PAY RATES IN BUILDING

by Jack Weldon

February, 1959—Ed.; had the Agreement remained unchanged and the assessment continued to be made on the percentage method, he would be earning 15s. 2d. per hour; thus lowering his rate by 7d. a hour.

Contractors victory

History has shown that progress does not always follow a straight line; more often than not it is undulated; falling below and rising above.

This happened in the case of the Labourers in 1953 when, through the inadequacy of their organization and the absence of the will needed to press for the retention of their newly acquired status, the Contractors were able to score a victory and thereby regain some of the ground lost a few years earlier.

Strengthen organization

They were successful in widening the differential but not in rendering it reciprocal.

And it should be noted that this was achieved at a time of full employment and the peak of industrial prosperity.

The immediate task confronting the Labourer is the preparation of ways and means that will enable him to render his services where and when called upon to do so.

FULL LTE operating statistics for 1958 are now available. The details are printed below. These figures stand as a monument to the systematic and calculated murder of the people's transport services.

And this is only one year's balance sheet of many. Since the LTE took over, in 1975, 25 per cent of the transport services have disappeared, 25 per cent of operating staff has gone, and 25 per cent of the passengers no longer use the services.

No board of directors anywhere—in any industry—in any country could get away with such a balance sheet as the LTE present for 1958—they would be out of their necks in double quick time. But the LTE are the chosen ones—the darlings of the Tory Government. The systematic destruction of London's Transport services is a calculated political act. It is a murder with a purpose—and the purpose is to discredit nationalisation and to prove to the people with whom they believe will be valuable election propaganda.

In this, the LTE are willing stooges. When the bus services were slashed in November last, the fatuous Sir John Elliot publicly declared: "It's a splendid start." When, driven to desperation, passengers revolted and refused to leave trains to suit requirements of the LTE, the egregious Mr. Brain Harbour told the press: "Our sole job in life is to serve the public."

Ordering the LTE's 14th application for fares increases this same £5,000 a year stoke billions of passengers. "London Transport expects passenger traffic in 1959 to drop two million in 1958.

How many more years like 1958 can we endure before London Transport finally collapses? How many more years of fare increases at a rate more basic than the cost of living, be sold at knock-out prices? How many more garages are to be bought by the LTE? How much longer is our industry to be used as a political punch-ball by the Tory Government?"

Once again this journal warns the union— the Labour Movement— that the Licence wheels of London Transport are grinding to a halt. A genuine people's enquiry in which public and municipal bodies can speak with authority, is an urgent and immediate need.

The building repoter says

INDUSTRIAL

TRAMP NAVYY

SEPARATE AGREEMENTS A DANGER

BUILDING AND CIVIL ENGINEERING may seem very similar to some of you, and so they are, but one fact is that each have separate National Agreements. This can cause, and has caused, a great deal of confusion in the minds of the workers.

At Shell-McAlpine (McAlpine) South Bank Site started as a Civil Engineering project. The lads worked under the Civil Engineering Building Trade's Conciliation Board Agreement.

The working conditions under the building wages were fixed at the conditions under the National Federation of Building Trades Operations, but the wages were being reviewed, no regional overtime committee, no travelling time allowances. There was thus, there is not a great deal of difference.

Bro H. Weaver represents the AUBTW (Bricklayers and their labourers, when he is not expelling his local from the Department of Civil Engineering Board. The same Bro. Weaver represents the AUBTW on the NBFTO.

Mr H. E. Matthews represents the NUG & MW (Jim Matthews' boys) on the Civil Engineering Board, and the same Mr. Matthews represents the NUG & MW on the Federation.

You can see from this the same T.UUS leaders sit on both bodies.

Now last December, after a great deal of pressure and activity by branches, the T & GWU decided that they would seek the re-employment of their victimized stewards of the Shell-McAlpine (McAlpine) Site at South Bank, by presenting their case to the Civil Engineering Conciliation Board. But a big shock was awaiting the T & GWU. When the Trades Unions met to discuss the agenda on the morning of the fatal day and when they came to the item on the agenda dealing with the re-employment of the victimized stewards, the agenda broke loose. There were roars of indignation at this affront; at the very impudence of the T & GWU daring to seek the support of their fellow Unions; there were cries of "Discipline or we're gone!" "If these insurgents as we did", you are making our disciplinarian status, our statecraft, look ridiculous. With this support, the T & GWU decided it would be useless to go before the Joint Conciliation Board and they withdrew their case from the agenda.

Now after this example of trades unionism gone berserk, the contractors began to change a little. Naughy McAlpine broke his promise to the ASW that he would re-employ them as stewards. The f.s. d. was not coming in. So the ASW called a branch delegate conference and there were cries of "What about our victimized men of the South Bank?" The London Regional Council of the T & GWU insisted on the re-employment of the boys. It was therefore decided that a further attempt be made, and 20th February was to be the big day. Again, there was panic among the stewards; one of them had a brainwave. Solomon in all his wisdom never had a brainwave like it—you would marvel at this piece of duplicity.

The idea was that the Shell-Mex site was changing over from Civil Engineering to Building anyway, and that this would provide a wonderful "get out."
PAY INCREASES THE EASY WAY

WHEN workers earning £7, 00 or £25 a week want an increase in pay to keep up with rising prices, they have to embark on a long, hard road of bargaining with their employers. The wage increase has been a tough battle for many cases by strike action, or at the least the threat of it. By the time all possible delaying tactics have been exhausted by the employers’ side and a few big wins have been to be very about time to start on another battle. And so the weary struggle goes on. If a strike is necessary, it will take months for the workers to recover through their pay increase what they have lost through it out of work.

Interests guarded

But under our top-syrup capitalist system, this method applies only to the wage-earners and the lower salary brackets. "Top people" (as The Times chooses to describe its readers), even if technically employees, do not have to tread this hard road. Professional people — doctors, dentists, higher civil servants, etc. have their interests carefully safeguarded for them and they get their salary increases from time to time without having to lift a finger. Recommendations

This was strikingly illustrated recently by the publication of recommendations made by the Colouraine Committee on the pay of higher civil servants. The committee was set up by the Government at the suggestion of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service, so as to save these emi- nent public servants the embarrass- ment of taking their mini- nisters to arbitration over pay claims. It’s comforting to think that the Government has such a tender regard for people’s finer feelings. Instead, the salaried of the higher ranks are reviewed from time to time by this “independent” committee. Trade unionists with experience of “independent” committees know how their “impairment” invari- ably works to the advantage of the boss and not the worker.

The guide

Not so with the Colouraine Committee. They have recom- mended no modest little increases of 7½ or 10%; a week. Nothing so commonplace. The committee has not prevented them from suggesting such whopping in- creases as £300 a year for assist- ant secretaries now struggling along on £2700 a year and at the top end bumping up the 15-year permanent secretaries by the colossal sum of £1,500 a year—£6,500 to £8,000. The committee seems to have been guided by the Biblical say- ing: “Unto him that hath shall be given.”

Competition

Of course, the price of these people’s labour is, under capita- lism, determined by competi- tion. The civil service has to com- pete with industry to attract the brighter products of the universi- ties. Salaries paid to top execu- tive industry are of good reason) usually a closely guarded secret. But these proposed in- creases have to be considered in the light of children of school fees, etc. These are the gentlemen who are so well qualified to receive the uttermost any wage increase for their employees.

Tiny minority

The high salaries proposed for the top bureaucrats are also due to the scarcity value of highly educated people, under condi- tions of capitalism. University education (particularly at Oxford and Cambridge from which the majority of senior civil servants are drawn) is still regarded as a tiny minority of young people.

Class and status

Capitalism insists on the divorce between brain and hand. It edu- cates the majority to do monoto- nously repetitive work. Few who get higher education are accorded by society an altogether disproportionate status. According to capitalist philosophy and economics they have to be re- warded for the time it takes them through their training. Yet who in their senses could argue that any one of these people, however capable they may be, is worth ten or twenty times as much as a worker? And who could argue that this capability is a qualification for a high salary, there is plenty of ability in the world, the human species is frustrated and stifled by all kinds of social and educational factors?

Impartial?

Above all, why should "adminis- tration" be such a highly regarded art? It is not inherently difficult. Lenin quite correctly spoke of the possibility under socialism of any worker taking over in his turn the function of the official. It is only under capi- talism that administration be- comes complex and difficult. For the State is for ever trying to find a means of getting round the conflicting class interests which tear society apart. Under conditions of parliamentary democracy, it must keep up an appearance of impartiality, and this involves skill of a kind in its higher bureaucracy, just as the elaborate shams of diplomacy call for a delicate touch in negotia- tion. But workers, when they take over control of society, adminis- tration will take its proper place as random, as genuine, as a part of society as a whole, calling for no higher skill and no higher salary than are appropriate to the mass of the workers. There will be an end of the present gross injustice between the few and the many, peace by mutual terror —

YOUTH FORGOTTEN WORKERS by A. REYBURN

It is perhaps a tradition among employers to pay such low wages to apprentices, but it is one which is robbing many in- dustries of potentially skilled workers. Apprentices are getting a raw deal from employers and little experience from the trade unions.

The table below shows the wages of an apprentice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>59 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>69 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>81 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th year</td>
<td>110 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th year</td>
<td>130 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures, compared with a clerk or similar professional, are low indeed. However, we appreciate that the employer is giving the apprentice the benefit of becoming experienced and skilled in a trade which can possibly give him the opportunity of obtaining a job with a good wage.

LTE OPERATING STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1957</th>
<th>1958</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong for service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers and Conductor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39,874</td>
<td>36,303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside Staffs</td>
<td>6,478</td>
<td>5,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>7,259</td>
<td>7,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriageworks Run</td>
<td>381,660,000</td>
<td>320,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>3,152,662,000</td>
<td>2,574,029,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>£59,169,000</td>
<td>£48,506,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It remains only to add that, as a reward for this year’s unexempted success, the salaries of the 5 members of the LTE were increased as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Elliot</td>
<td>£7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. H. Grainger</td>
<td>£3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. H. Harbour</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. C. Hawkins</td>
<td>£3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Bull</td>
<td>£3,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Truly London Transport is "Strong for Service" — but whose service?
THE MOVEMENT ON THE CENTENARY OF GEORGE LANSBURY'S BIRTH
RAY CHALLINOR RECALLS A MAN OF PRINCIPLE

GEORGE LANSBURY was a man of principle. Unlike our present Labour leaders — unlike Mr. Kinnock, for example, dining with each treacher of public opinion — Lansbury knew what he thought and how he felt, and what may, he stuck firmly to his socialist beliefs. Whether in Parliament or out of it, whether he was always kept the Red Flag flying.

Such behaviour, positively unheard of among Labour high-ups today, would have been taken for granted in the old Port House as dangerous and indecent. Were Lansbury still alive today, he might be showered with praise; he must be looked up to, venerated as one of the pioneers of the Labour Movement.

The centenary of Lansbury's birth — he was born at Lowestoft on February 21st, 1859 — is to be marked this week. It's a day of hypocritical praise from the Establishment of the Labour Party. The leaders don't want people to know Lansbury's real message; they hope to shroud him with their own tales of false praise.

We can be sure that Hugh Gaitskell, just back from Africa, where he has been promoting the neo-fascist De Gaulle to accept American Thor rockets, will not dwell on Lansbury's opposition to war and re-armament. He is hardly likely to quote from the Daily Herald during Lansbury's editorship the period — that of the First World War — the paper took an anti-war position.

Agains war

In his struggle against war, Lansbury saw the Russian Revolution as the first ray of hope. The Russian people, hungry and tired of the futile slaughter, overthrew the Tsarist regime. The soldiers even voted for “peace and bread” with their feet—by simply disobeying their officers and deserting. Lansbury saw this as a model to be followed elsewhere. Speaking at a giant meeting in the Albert Hall, he drew his arguments from the Russian Revolution:

“This triumph has come, friends, because for the first time in my life I can say that history — at least, in modern history — soldiers, working class soldiers, have refused to fire on workers. (For once, a great applause.) To me, comrades, this is the greatest lesson of all. Oh, I know you hadn't learnt this lesson; they have learnt it now, and it is for us to learn it too — a great applause — because we can understand that when the working classes of all nations refuse to shoot down the working classes of other countries, governments won't be able to make wars any more.” (Tremendous applause.)

Lansbury's appeal to the trade unions — “march out into No Man's Land and refuse to fight any longer” — is not likely to be heeded, politically received by Hugh Gaitskell who, when Chancellor of the Exchequer, cut off all social services so he could spend more on arms. Lansbury's policy is based upon the most important socialist principle of individual working-class solidarity — whereas Gaitskell's is based upon a reliance on the Great Deterrent, an idea imported directly from American capitalism.

Poplar council

After the First World War, the promised land did not materialize. Instead of “homes fit for heroes”, there was unemployment, a wage reduction, a bonus. Faced with this situation, Lansbury did what he could to defend the working class. In 1918, he was a member of Poplar Borough Council. In those days unemployment benefit was administered from local authorities, not on a national basis. This meant that in Poplar, the Council was confronted with the alternative — either to cut the amount of unemployment benefit or to increase the rates in this overwhelmingly working-class borough. In either case, it was the poorer section of the community that stood to lose. Lansbury, as a councillor, was reviled by both prospects. He said:

“From the first moment I determined to fight for one policy only, and that was the advancement of the working people, and hang the rates! My view of life places money, property, and privilege on a much lower scale than human life.”

Consequently, Poplar Council passed a resolution raising unemployment benefit and refusing to meet statutory commitments. This decision resulted in the whole membership of the council being prosecuted. As a body, the worthy Mayor, Alderman and others, by the corporation mace bearer, marched in procession to High Court.

In court, Lansbury, stoutly defending Poplar's decision, pointed to the growing unemployment — at that time it numbered about a million—and said he did not see why working class areas, which have the misfortune of having the largest number of unemployed, should have to bear the burden of maintaining them. Working-class, real working class areas, places with far greater wealth, had practically no unemployment.

Lansbury was asked by a judge, “What if all borough councils did as you’ve done?” He replied: “Simply, why, let’s get the necessary reforms.”

While this statement was no doubt true, it did not satisfy the judges. They sent the whole of the council to jail for “contumacy of court”. They were to remain there indefinitely until they were prepared to carry out the judges' order to pay the £270,000 owed.

As the councillors didn't have the least intention of paying, they prepared themselves to serve their term in prison. But they had not counted — neither had the capitalist government — on the electrifying effect their magnificently large sentence would have on the working class. Millions of people throughout the world, Germany, which comes second, was only at war 28 years. To cut off the blood-lettings abroad, British capitalism could be peaceful at home, and the councillors being sent to jail, Lloyd George realised that his policy was no longer tenable. He caved in, granted the reforms — and Poplar went free.

After the ensuing 1922 General Election, Lansbury, with his Poplar success still fresh in the electorate's mind, got re-elected for Bow with an increased majority. Elsewhere Labour gained more than before. It was in the position, with Liberal support, to form a minority government. But King George V, stiff-necked, narrow-minded Tory, refused to call upon Labour to do so. This example of the political bias of royalty led Lansbury in a public speech, to remind the King of how Charles I lost his head through dabbling in politics. When the King finally was compelled to call on Labour to form a government, he insisted that Lansbury should be excluded from the Cabinet.

And, of course, MacDonald agreed that Lansbury should be excluded from the Cabinet.

Unlike MacDonald then — and our present Labour leaders now — Lansbury never mixed in exalted, aristocratic circles. In his Autobiography Philip Snowden reports MacDonald, immediately after his betrayal of the Labour Government in 1931, as saying, “Yes, tomorrow every Duchess in London will be wanting a kiss from me, but they need not fear the blandishments of noble ladies: they saw him as an enemy, attended him as an enemy. For his part, he saw them as one of the reasons for the creation of MacDonald and Co.

That is why, after the demoralising 1931 debacle, he argued for — and the Labour conference adopted — a resolution pleading the Party to oppose all hereditary rights and privileges.

It was during this period, as leader of the Labour Party, that Lansbury achieved the culminating triumph of his life. Singing the Red Flag as he marched his small band of 59 Labour MPs through the division lobbies, he ignored the Tories with a thousand times more gusto and effectiveness than Gaitskell has ever done. The reason? Lansbury made this plain from the start: “The program we fight on shall be a Socialist one, full-blooded and unmitigated.”

The greatness of Lansbury stems from the fact that he mirrors the best qualities of the socialist movement; its integrity, its interest in progress, its concern about the sufferings of the working class, how he reflected its weaknesses — its lack of theory and tendency to capitulation. His lack of theory resulted in him often being buffeted by events. For example, instead of supporting the 1917 Russian Revolution, the Minority Labour Government for coming to power and merely adapting capitalism, he took a post in MacDonald's Ministry. He never understood the essential character of reformism.

The prevalence of pacifism in the Labour Party is a movement. It is caused, paradoxically, by the extremely violent nature of the political movement itself. The period of Empire-building, 1815-1915, Britain was at war 64 out of the 100 years. This is more than any other country in the world. Germany, which comes second, was only at war 28 years. Because British capitalism has to cut its blood-lettings abroad, British capitalism could be peaceful at home, and the councillors being sent to jail, Lloyd George realised that his policy was no longer tenable. He caved in, granted the reforms — and Poplar went free.

After the ensuing 1922 General Election, Lansbury, with his Poplar success still fresh in the electorate's mind, got re-elected for Bow with an increased majority. Elsewhere Labour gained more than before. It was in the position, with Liberal support, to form a minority government. But King George V, stiff-necked, narrow-minded Tory, refused to call upon Labour to do so. This example of the political bias of royalty led Lansbury in a public speech, to remind the King of how Charles I lost his head through dabbling in politics. When the King finally was compelled to call on Labour to form a government, he insisted that Lansbury should be excluded from the Cabinet. And, of course, MacDonald agreed that Lansbury should be excluded from the Cabinet.

Unlike MacDonald then — and our present Labour leaders now — Lansbury never mixed in exalted, aristocratic circles. In his Autobiography Philip Snowden reports MacDonald, immediately after his betrayal of the Labour Government in 1931, as saying, “Yes, tomorrow every Duchess in London will be wanting a kiss from me, but they need not fear the blandishments of noble ladies: they saw him as an enemy, attended him as an enemy. For his part, he saw them as one of the reasons for the creation of MacDonald and Co.

That is why, after the demoralising 1931 debacle, he argued for — and the Labour conference adopted — a resolution pleading the Party to oppose all hereditary rights and privileges.

It was during this period, as leader of the Labour Party, that Lansbury achieved the culminating triumph of his life. Singing the Red Flag as he marched his small band of 59 Labour MPs through the division lobbies, he ignored the Tories with a thousand times more gusto and effectiveness than Gaitskell has ever done. The reason? Lansbury made this plain from the start: “The program we fight on shall be a Socialist one, full-blooded and unmitigated.”

The greatness of Lansbury stems from the fact that he mirrors the best qualities of the socialist movement; its integrity, its interest in progress, its concern about the sufferings of the working class, how he reflected its weaknesses — its lack of theory and tendency to capitulation. His lack of theory resulted in him often being buffeted by events. For example, instead of supporting the 1917 Russian Revolution, the Minority Labour Government for coming to power and merely adapting capitalism, he took a post in MacDonald's Ministry. He never understood the essential character of reformism.
NOEL HARRIS OPENS THE DISCUSSION ON A POLICY FOR IRELAND

The passing of resolutions calling for “the withdrawal of British troops from Ireland,” “self-determination” for Ireland, and similar declaratory objectives has become common practice among British Trade Union and Labour Party socialists and other socialist organizations and groups. These resolutions are passed, on the whole, by well-meaning socialists on the sound socialist principle of the right of every nation for freedom from foreign domination and exploitation. The attention of the comrades or brothers who pass the resolutions is, however, usually drawn to the position of the six north-eastern counties of Ireland by Irish exiles who have been, unfortunately, blinded to fact by virtue of having been engendered with a fierce nationalism which has been deliberately confused with religious bigotry by years of clerical indoctrination.

Confidence trick

These facts must be faced by all Irishmen, no matter how bitter and hard to digest the pill may be.

There is no denying that the “State” of Northern Ireland was founded in a totally undemocratic manner by means of a Tory confidence trick, the overtures of which the Irish people had demonstrated their wish for political independence. But there is also no denying that the confidence trick was highly effective and that Northern Ireland was established as “an integral part of the United Kingdom” with the almost complete support of the people living within its boundaries.

There is still support for the continuation of the status of Northern Ireland and it would be comparable with the United States’ policy with regard to the People’s Republic of China to ignore this established fact.

Divide and rule

The confidence trick referred to was a tactic of British imperialism: the division of the people into antagonistic camps on the basis of religious differences, in India, Palestine and the more recent attempt in Cyprus are examples of this policy. Suspicion and antagonism are engendered by granting small favours and rights to the minority group. This was, as in the Irish case, and Protestants—at the expense of the majority, the Roman Catholic Irish.

In this way, the heroic struggle of the Irish peasants for basic human rights and dignities degenerated into a struggle between the lackeys of British imperialism and the agents of the Irish bourgeoisie and aristocracy, the rival churches. In this gradual change of direction of the Irish struggle, great socialists like J. F. L. Connolly and James Connolly were used and cruelly betrayed. Very many of the people in the South and the people in the North are almost totally ignorant of them.

Many of the origins of the resolutions, to which I have referred, are sincere. Without believing that Socialism can never be achieved in a divided country. That slogan is only a living Socialism. This contention is true up to a point, but it is a sheer fallacy, indeed folly, to contend, as they do, that territorial unity must be the first goal of Irish socialists.

Ireland is therefore governed by two basically similar bourgeois classes who are ever jostling for power. The question must therefore be posed as to what good can be obtained by supporting one against the other. This is not only by virtue of the literature and newspaper cases of the Irish case, but by the fact that most, if not all, of these rival factions, the only purpose served is to strengthen this faction which is a regressive step for socialists.

Since there are two firmly established governments in Ireland with the support of the majority of their respective citizens, the task of Irish socialists is to achieve unity among the Irish proletariat and refer the matter to a Court of Inquiry which substantially accepted the union’s claims.

In their pamphlet Looking at Industrial Relations (February, 1934), the Engineers and Allied Employers’ Federation frankly admit that they were looking not for a settlement but for a fight:

Twice in four years the Federation has been prepared to “fight it out” with the unions. Clearly, the unions’ capacity to pay strike benefit was limited. Such a course, involving as it would the eventual destruction of the industry, might have been a worthwhile calculated risk. It was no occasion for the kind of compromise which inevitably emerges from a Court of Inquiry.

Who encouraged the engineers employers in their attempts to force a showdown? Once again the pamphlet is damningly frank:

The Government and the employers’ organizations—notably the British Employers Confederation, in a document “Britain’s Industrial Future,” published late in 1935—were in complete agreement: in 1956 if further pay rises were not in the best interests of workers in a period of rising prices, when bigger pay packets would buy less and further aggravate the situation.

When all appeared set for a struggle to which the Federation and the Confederation were irrevocably committed, the Government, in an economic and political repercussions of intervention in Suez, decided that the country was not strong enough to withstand the probable effects of transport, engineering and shipbuilding strikes.

So here we have it! The Government which is supposed to be above the battle had first encouraged the employers to get tough and then faced with the economic consequences of their attack on Suez, decided at the last moment to call it off.

Northern Ireland is the sole cause of the social and political grievances and exploitation which is so widespread in their area.

In the North, the Tories have achieved the same end by a reversal of the tactic. They have managed to convince their people that the existence of a slightly higher standard of living in Northern Ireland is entirely due to the separate status of the six counties. Thus they feed the minds of the people of Northern Ireland that any merger with the “Catholic South” will result in the pushing down of their living standards to the low level of the latter area. They are therefore deluded into a policy of guarding the status quo and disregarding, like their Southern counterparts, political and social issues.

Neither of the bourgeois governments are fools, however. Both realize that the main enemy is not one another but Socialism, and both adopt measures designed to prevent its spread in their respective areas.

The Southern government adopts tactics which are not far behind those of the Fascist Spain. The banning of books, magazines, newspapers and other forms of print, the proscription of political parties and similar organizations, together with the relentless, determined attack on the pulpits and other platforms.

The Northern government use slightly more subtle tactics. They, like their Southern counterparts, have an almost complete monopoly of the propaganda media, including newspaper, radio and television. By widely publicising the aforementioned resolutions, no matter how obscure their origin may be, as implying support from the British Trades Union Congress, Liberal and Socialists movements for the petty bourgeois terrorist organization, the Irish Republic, it is an attempt to plant a fear and suspicion of Socialism in general in the minds of the workers of Northern Ireland.

A greater service

A much greater service would be rendered to the Irish people if British socialists were to refrain from passing these useless resolutions and were instead to concentrate on establishing more direct contact between socialists, both North and South of the Irish border, and possibly actually to establish a kind of mediator between them. Further purpose could be served if the Irish section of THE SOCIALIST REVIEW were made available for Irish socialists to use in an attempt to publish more widely the sorry truth of the gross betrayal of the Irish working class by revolutionary movement by the British leadership right through history.

Only by a policy of separately establishing Socialism, North and South, will the "orange" and "green" Tories will ever be "A Nation Once Again."
ECONOMICS

Recessions and unemployment

By J. CRUTCHLEY

The most significant feature of the recent upturn in the American economy is that production has increased faster than employment. In January, 47,000,000 workers (including the total labour force) were unemployed. At the height of the recession in March and April, 1958, 5,120,000 (7.5 per cent) workers were unemployed. Employment has risen by 3 per cent since January but therefore rose 13 per cent, but in the same period total industrial output increased 13 per cent.

This is not explained by seasonal employment and the influence of non-industrial employment. Despite this, the trend towards "technological unemployment" is causing concern among economists.

The Steelworkers have recently made a survey of employment and production in the American steel industry. They found that 131 per cent more ingots were produced in the third quarter of 1958 than in the first quarter of that year. This increased output was achieved with 27 per cent less production and maintenance workers and 1 per cent less salaried employees. (Quote in AFL-CIO News, January 1).

Evidence

Figures from the car industry are even more impressive. The General Motors plan a 25 per cent increase in output in the first quarter of 1959, while the Ford division is planning a 5 per cent increase in workers. At the Dodge Main Plant in Detroit, the employment of 1,000 workers went up 20 per cent, and the other 26,600 workers, working two shifts. In December, 1958, there were 7,000 workers on one shift. But production has only dropped from 950 to 550 cars a day. (Business Week, December 30).

About this evidence, AFL-CIO News says... this "has already happened in textiles, electrical equipment, coal and many other industries" and that "these figures one conclusion is inescapable, namely, that stabilisation and a decline in declining employment levels. Slowly rising production can be, of course, an accomplishment with little or no rise in employment."

This pattern has been duplicated in the British Car Industry where output is now above the near peak production figure the number of workers employed is less. This trend is also apparent in other industries. As the survey in 1958, they were working below capacity, it is difficult to estimate to what extent. The only survey in Britain was made by the National Institute of Economic and Social Research in January, 1955, and is contained in their first Economic Review—January, 1959.

Initial stages

They found that there was an excess capacity of about 20 per cent in the metal-using and rubber industries and 10 to 15 per cent in the chemicals, paper and textile industries, and in the latter group capacity is still growing fast. The bosses in the metalusing industries said "on average, they could produce 10 per cent more by working 3 per cent longer hours and employing 5 per cent more labour" and at full capacity they could "produce 20 per cent more with 7 per cent more labour". (See also Andrew Shonfield, Observer, August 17, 1958, and Douglas Hague, Westminster Bank Review, November, 1958.).

During the initial stages of a recession firms are usually unwilling to shed workers. There are two reasons for this: Firstly, if they expect a quick recovery conditions that will maintain their labour force through a small slump so they will have enough labour to reach their full capacity when the boom comes. This presupposes the labour shortage that has existed in Britain since the war and that the capitalists are confident about the future.

Another reason

Secondly, as industrial production becomes more capitalised and the cost of labour, extended, the flexibility that characterised the older industrial units disappears, and as a result reduction in output does not mean a proportional reduction in labour. The logical outcome of this is that, which is approached in the steel, chemical and car industries is that the labour force cannot be reduced without cutting output to zero. Output can be reduced, but it will be at a cost that is much higher than the cost per unit of output is increased. To counteract this, two things have been happening—firstly, firing two shifts which can be cut to one during a slump.

Despite this inflexibility, a recession does give firms a chance to reduce workers "rationalising" employment and utilizing excess capacity, created by new investment. Thus, when the boom comes, output increases much more rapidly than employment.

The present recession is the first one since the war to be widespread in the British manufacturing industries. Therefore this is their first chance to organise their factories and produce an increase in productivity that the investment in industry since 1954 has created. One result of this capacity is that they are planning an increase in man hours worked but not men employed. This means the bosses will want overtime to increase. Workers in these industries can learn an important lesson from these facts. Overtime should not be worked while their mates are still in the dole queue.

It is impossible to estimate the extent to which these factors are operating in British industry, but I do not think unemployment will fall to the 1 per cent level ($20,000) before the end of June. In January it was 2.8 per cent (620,000). This will be reduced by the seasonal spur in output in building and other trades but it is doubtful if it will fall below 2 per cent (460,000) by the summer.

Reviewing this situation, the Economist (February 14) says, "These are the main reasons why optimism about a continued, though probably mild, improvement in 1959 is justified. For the next few months carry no coronet assumptions that employment need rise or unemployment fall correspondingly. Workers have been considerably underemployed in many British factories. For the next months past, if not quite as much as machines have. If there is still politically embarrassing if British industry manages to achieve a significant increase in its output before it needs, take on more men. But it will be economically scanda-
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WHAT WE STAND FOR

The Socialist Review stands for National Socialist democracy. Only the mass mobilisation of the workers, based on the democratic and political arena can lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism. The Socialist Review believes that a really consistent Labour Government must be brought to power on the basis of the following programme:

1. Nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments based on a means test. Nationalisation of all denationalised industries without compensation. The nationalised industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.

2. Workers' control in all nationalised industries is, a majority of workers' representatives on all national or area boards, subject to frequent elections immediately and receiving the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.

3. The establishment of a workers' committee to control all private enterprises within the framework of a plan, these workers' representatives to be subject to frequent elections by the workers involved and receive the average skilled wage in the industry.

4. The establishment of work councils to control hiring, firing and working conditions.

5. The principle of full employment, not as a means of initiating the principle of full mainenance.

6. The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, the abolition of all payments for the poor, the abolition of unemployment benefit and the development of an industrial health service.

7. The expansion of the housing programme and the granting of interest free loans to local authorities and the right to require private houses to be maintained.

8. Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fee paying schools. For comprehensive schools with free accommodation grants—without a means test—for all university students.

9. Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection and the right to live wherever their country of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to gain higher standard of living in Britain.

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

11. A policy of compensation and the withdrawal of all British troops from over.

12. The abolition of the H-bomb and all weapons of mass destruction. Britain to pave the way with unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb.

13. A Socialist foreign policy subversive to neither Washingle nor Russia.
SUMMIT DIPLOMACY NO WAY TO PEACE writes BOB HOWARTH

A PART from the immediate election gain that Macmillan can expect from his championing of the Summit Conference, what could such a conference achieve? There are two main reasons why: a) the restoration of divided Germany and a disarmed Europe? The Left-Wing Summits have a lot at stake here, and it is crucial to prove that the results of a conference, or even Macmillan’s visit to Moscow, are worth a renewed period of cold war.

For Germany, the issue is clear: one can have either a solution taking the interests of the German people as paramount, or a Labour government which, at best, will be a suitable compromise of the interests of the Great Powers, or, to put it another way, a realigning of their forces with the still unformed aim of build-up to war simply adapted to a different program. It is also suggested that perhaps the Labour leaders has interests to coincide with those of the German people, or both, by conference, can achieve a state of reasonableness that may nearly coincide.

Others, on a more realistic level, will point out that negotiations have been continually hedging and rejecting any form of compromise, whereas the Soviet has put forward a series of changing demands which indicate, to put it another way, a sincere desire for a settlement. Both sides have not hesitated, of course, to claim to be working in the interests of the German people.

Western proposals

There is, however, nothing which impels us to take any of the proposals of either side at face value, without relating them to the real condition of Germany and the Western Powers involved and their past record in these matters, which is the only way of establishing the value of the Summit Conference proposals.

The basis of Western proposals are those set forward in the Eden Plan of 1955, before anything, free all-German elections (no recognition of the East German regime at any cost), followed by a staged withdrawal to form a neutral belt on the eastern border of the new united Germany to a similar depth on the Stalinist side. Further, that it would be the Soviet Government which, after it has drawn up a new constitution, to decide whether it will join any of the aggression.

The sincerity of the West in championing the principles of self-determination and democratic suffrage at a Summit Conference, however, were open to examination by the results of previous big power conferences. It can be claimed, justly, that to wake up the mess of Yalta, Potsdam, etc. (all of them "Summits") is digging up ancient history, but we can come much closer with the 1955 Geneva Conference, the often forgotten first Summit Meeting of the post-Stalin peaceful coexistence drive. The Continentals were still awaiting the free national elections promised by the US and Britain for mid-1956, where it is as obvious that the Communist Viet Minh would emerge from the people, as it is that the anti-Soviet (and probably Right-Wing) forces would win in Germany. Their Western Plan would unfold itself on the inclusion of united Germany, into the NATO alliance, the carving up of the East German economy and distribution monopolists—Krupp, and so on—staffing official positions with "minor" Nazis, vanishing from Western Folland, etc., would the Western imperialists be satisfied with less?

Whatever social analysis is accepted to the nature of the Soviet bloc, with its expanding, planned economy, the Soviet rulers are less inclined to seek war as a way out than the Western rulers. But what is the position on the ground where the two super-States meet?

The Ulbricht régime, already shaken by popular uprising, gives a full-time demonstration of an industrial working class with a full-time choice for or against Stalinism. Even granting that the German Democratic Republic has special features as a régime in the Bayonet foundations, it has its centrally-planned, statified economy fairly typical of all the Communist countries, and is, if not controllable, liveable by Soviet consumer goods injections (since 1953) and also the biggest refugee flight in the history of industrial workers. The Berlin proletariat with the choice only is a Deutschnach tube-ride away, a choice between the "Socialist" (and the monopolist Germany of Adenauer and Krupp, voted 98.1 percent in what no one had denied was a free election) against Stalinism.

This itself is disturbing to Khronschek because it underlines the point that there are two types of industrial worker who register by ballot their support of Stalinism. The one, in Russia, for instance, has no choice, the other, chooses Stalinism for what it claims to be. But there is the third type in Berlin and East Germany, voting with their feet, who can understand, by example the international equilibrium of the Stalinist movement. The Soviet leaders can be prepared to risk a great deal to the gap which threatens not only their territory, but the ideological and spiritual strength of their world organization. And facing them the Western imperialists are on their firmest ground; Western working
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LETTERS

A reply to Geoff West's comments (SR, December 1, 1958) by Ron Smith, of the North Leisburn Labour Party Youth Section

Many of Geoff's comments on Youth Sections in his article "Labour Party For Socialists" in December's edition of the Socialist Review are very important in some respects, but I feel that some of his statements need enlarging and, perhaps, some explaining.

It is incorrect to say that only the Youth Bureau lacks appeal to youth. I would go even further and say that no party has an appeal to youth. What, then, is the reason for the failure? The economic number of members the Young Tories have compared with the Youth Sections is the reason that the Young Tories are politically inert, but socially extremely active. The Youth Sections, which are politically active. Apart from the isolated over-social Youth Sections, our social events are limited owing mainly to the lack of money. Some Youth Sections over-indulge in the social activities and get cut out of the budget, but these members are quickly introduced to politics and the majority use them for political discussion.

There is an abundance of potential revolutionary youth. The increases in world tension will be necessary to revive the Socialist Youth Section, but this can only be done by the British Labour Party intends to create complete Socialism in Britain.

Our need is for new enthusiastic members and we welcome any assistance from readers who can encourage any young people they know to join their local Youth Sections.

Casual Labour - end

would make the industry more attractive and thereby induce many, who are at present reluctant, to stay on in the industry, or to enter it for the first time.

There are many aspects that will need urgent and active attention on the part of those called upon to provide and set up the machinery of the new régime. The employer and the employees but they can go a long way towards this, but all the essential factors are in their favour.

It is not by any deviation from the belief that "Registration" and the guaranteed week can become an accomplished fact. It depends on YOU the General Operative.
CASUAL LABOUR — contd

There is a large volume of national and private work which could be undertaken when the industry could not normally employ all its available labour.

When these and other avenues of finding full and steady employment have been exhausted, the industry would be faced with the problem of its responsibility to keep its unemployed workers employed during periods of unemployment.

The Damocles sword of unemployment hangs ominously over the heads of Building Operatives and this fear must be removed before the operative can be expected to give of his best to the nation and the industry.

Considerations of humanity and efficiency demand that provision must be made by the industry to maintain the operative and his family during periods of unemployment through factors beyond his control.

In the case of unavoidable unemployment the maintenance of the unemployed shall be under-taken by the industry through the employment during periods of unemployment of the necessary revenue shall be raised by charging a fixed percentage levy on the work of the work submitted weekly by the Contractors to the Local Committees. Experience shows that a relatively small additional charge on the present outcry would be ample.

The benefits to be derived from the introduction of "Registration" would be an inducement to the non-federated contractors to join their appropriate organisations.

An additional advantage would be the removal of the fear of unemployment or under-employment under the present method of contracting industry. Inefficiency, in all its aspects would be reduced to its least acceptable that of comfort.

The introduction of a guaranteed weekly income would ensure a more satisfactory standard of comfort.

The improvements outlined

PARLIAMENT

by Michael Millet

It is said that the Irish are more Catholic than the Pope, but there has been a recent proc that the MPs are more Conservative than the Government. This was a Private Member’s Bill of Mr. Goudhart (Beckenham) and the subject was night work by bakers. It was an amendment to a Bill of 1954 which came due force a year ago, which limited the amount of night work in bakers. Mr. Goudhart’s Bill gives the Minister of Labour power to waive the provisions of the 1954 Act on the application of an employer.

Mr. Brown was indignant for the Labour Party—

“Not was there a single piece of industrial legislation for the protection of the health, safety, and working conditions of workers that could not have been overturned on the same grounds as have been put forward on behalf of the Bill. The Opposition was not arguing about night work as such, but about continuous night work. There was no evidence that legislation had been torn and failed because of the obstinacy of the union. There was every evidence to the contrary. If the Government had offered their support and the employers had refused them.”

Even Mr. Ward, the Parliamentary Secretary for the Ministry of Labour, said for the Government that the Bill, as it stood, was unsatisfactory. It did not provide for a decision in advance of the Bill. The Opposition was not arguing about any legislation which had offered their support and the employers had refused them.

DID you ever hear the like of it? For carrying out in the true sense of the word, the monopoly of the City of London business, the right to manage their businesses, to hire and fire workers because they provided the original capital that enabled the factories, etc., to be built. But in this case they have only provided 17% per cent of the capital. Therefore, they should have only 17% percent of the control. We would suggest that everyone interested in the motor transport pool, both of which ought to offer sufficient capital for managerial talent.

As it is, they are in a fortunate position well described by an eighteenth century pamphleteer: “They are paid on both hands . . . which to make use of a homely comparison is to have a good dinner every day and be paid for eating it. Here’s luck, my lad! Never was there so fortunate a business.”

GERM WARFARE

SOMEONE said yesterday that “They invent a new sort of influenza for every year.” This column, still toterry in the lintels from this year’s variety, was greatly interested in questions of the West Pacific—Mr. Emrys Hughes. He asked the House of Commons a question about the Gift for the Junior Service and walked to the other end of the House.

Mr. Strauss (Winston Churchill) himself on the subject of the reduction of the 58m capital of Covalive, £6m will belong to the State and £14m to private individuals, but the profits are taxable. The Government will go to the private shareholders. Can he justify that, and will he engage Mr. Harry to see whether this indefensible situation has public support? Mr. Maudling. The Government do not believe that they should participate in the equity of the steel industry.

fortunate position

GRANTS

NATIONAL ASSISTANCE

The number of weekly National Assistance grants on 16th December, 1958, was 1,649,900.

Written answers Col. 136, “Hansard,” 9/1/39

Mr. Hughes—Has the Minister’s attention been directed to the speech last week by Sir Robert Watson-Watt in Montrose and he has said that this establishment has invented a substance, one pound of which could wipe out the whole world? Does the Minister not expect a little public interest in that, and can he tell us more?

Mr. Jones—It is not a new development. It is an old one. I want to observe the ominous phrases—“Not in the public interest to reveal,” “Essentially directed by the provisions of the Bill.” These are the usual euphemisms which in this case may be taken as a reflection of the Minister’s mind is hell-bent on schemes for Germ Warfare.

And no MP can do anything about it, for, like so much else of real public importance, it would “not be in the public interest” for it to be discussed publicly!