May Day Slogan

OUT WITH THE TORIES!

LET there be no mistake. Whatever the issues in the local elections this month, whatever the slogans at May Day demonstrations and rallies this week, the first and overriding job is to get rid of the Tories at the coming General Election.

Tory rule means murder in Nyasaland (5 bleeding years of Cypriot history have just been buried).
Tory rule means a showdown with organized labour (remember the rehearsal with busmen, meatmen, dockers and builders).
Tory rule means unemployment and short-time working (still over half a million on the books and another half million uncounted).
Tory rule means slow starvation for pensioners (nothing in the Budget while Big Business got some £300 million on and off the record).
Tory rule means taking £200 million from the workers in higher National Insurance contributions and giving it to high income earners in the Budget.
Tory rule means a cut in council house building to below what it was just at the end of the war in 1945; it means jacking up rents to private landlords by an extra £150 million a year (before the effect of the Rent Act was felt last October); it means mortgaging for ever the lives of those compelled to buy houses of their own (loans are now dearer than they have been for a generation).
Tory rule means strangulation of nationalized industry (like London Transport's death by mutilation).

And above all, Tory rule means H-Bombs, H-Tests, H-Bases—humanity's hangman's noose.

THE job of Labour, of every section of the movement, is clear: rout the Tories, smash their confidence, defeat them and theirs whenever we meet them. Only Labour can do it. Do it it must.
It won't be done by watching the swing of 'public opinion', or by getting into a huddle with Dr. Gallup. We'll not do it by creating a 'party image' instead of a program.
Labour must enter this election period with a clear message:
Freedom for Nyasaland and all colonies!
All out support and recognition for embattled workers in their daily struggles!
Work or full maintenance! No sackings!
A fair-deal for old age pensioners!
A massive housing program, expanding education!
Full national planning under workers' control!
The abolition of the Bomb immediately, unilaterally!

Let Labour march this May Day with a clear purpose: Out with the Tories, out with their world! Labour to power, armed with a goal!
Let massive marches prepare a massive defeat for the Tories at the local polls; let this be a clear pointer to the General Election later on.

- Aircraft Steel Structures
- Building and Printing
- London Buses
INDUSTRIAL

DUDLEY EDWARDS, CONVENOR, writes on

SMALL STRIKE - BIG ISSUE, AT AIRCRAFT STEEL STRUCTURES

Engineers are once again becoming the defence corps of the Labour movement and bearing the brunt of the bosses' current attack. It is not long since the BOAC dispute was the storm centre; Hendley House is now—in the last week of April—demanding all our moral and financial support (which shall be dealing with the issues involved in a later number). But there are other bosses, many others.

One of the most important for the general lesson it presents to industrial workers is the dispute at Aircraft Steel Structures in North West London. It shows how industrial amalgamations and the concentration of control in industry are always made at the expense of the workers in the firm, that the daily civil war of Big Business finds its casualties amongst the working class newcomers. It makes a powerful case for national planning under workers' control. Editor

The strike has been a resounding success for the workers involved.

The strike of 160 members of the AEU and some other union members at Aircraft Steel Structures—now a subsidiary of Simms Motors and Electronics—is in its third week, but it raises very big issues for the whole trade union and Labour movement. The direct action resorted to and supported 100 per cent. by the workers on this factory since March 26th is of particular importance because we are facing a period of increasing industrial amalgamation and take-over. The type of ruthless action in which this large combine is indulging at the present time can only monoply capitalism can inflict a very serious blow on the whole trade union movement.

For the last two or three years the Employers' Federation have tried and failed to stage a frontal attack on militant trade unionism. However, it is clear that the same goal can be achieved by piecemeal attacks on separate sections in the workshop. In the case of this strike, by means of a "take-over" the Employers have attempted to declare all previous agreements null and void in this factory. If this is successful large employers will thereby be encouraged to adopt the same means elsewhere.

Bosses tactics

As the recently published statement of the Engineering and Allied Employers' National Federation boasted, this body had hoped to stage a fight to the finish which would have "washed the teeth" of the whole movement in the factories. Indeed these hopes have long been dashed. Tory employers went in print, fiercely criticizing their political representatives in the Government because at the time the national strikes in 1957-8 the Government had not the nerve to carry through with a clear fight to a finish against the unions. Of course the Government was not in this position at the time, but the existence of a real front in the industrial map. Gradually the union succeeded in obtaining a series of model agreements; and although the workers may not have gained all they were fighting for, they were fully conscious of the benefits won by the 100 per cent. trade union membership which the management had recognized as a necessity.

other methods are now being adopted which it is hoped will achieve the same result. This places squarely before every worker who values his union as a protection against increased exploitation the question: Are the unions to allow small bodies of the best organized workers to be defeated one by one?

There have already been a series of smaller strikes following this attack against redundancy at Standards in 1956, which after a heroic stand by the rank and file against a definite defeat, partly because of the lack of union executives, but mainly because the trade union movement has still no clear-cut policy on redundancy or shown any sign of facing up to the question of the "right to work". The strike at Aircraft Steel Structures is not in the main a strike against redundancy, but it focuses attention in a most vivid form on all the grave problems already mentioned.

Model agreements

Here we have 160 engineering workers who over the past three years had succeeded in creating a model shop organization. They worked for a comparatively independent employer. Some in comparison with the ruthless approach of the "take-over" type of big business executive which has since moved in.

Until about two years ago this factory had been run fairly efficiently and certainly profitably for 5 years. It was producing a proportion of high precision pneumatic equipment required by the aircraft industry as well as for other purposes.

Many of the craftsmen involved had begun with the firm since its inception—pride of the part they had played in putting this factory on the industrial map. Gradually the union succeeded in obtaining a series of model agreements; and although the workers may not have gained all they were fighting for, they were fully conscious of the benefits won by the 100 per cent. trade union membership which the management had recognized as a necessity.

Instead of the fantastic wage structure existing in most federated shops, in which the average earnings are made up by a complicated system of bonuses and bonuses, the rate paid was a consolidated or straight hourly rate and all overtime and holiday payments were based upon this consolidated rate. Far from the closed shop resulting in continual stoppages it was considered that the capitalist press seeks always to imply that there had been almost complete industrial peace during the years before the present strike.

Judgement

What went wrong?

By 1956 this industrial unit, which started with a couple of lathes and a drill and now had £250,000 worth of machinery in installed thanks to the labours of its engineers deserved to be better housed, better equipped, in order to make a still greater contribu-

With your help, the state by the state to carry out this justifiable expansion. Unfortunately no such planning exists. The technical and financial changes required are entirely dependent on the resources, judgement and often on the whims and fancies of private individuals, whose judgement is often quite unrelated to what is happening in the country outside, with its books or slumps. For these reasons the "best-laid

New factory

It was in these conditions that a new factory was conceived. By 1957 this factory, built, with new offices, good canteen and with machinery installed it had become potentially more powerful and more profitable. Most of the old labour force followed it to its new premises in Western Avenue, Park Royal. There was no reason why it should not make a still useful contribution to the industries of Britain.

The reason it has gone so, has nothing to do with the rela-

CLASS WAR DIPLOMACY

Twice in four years the Federation had been prepared to "fight it out" with the unions. Clearly, the unions' capacity to pay strike benefit was limited. Such a position, as it would have done, the virtual closing down of the industry, might have been a worthwhile calculated risk. It was no occasion for the kind of compromise which would inevitably emerge from a Court of Inquiry.

The Federation can hardly be blamed for heeding Government warnings calling attention to the economic dangers of further wage increases. Like the Czechs in 1938, their complaint was that they were not allowed to resist in 1954 and 1957 after they had received every encouragement to have a firm purpose and to dare to make it known to the unions.

* * * * *

They stood firmly by their declaration that any general wage claim by the Confederation would be rejected, until pressure of events, partly dictated by the Government's apparent capture of world of a 6½ per cent. railway settlement in March, 1957, confronted them with the choice of meeting the trade unions' challenge alone, or with creating a situation which would lead to the strike being called off while a Court of Inquiry examined the causes and circumstances of the dispute. Evidently the Government was not as convinced in the spring of 1957 as it had been in the previous year that industrial conflict might be preferable to capitulation to the unions in an inflationary economy.

* * * * *

When all appeared set for a struggle to which the Federation and the Confederation were irretrievably committed, the Government, shaken by the economic and political repercussions of intervention in this case, decided that the policy was not strong enough to withstand the probable effects of transport, engineering and shipbuilding strikes.

From the Federation's point of view, once the resistance to the union's claim had ceased to be one actuated by principle, the fact that the claim in terms of money was a simple enough procedure.
ONE UNION FOR THE BUILDING INDUSTRY

BUILDING Trade Unions are agreed in principle that there should be one union for the industry but there are differences as to how they are to be prepared to go. Almost all the leading personalities in the trade unions believe that industry should be rationalized and that power should be centralized and concentrated, but they still differ on the relative pace. But when it comes to their own organizations they express their preference for anarchy and disunity.

What are the reasons for the reluctance of the trade union movement to develop more rational forms of organization? This attitude may in part be attributed to tradition and its influence on the minds of crafts men. We agree with Omar in deploring the present state of bickering disorganization in the building industry. We agree too with the necessity for one union for the industry. What we cannot accept—and Omar does not accept—is his conclusion that the TUC has chartered a course which aims at merging the cognate trades into the industry as a first step in the direction of the development of a union that can face up to the difficulties of rationalizing the building industry.

False pride and prejudice also have their place in the lives of craft unionists and, in a way, determine their actions and the structure of their organizations. But the facts of life must be faced. Social and technical advancement has affected the craftsman just as much as other social and industrial groups.

One significant change is the introduction of new crafts and skills and experience and more, they have new ideas. They are not accepting the view that hegemony should continue to remain with the craft organizations.

These changes have exposed the true role of crafts in modern times. They have shown that there is no magic inherent in their vocations and that the value of their labour power is only slightly higher than that possessed by others.

The craft unions must cease to be bastions supporting a productive system which is being abandoned. Gone are the days when their duty to defend the status quo, an added bombshell is thrown on the table in the form of a statement that 30 work mates are to be sacked within two weeks.

It doesn't matter to big business that the attitude of their shop stewards represent the views of 30 per cent of their employers. It doesn't matter to Mr. Ayres that on April 24 the North London DC instructed the members to withdraw their labour as from 8 o'clock on April 25, unless the ultimatum was withdrawn. In order to make this point, the very high dividends and bonus paid out by Simms Motors all this is ignored.

The challenge.

Now after some inexplicable delay the strike notice was served by a solicitor official by the EC of the AEU and at least formally the 90,000 Simms workers are engaged behind these 160 workers fighting for elementary trade union principles. These men have impressed the Simms Board to date. No doubt one of the reasons is Minister of Labor Ayres' membership of the Executive of the Employers' Federation. He has refused to convince his colleagues that if he is to assist to impose his will, this will provide the rest of them with the necessary pretext to go ahead and make similar attacks on militant trade unionism by other means.

Here, then, are the vital issues facing the trade union movement and not just the 160 members at this small works. If all nihilistic agreements may be abrogated by financial manipulation and take-over tactics in this one case, then it can be a means of dismantling printing machinery on the workshop level through one industry. More, it challenges the whole labour movement and the economic policy of the present Labor Government: How can production be planned and the vaunted policy of expansion be carried out if by such means the employer is allowed to disrupt industrial organization of the workers upon which Labor must rely if it seriously intends to plan the future?

The emblem upon the badge of all AEU members is educate, organize, control. The lesson to be learnt from this incident is that we have reached the stage when the emphasis must be put on the last word of the slogan. If Labor takes seriously its professional Socialist aims, then it must face the question it has so far evaded. It must in fact challenge the right to "hire and fire" so sacredly preserved by the bosses. Unless this is done it will be wrecked by the power that the big employers retain to disrupt industry by financial manipulation and to demoralize labour's natural supporters by putting the workers on the dole queue.

PAY CLAIMS IN PRINTING

by Jobbing Printer

As from 20th April, the agreements of the National Society of Operative Printers and Assistant- author (Reynolds News, April 12 en- tominated. NATSOPA are trying to negotiate a new agreement. The points of the claims are as follows:

1. Forty hours a week as opposed to 43 hours worked now. Workers on newspapers —36 hours a week.
2. 12½ per cent. increase in basic pay.
3. Cost of living bonus to be dropped and the 13½— a week amount to be included in basic pay.
4. Average earnings to be in- cluded in annual holiday pay. There are other points to the case but they will not be dealt with here.

Conditions

We in the printing industry have had a rise for three years. The 10 per cent, which the employers 8½d. an hour, but the customer was charged 1s. 1d. an hour. (Reynolds News, April 12, 1959, "You and Your Job"). Already 40 hours a week is being worked in USA, Canada and New Zealand.

Before both sides met, the em- ployers had issued statements to the press stating why they could not accept the proposed wages.

The two sides in the 1956 dispute, The People's League for the Defence of Freedom have also threatened to break any strike that may take place by printing work in rat shops. (Remember the bus strike last year?)

NATSO

I must point out to readers that NATSOPA has dropped out of the Printing and Kindred Trade Federation, the reason being that the other nine unions claimed to represent skilled workers and as such wished to present their case first. NATSOPA, representing un- skilled workers, presented their case.

The nine unions also asked for only 10 per cent, and cost of living bonus, and an agreement to be continued for another three years.

Latest: The employers have turned down all claims. The PAKTF has gone back to ballot its members on what to do. NATSOPA will take other action which I cannot discuss here.
POLICY FOR THE UNEMPLOYED

1959 will undoubtedly see a General Election, and, we hope, the introduction of a Labour Government. However, the election of a Labour Government will not entirely solve the problem (of unemployment—ed.) This can only be done by the introduction of strong socialist measures.

That is why in the City today, the Trades Council must take up the control with a Labour Government, which will make its first task full employment for all workers in the City, and the selfish class interests of the employers.

2. That all trade unions and national bodies, Russia, China and the East European countries.

3. That there be an immediate introduction of the 40 hour week—without loss of pay. That a policy of work-sharing be introduced with the co-operation of the Trade Unions, where redundancy is threatened, and no worker should be made to suffer further employment is secured.

4. We oppose the Government's policy of mobility of labour, and demand work be brought to the workers.

5. We demand immediate action in the building and engineering industries where we believe the expansion of Public Ownership in the Building. Such building and engineering industries would benefit Merseyside.

Youth

Youth Proposals

1. The school leaving age to be raised immediately to 16 years of age.

2. That one-day release be made compulsory and that the Liverpool Corporation give a concrete lead by applying this to all youth in its employ.

3. That more County Colleges and Technical Schools for further education be built at the earliest opportunity.

4. That full assistance (Governmental and Local Authority) be given to enable young people to take training schemes, especially to youths up to the age of 21. This to have both a short term perspective and a long term perspective of a more balanced labour force.

5. That there should be more Arthur Greenwood agreements similar to that existing in the building industry, where the Unions have joint control with the employers. All apprentices to be taken on with Trade Union agreements.

6. That the Government encourage and give financial aid to sub-

LIVERPOOL TRADES COUNCIL and L P's

Once again, the Tories have succeeded in bringing home to workers the knowledge that whoever controls the machine controls the livelihood of those that work them. The Tories are doing their best to stifle this knowledge in new statistics of falling unemployment, to null workers into a feeling of security by failing to report other figures of a falling number of jobs, and the numbers of hidden unemployed on the docks and amongst youth. But such hard-won knowledge is not easily forgotten. Where unemployment has been high, the process of organizing the fight against it, of formulating the lines of attack has been going on. Nowhere, it seems, has this been done better than in Liverpool. Council and Labour Party appointed a special Unemployment Sub-Committee to study the problem and the policies which could mobilize the working-class for positive action. The report, subsequently adopted by the EC of the Trades Council and Labour Party, is a valuable document and deserves study throughout the movement. Here, we are reprinting some of its policy conclusions, deleting those that relate specifically to Liverpool. The full report can be obtained from Eric Heffer, 54 Avondale Road, Liverpool 15 (price 3d plus postage).

Editor

Nevertheless we are convinced that it is our duty to put forward proposals that can immediately arrest the situation.

We wish to stress that one of the greatest crimes of this Tory capital is a move to deprive their one of creating a growth of unemployment. That it is partly justifiable, is perhaps nothing new. We examine the Report and take note of the statements made by the employers' Federation, the Management, the Council and the Unions' organisations. The Tories and their allies, the employers, wish to use unemployment as a means of disciplining the workers and breaking down the gain made particularly since 1945. This policy must be resisted by all sections of the movement, and we believe our proposals are a step in that direction.

Youth

Youth Proposals

1. The school leaving age to be raised immediately to 16 years of age.

2. That one-day release be made compulsory and that the Liverpool Corporation give a concrete lead by applying this to all youth in its employ.

3. That more County Colleges and Technical Schools for further education be built at the earliest opportunity.

4. That full assistance (Governmental and Local Authority) be given to enable young people to take training schemes, especially to youths up to the age of 21. This to have both a short term perspective and a long term perspective of a more balanced labour force.

5. That there should be more Arthur Greenwood agreements similar to that existing in the building industry, where the Unions have joint control with the employers. All apprentices to be taken on with Trade Union agreements.

6. That the Government encourage and give financial aid to sub-
THE AFFAIR at East Lilling- ton, where six people were refused membership of the local labour party in June last year, reached the proportions of a cause célèbre. But despite the solid barrage of indignant letters to the local Press, Tribune and New Statesman; despite a protracted enquiry and a subsequent decision by Transport and Roadmaking the six should be "admitted forthwith," the local party have, to all intents and purposes, refused to carry out the decision.

They have offered no official reason for the exclusions, although one of their officials at an Executive Committee meeting said quite plainly that it was because the applicants—one of them transfers from other Labour parties—were members of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. It is possible that the attitude of the East Lillington party was triggered off by fear of a repetition of the not-so-distant Hunter case. Another explanation is that the local officials are being in the classic, ultra-conservative tradition of the petty Labour bureaucracy.

It remains to be seen what the NEC will do now. Will they repeat their decision in more emphatic terms or will they, with the ambition of achieving a slick pre-election national unity sit back and do nothing, hoping that the excluded six will eventually lose heart in their protest?

Two things, however, are certain: firstly, that East Lillington is neither an isolated nor a short-term matter; secondly, that the East Lillington bureaucracy, although a little frightened by the recent lightning, will remain as firmly entrenched as ever, simply because there is not the slightest suggestion of a discoordinate, socialist opposition within the party they so effectively control and subdue. Pressure must come from outside: from either constituent parties through resolutions to the East Lillington party and to the NEC.

THE ETON BOOZING SONG

Let them scupper us in Suez
Boo boot us out of Abadan,
In the 'top ten' of the rations
Mark us down as 'also ran',
Let Makarios have Cyprus
We need never shed a tear,
For Mac—our wonder boy—has taken
Tuppeny off the beer

Let the IRA take Belfast
And the Taffies Cardiff Docks,
If the Scots pinch old Loch Lomond
We can still pull up our socks,
We can boldly face the future, boys
The road ahead is clear,
Now Mac—our wonder boy—has taken
Tuppeny off the beer

Tho' we're losing Foster Dulles
And Herr Adenauer too,
And those hound dogs in the Kremlin
Give us quite a nasty do,
Yet our upper lips we'll stiffen
Give a hearty British cheer,
For Mac—our wonder boy—has taken
Tuppeny off the beer

True, they hate our guts in Malta
And Rhodesia's full of plots,
And the best laid schemes of Selwyn Lloyd
Are simply awfully flops,
While those Mau-Mau blokes in Kenya
Put our plans all out of gear,
Yet Mac—our wonder boy—has taken
Tuppeny off the beer

We have kept the flag a-flying
Since the days of 'Auld Lang Syne',
Our saloon bars 'fore the 'Gracious Queen',
For they'll be doing fine,
All the boozers will vote Tory now
Of that we have no fear,
Now Mac—our wonder boy—has taken
Tuppeny off the beer

Let the tocsin call be sounded
In all 'locals' through the land,
Let the 'Old Dim' not get weaving
For a last defiant stand,
We'll do Hugh Gaitskell in the eye
In this election year,
Now Mac—our wonder boy—has taken
Tuppeny off the beer
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INTO ACTION!

FACTS FOR THE STRUGGLE

TORY LIES NAILED

Revealing the lies and disinformation about the Tory Party, this fact sheet provides evidence of the historical dishonesty of the Conservative Party. It covers topics such as their position on the economy, their past records, and their present policies. The document is a valuable resource for activists and campaign organizers.

A DYNAMIC ECONOMY... Under the Conservatives our economic life is free and strong.

The end of the credit squeeze in autumn 1955 brought about a state of almost complete stagnation in the British economy. If 1948 is taken as 100, industrial production rose to 139 in the fourth quarter of 1955. Subsequently it reached a peak of 140 in the third quarter of 1957. Then came the rise in the bank rate to 7 per cent and a more severe credit squeeze. Industrial production began to decline and had fallen to about 136 by the third quarter of 1958. British industrial production is now lower than it was over three years ago.

PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN PRODUCTION FROM 1951 TO 1957

Japan 126
U.S. 119
W. Germany 73
France 40
Netherlands 40
U.S.A. 19
Sweden 19
U.K. 18
Belgium 16

"Exports have reached record levels."

British exports began to decline in 1950 for the first time since the end of the war. The volume of exports in 1958 was about 3 per cent lower than in 1957.

For the first time since the war, West Germany has surpassed Britain in the export of manufactured goods. The latest figures show that for the first quarter of 1958, West Germany's share of world exports (by value) was 23.4 per cent. Britain's was 18.4 per cent. and West Germany's 23.4 per cent.

When the Conservatives took office in 1951, British exports were 22 per cent of the world total and West Germany's were only 10 per cent.

Britain has traditionally been the world's leading shipbuilding country. In 1955, it was surpassed by Japan and in 1948 by West Germany. The output figures for 1958 (in tons) were:

Japan 2,076,600
U.S. 1,429,900
Britain 1,402,000

"Freedom to earn all you can.

Especially when you have earned yourself out of a job. Mr. F. Perkins, chairman of R. Perkins Ltd., which was bought by Massey-Ferguson of Canada, in February, 1959, got $10,000 for loss of office besides what he got for his shares. Mr. Bernard Dixon, of Flowers Breweries, got $40,000 when his service agreement was terminated in May, 1958. Lord Portal, chairman, and Mr. Geoffrey Cunliffe, deputy chairman, of British Aluminium, got respectively $30,000 and $58,000 on leaving the board when the company was bought by Tube Investments and Reynolds Metals in February, 1959. Sir Frank Spriggs, managing director of the Hawker-Siddeley group, got $75,000 when he resigned that job, as of May 63, in June, 1958. And Tom Jones, aircraft worker, got $4,15a, a wage for himself and child when he and thousands more were stood off one time in the last few years.

"The Rent Act has brought with it, as it was designed to do, more repairs. Less wastage accommodation. And a chance, at last, for 'newly-weds' to rent a house."

The Rent Act has brought with it, as it was designed to do, a decrease in insecurity for 810,000 families. Most of these families have been faced with the impossible choice of paying whatever the landlord liked to charge or going elsewhere. It also brought with it higher rents for millions of other tenants. In the near-future, September, 1957, when the Rent Act increases first began to operate, consumers as a whole paid out £158 million more on "housing" than they did in 1952. The result of this figure includes occurrences of repair and maintenance costs, the value of building work other than new work (i.e., repairs, maintenance, etc.) only increased by £5 million in the same period. The bulk of this £158 million therefore went in increased rent and rates. And the largest share will have gone to the private landlord. All this in the period before decontrol began to operate in October, 1958.

S.R. REPORT

NEW REASONER CONFERENCE

by STAN HAWKINS

The next step for militant trade unionists—under the auspices of the heavyweight socialist journal "New Reasoner" at Worley Hall over the weekend of 18th/19th April. And to listen to the opinions of others and offer their contributions came active socialists from many parts of Britain. Probably for most heartening feature of the Conference to those who have struggled for the past two years to break with left wing socialist ideas without falling into the orbit of the Communist Party, was the consciousness that there are more than a few left wingers with this outlook today than there were at the height of the Cold War. At that time, Marxists who were not also some sort of Stalinists were as rare as the proverbial four leafed clover. Today, however, there are Marxists in practically every town and country in the country who are neither Communist Party Members nor fellow travellers and the work of keeping a number of them together has been done by the "New Reasoner".

WIDE DISCUSSION

One thing that characterised the discussion throughout was a very large extent an absence of dogmatism. So many left wingers of this vintage have been through the mill that rigid party lines imposed absolutely suspect. Consequently, an atmosphere of enquiry and exchange of ideas was the order of the day in many fields were part and parcel of the discussion throughout. The problems, trade union struggle, youth employment and Workers Control, were all pointed out as subjects requiring close and detailed study in the future and those closely connected with the production of the journal "New Reasoner" intimated that they are hoping to produce pamphlets dealing with some of those subjects on the scale of the New Left discussion booklet by Ken Alexander and Richard Hughes "A Socialist Wage Plan for the future.

WIGHT

Heavyweight

The latter pamphlet came in for some heavy criticism from some of the contributors to the discussion, but the idea of publishing heavyweight pamphlets of this type was with general approval.

During the course of the debate, however, a number of speakers stressed that policy formulation and the work of "new left" was, although valuable, not enough and urged the need for the connection and coordination that was established by a

ONE UNION FOR BUILDING ENDE

when craft sectionalism can reign supreme.

A cursory glance through the reports of the annual Conferences of the NFBTU is enough to show that much time and energy has been wasted in an effort to prove that one union for the building industry is impracticable but little time has been given to a serious examination of the problem.

It is hard to find a serious argument for or against the principle.

Arguments

The objections can be briefly summarized. Some of the larger Unions make play of the fact that they have many members employed in industries outside of Building and Civil Engineering and these, it is said, can only be protected by a craft organization. For evidence given in support of such a viewpoint.

Another argument in no more than the expression of vested interests (and this does not apply to personnel at the helm of the Unions). No one seems to be willing to relinquish the Office they may be holding, be it humble or otherwise. They prefer the magnitude of office to a small but ineffective organization to the importance of membership in a powerful organization.

When dealing with the organizational position in the Isle of Man, at its December 1958 Meeting, the General Council of the NFBTU provided the craft unions with an opportunity to do something practical in the way of unification; but they adopted a negative approach and placed on record their inability to deal with the problem.

It was admitted in discussion that no single union could effect a single solution by itself and that it must be a co-operative effort. This however, is not strictly true; there is one affiliated union fully able to deal with the situation, provided it is given a free hand by the Federation and not subjected to interference by the craft unions. However, to grant these facilities would be an affront to the independent spirit of the craft unions of their iniquity.

In the same discussion it was revealed that the Delegates "steadfastly believed in unity, in the ultimate achievement of one union for the building industry." They were all just as convinced in their own minds that it was the next generation or the next but one that must take the responsibility for progress and not the Union in which they were living.

A Course

Gloomy, the situation may seem, but there is a light on the industrial horizon which can, if developed, lead us to the desired goal.

The TUC has charted a course which aims at merging the cogitate unions within the industry as a first step in the direction of forming one single union. This is a practical way of dealing with an almost anarchic state of affairs and every effort should be made to put it in practice.
N Sween Discusses FORUM NEW TOWN PROSPECT

WHEN the Labour Government took over the policy of building the New Towns that it took the boldest step in social planning ever taken by a British Government. The New Towns, however, were not merely one building of large houses erected on the site of overcrowded slums in existing cities, but of creating completely new towns, the model of which catered for all aspects of the resident's life — not only accommodation, but also employment, shopping and enjoyment, etc.

This meant something more than the mere erection of houses. Main and local shopping centres had to be planned; industrial estates established; firms persuaded to come in; schools, community centres, churches and fire stations — all had to be included in the design.

The housing aim was not only to create towns but also to provide on the outskirts of the countryside, but to ensure that they were lived in by balanced communities. A not insignificant feature of the plan, though not clearly stated, was for the residents ultimately to own and control, through a local authority. And, of course, behind the idea was the conviction that a community should be cut off from many evils of the old towns.

In terms of housing and accommodation pattern to be simple, the rise in standards is immense. Roomy, clean houses set amid gardens and greens have provided an incentive for all self-respect, from which they have grasped with open arms. Standards in furnishing, decoration and equipment from almost everywhere very high and the contrast with the pre-war East End smiling down on them, so many of these people originat...

Dear Editor,

I do not think we can accept the explanation of super-profits, as put forward in "Quit Africa" (SR, mid-April) for events in Central Africa. The editorial shows clearly the wide difference in the political and economic position of whites and non-whites. The historical reasons for this I need not go into. The question here is what is the mechanism driving the country along the road of conflicting interests of Africans and white settlers.

The truth is that the opening up of skilled occupations, and trade unionists, the change in the rising on an appreciable scale, to the African, would mean the end of white supremacy. As a group, it is not the African who has fought his way into the camp of the ruling class, and identifies his interests with theirs.

Like the proverbial donkey, the ruling class finds itself straining for new innovations and internationalization, maintaining white domination. In this contradictory position it is both forced to choose any one on its own to negate the interests in production. Here, the problem is that forces it to travel the road of suppression and strangulation of trade union and other democratic rights.

I think this brief explanation throws more light on developments in Central Africa. Yours faithfully, J. Karra.

The reality is two fold and in some ways contradictory. Workers are afraid to stick their necks out in an exercise in militant unionism. Fear of the sack, but at the same time are increasingly conscious of the need to protect themselves. Just beneath the surface one can sense a deep anxiety which could easily, given the right conditions, burst forth into flame.

At the same time, the break with tradition is also reinforced by another factor. The proportion of highly skilled scientific and technical workers in the modern New Town factories and the tendency to be concerned with certain more sophisticated political problems has its effect. It is with no surprise that it was in one of the New Towns-Crawley—where the only general token strike against the Suez adventure took place, and in another—Stevenage—that the only real token industrial action against the making of the H-Bomb occurred. Harlow Labour Party has taken a very strong line on the question of the H-Bomb and other New Towns have also been deeply affected by the current campaign.

In the New Towns, one is permitted a peep at the newest at the first generation with the same traditions and strengths, with only a slight colouring from the old. Despite experience and lack of tradition of struggle, this generation is promising from the Socialist point of view.

Your sincerely, J. Karra.

WHAT WE STAND FOR

The SOCIALIST REVIEW stands for a new Socialism for today. Only the mass mobilization of the working class in trade and political arena can lead to the overthrow of capitalist and the establishment of Socialism. This can only be achieved if a really consistent Labour Government is brought to power on the basis of the following programme:

- Complete nationalisation of key industries — the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments to those who would lose out.
- 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.
- Workers' control in all nationalised industries i.e., a majority of workers' representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequent elections and guaranteed receiving the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.
- The establishment of workers' committees to control all private enterprises within the framework of a planning system where workers' representatives must be subject to frequent elections and guaranteed recall, and receive the average skilled wage in the industry.
- The establishment of a national health service covering 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 by the payment of adequate pensions, the abolition of all payments for National Health Service charges and the financing of an industrial health service.
- The expansion of the housing programme, together with interest free loans to local authorities and the right to redeem private held land.
- Free State education up to 18. 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 racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection for all irrespective of their country of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers.
- 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 abolition of conscriptions in all its forms, and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas.
- The abolition of the H-bomb and all weapons of mass destruction. Britain to pave the way with unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb.
- A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington nor Moscow.
SR EDITORIAL

Defend London works! !
Defend London transport!

THE systematic dismemberment of the London transport services continues. By reduction of services, cutting of mileage, closing of some routes, the Tory-sponsored LTE have already cutbacks 25 per cent. of the great system that was nationalized in 1948. In the process, some 2,500 vehicles and 25,000 transport workers have disappeared. So far as efficiency is concerned, one might truthfully paraphrase the old man himself by saying "Never before did so many want so long for so few.”

Now a new monstrosity threatens to make its appearance in central London—the "One-Man Bus," i.e., a vehicle carrying up to 46 passengers with the driver, issuing tickets, giving change, operating doors, "mind- ing that child" and "keeping down the noise" all at once. While, at the same time, driving the bus and observing a tight time- schedule. For every bus, every vehicle put on the roads, a bus conductor becomes redundant, while the LTE makes an economy of about £18 per week, per vehicle.

Ex-owners

When transport services were nationalized eleven years ago, two main obligations were placed upon the LTE by the parlia- ment. As far as the Government was concerned, it was expected to provide an adequate and efficient service—the second, was that the undertaking must pay its way. Included in the latter requirement was the payment of compensation to those who were dismissed. Today, runs at £55 million a year.

In the upshot, these two obligations have proved—not completely. So far operated as it has, the LTE has cutbacks a mass desertion of passengers on a scale far exceeding any economic depression.

Twin policy

Even from the purely capitalistic angle from which this alleged "public service'' has operated, the policy simply does not pay off. Every one of the 13 annual fares increases was more than offset by the reduction of services has caused a mass desertion of passengers on a scale far exceeding any economic depression.

That the twin policy — "raise the fares—cut the services"—does not pay, is not matter of opinion but a matter of fact—and the facts are written in cold, unanswerable figures in every annual balance sheet of the LTE. Yet, the policy continues. The next "fare increase is already more on the cards and will shortly be authorised. The daily curving up of bus services continues. That the LTE’s finances will be in a worse state at the end of 1959 than they were in 1958 is certain. Thus may be theLTE will be cut but and millions more passengers desert, is inevitable.

Personal contact with members of the LTE reveals them to be a rather stupid and incompetent bunch—chosen rather for their "political reliability" than their knowledge of transport requirements. But the methodical, calcu- lated destruction of London’s transport services that has gone on systematically for years, cannot be explained on the grounds of mere "stupidity.''

Deliberate

On the contrary, The clipping of the LTE’s services is a perfectly irresponsible act of stupid people—but a calculated and deliberate political act, connived at, spon- sored, encouraged, and defended by a Tory Government. The exist- ing nationalized services, particu- larly transport and coal, is being deliberately run down as an "awful warning" to the public of the fate of non-nationalization, the evils of socialism." Nationalized transport and coal are being sacrificed as an insurance policy to save "private enterprise steel", to provide useful "election propaganda" for Tories, and to foreclose the opportunity of the Government brand to resist demands for fur- ther nationalization.

Public vs state

It is against this political back- ground that the rank and file socialist in the unions, the local councils, and the main inspiration of the "raise the fares—cut the services" policy relentlessly pursued by the LTE during the last seven years.

The campaign

The campaign initiated by the London busmen, through their rank and file journal, the Plate- form, is now beginning to bear fruit. At the recent Annual Con- ference of the London Labour Party, the following composite motion was carried:

That this conference, having regard to the increasing bankruptcy imposed on London’s travelling public by the LTE’s conduct, finally cutting both Metropolitan and County Councils’ services, bearing in mind the long term effect such a policy will have on workers and the public, demands an investigation by both local authorities and the replacement of vehicles withdrawn as unworkable on the other. Considering that the present attitude of the LTE suggests a de- liberate attempt to create resent- ment against the principles of pub- lic ownership through the medium of continually worsening the pub- lic’s travelling conditions.

This conference further protests at the mismanagement of the LTE in building new garages, work-shops, etc., and then abandoning them.

It is our view that transport in this country in the national service financial loss on its operations should not be allowed to prevent its proper operation.

Conference therefore urges all London and Middlesex Members of Parliament to demand that Lon- don Transport be relieved immedi- ately of its heavy financial burden and the present Executive be re- placed by the men and women who believe in nationalization and are determined to make it serve the interests of the travelling public.

This resolution, including its demands to sack the LTE, replace it by socialists, cut down compensation to bondholders, etc., is a remarkable one. It is obviously goes far beyond any stage ever reached by the top layers of the Labour Party, that one can expect that the officials of the London Labour Party will do everything possible to ensure that it dies the death that most resolutions that carried against the platform by rank and file pressure usually meet.

Action now!

Nevertheless, the resolution provides a basis—and gives autho- rity—to local labour parties, trades councils, in conjunction with other trade union bodies, shop stewards, in conjunction with local busmen, to broaden the action.

In every locality the people suf- fer from LTE policy, in every part of the country. Every borough, garages. In every locality there is a local trades council, labour party, and numerous trade union branches. On the local Borough Council there is either a majority —or a minority—of labour members. The local rank and file socialist is to bring all these bodies and elements together on a matter of wide public concern, i.e., the state of the people’s transport services.

Here is an ideal issue—all em- bracing and immediate concern—on which a real unity of action can be built. Out of the immedi- ate fight against the LTE can develop a more thorough-going discussion of socialist policy in respect of nationalization and what needs to be done in this field—both now and in the future.