LABOUR MUST FIGHT BACK!

Big Business is making no secret of its plans. It wants the Tories in government and is going to keep them there. None of this gentlemanly diversion into industrial and political campaigning. No ideological front is to be left undisturbed.

So you have the bonce budget and Macmillan's summation. You have the Engineering Employers' demand for a showdown with organized labour in their pamphlet Looking at Industrial Relations. Now the National Union of Manufacturers have followed the steel barons in mounting an offensive on nationalization. This is Your Fight they call it.

And what has Labour done in defense? Where are the great ideological battles being joined? Big Business uses its power to sack workers and victimize stewards, to undermine our gains by government action. Our Party answers by segregating politics nearly from economics and remaining impotent in both.

We must answer in defiance. Solemn pledges on H Tests are not enough. Equally solemn pledges to oppose sackings, to defend victimized shop-stewards, to support embattled workers in the small and big showdowns of everyday are needed. And behind the pledges—action. More, there must be a clear statement of our basic socialist aims: full nationalization and national planning under workers' control.

**Socialist Review**

**Fighting Fund**

We need £20 an issue

During the last fortnight we have received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readers in Harrow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.C. (Birmingham)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M. (Birmingham)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.B. (Barrow-in-Furness)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers in Islington</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers in N. Lewisham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANKS! and KEEP IT UP, COMRADES! I enclose a contribution of £ s. d. to the **SOCIALIST REVIEW** Fighting Fund.

Name

Address

Send to **SOCIALIST REVIEW** APPEAL FUND, 35B Priory Terrace, London, NW6.

**FORTNIGHTLY for the Industrial Militant — for International Socialism**

Why should we go into action for a program short of this, short of radical change? Why be enthusiastic about turning out to the polls, turning out the local Tories, doing any of the necessary work unless they held out a promise of a different future? Writing before the results of the local elections are declared, we confidently predict an apathetic response, as apathetic as our official Party program is undemanding.

**NUR UNION GOES IT ALONE**

**By JOE SOUTHALL**

The members of the National Union of Railwaymen who are mostly the lowest paid of railway workers, are bound to be putting greater pressure on the leadership, at this stage, than members of the other two sectional Unions, the ASLE & F (Locomotives) and the TSSA (mainly clerks). That, essentially, is the explanation for the cold-shoulder given to the NUR by the other two when approaches were made to get them to join in a new pay claim agreement for a substantial increase." The decision of the NUR Executive was taken the day after the London DC of the Union had called for a 20 per cent increase and sent a special delegation to present it to the Union General Secretary Sydney Greene, the next day.

Never militant

In the coming weeks, the NUR will now go through the motions of presenting a claim through the usual stages. It is said that although the ASLE & F took a similar official attitude to the TSSA, the Locomotives' NEC was evenly divided on the issue. They may yet be pressed to join the NUR, who can for some of the footplate staffs. The TSSA (formerly RCA) has never been in the forefront of militant action, and has usually come along to pick up consequent adjustments for its membership after the pace has been set by the other two. During the last railway wages debacle (we get one about once a year), the three Unions settled for a 3 per cent increase and a pay enquiry to see how the rail workers compared with workers in other industries. It is true that railway basic wage-rates are amongst the lowest in all industry. Only additional earnings in the shape of overtime, rest-day and week-end workings, have been getting them along.

In a recent list of basic rates compared with take-home pay published in the NUR weekly Railway Review, average take-home pay was about a quarter to a third more than base rates. As an example: average rates for shunters are £8 14s against average £10 7s earnings. Of course, average figures can be misleading and, in many instances, the earnings are well below the sum stated.

Dole standards

Recently the EC of the NUR found it necessary to issue a reminder that they are not willing agents of the present economy drive of the BTC and, although they support broadly the Modernization Plan now going forward, they do not accept many of the measures being taken as being part of the Plan. The South Wales and the South Western DC has coined the term "economana" and it is now being freely used in the industry. The drive is slashing at the "additional" of the workers and forcing them onto base rates which are more akin to "dole" standards. Although Messrs Greene and Evans, respectively secretary and president, are well to the right as TU
BUILD LEFT IN THE AEU

SR readers will know the name Geoff Carlson as one of the regular contributors to our columns. Recently Carlson stood for election to the Presidency of the AEU in order to offer the members of his union something more positive than the grim alternative of Right-Wing Carron and Statist Birch. We believe it offers the type of program militant trade-unionists can adopt and fight for, not only in the AEU but in every working class organisation.

—Editor.

117, Carmelite Road,
Harrow Weald,
Middx.

Dear Brothers,

In allowing my name to go forward for the position of President, I realise what a serious and important job it is. Although I am a comparatively young member (34 years old), not possessing the impressive qualifications other candidates have, I feel the necessity of challenging the present holder who has given his opinion, given the correct leadership called for at this present time.

However, I have been a Shop Steward for 34 years and am at present Convenor at ENW. In 1955 I was Branch President in 1955/6 and on the Executive of the Hammersmith & Kensington Trades’ Council during the same years. Also, I am an NCLC tenter.

Important though qualifications may be, more important in my opinion is the candidate’s attitude to working-class problems in general and AEU problems in particular. The employers and their spokesmen in the Tory Government are attempting to use the present economic situation to discipline the workers, and, with the weapon of unemployment, to break the ranks of organised Labour. Sad to say, at this crucial time the leadership necessary to inspire and guide working-class action does not exist to any great extent, either in our own Union or in the Trade Union Movement generally. The failure of the TUC and our own Union to give effective leadership and support to the London busmen when the employers’ government started its offensive, has already cost us dearly.

Result of the election to AEU presidency are as follows:

William Carron 57,127
Reg Birch 19,779
Geoff Carlson 5,615
B Hartley 5,461
J Sanders 3,461

91,400 votes were cast out of a possible total of 960,000.

The figures intimate that a special effort was made by the Right to Get Carron back, that the CP’s candidate Birch lost some 10,000 or so, a large part of which was picked up by Carlson, the independent socialist candidate. We believe Carlson’s to be a good vote, well above anything that might reasonably have been expected and a good augury for the development of a militant socialist consciousness within the AEU.

The paltry wage increase which we Engineers obtained was based, not on the merits of our case, but on the fact that the busmen managed to wring from the Government. This constituted the wages pattern for 1958. It in no way compensated for the rise in the cost of living, and certainly did not amount to what could have been obtained out of the vast profits if the full strength of the Union had been brought to bear against the Employers.

In the struggle against redundancy, which I consider is the paramount question which we face in the AEU, we have a policy on paper, but no endeavour from the leadership to carry that policy out. In fact, it is a case of closing the stable doors after the horse has bolted. The only support coming from the Shop Stewards’ Committees, which are the priority targets of the Employers, and which have not had the support of our leadership, who seem more intent on “Red-baiting” and “witch-hunting”—to the detriment of our Union.

In the elections over the past years, members have had to choose between candidates backed by the right, Labour or the Communist Party. The choice has not been easy. Although most members owe allegiance to the Labour Party, they cannot accept the policies pursued by the right-wing of the Trade Union and Labour Party when these have included wage-freezing, class collaboration and “sell-outs”. Alternatively, although they respect the militant activities of the individual Communist Party member in the daily struggle on the shop floor, they cannot ignore the internal loyalties of the Communist Party to Russia; nor forget the stand the members adopted by the party in East Berlin, Poznan, Hungary, etc.

I am a member of the Labour Party, and a firm believer in international socialism, but I do not believe it is possible by accepting the policies of the Communist Party or of the right-wing at Transport House. I believe that we members of the Trade Union must fight within these organisations for a complete change of leadership and policy.

We must strive for a movement that will fight at all times in the interests of the working-class as the only class capable of playing a progressive role in society. A movement that will stand politically for International Socialism—Independent of both Washington and Moscow—and industrially will pursue a policy of increasing the independence of our members until we arrive at a stage where industry is taken out of the hands of the Capitalist class and placed under workers’ control.

This, briefly, is my attitude. I hope it will receive your support.

Yours fraternally,

GEOFF CARLSSON.

Supported by:—
Brother Crane, President Withelden 5,
Brother Hagger, Secretary Feltham 3.
Brother P Jordan, Nottingahm No. 5.
Brother Hagger, Secretary Feltham 3.
Delegate City Labour Party,
Delegate Trades Council.
Brother Hagger, Secretary Feltham 3.
Delegate City Labour Party,
Delegate Trades Council.
Brother Draymore, Slough 6, Shop Steward, member District Committee.
Brother Searle, President Tottenham 6, Coivener Benjamin Electric.

NUBE-NEEDED MILITANT POLICY

by N Conquest

THE National Union of Bank Employees has always been one of the most “newsworthy” of the non-manual trade unions. Hardly a week goes by without some mention of the activities of this 50,000 strong black-coated union appearing in the national press or a question being asked on its behalf in the House of Commons.

That nearly half of the ultra respectable, “middle class” men and women working in banks are members of a trade union is, in itself, a rather startling fact. It upsets one’s idea of the established order of things to be faced with the possibility that dapper Mr Jones, the chief cashier with the distinguished, grey-at-the-temple look and the superior smile (smarter even than the manager of one of the big Five) banks might be a secret shop steward. Who knows what dark thoughts may be passing through his head as he thumbs through the pile of pound notes, rejecting one here and there for not appearing in the machine. Perhaps he is thinking of tonight’s Branch meeting or, even worse, of whether or not he will be elected a delegate to this year’s TUC to, perhaps, rub shoulders with the dreaded Mr Cousins.

There is, however, little about NUBE to strike terror into the heart of the most timid small shopkeeper of Surbiton and it is unlikely that they will be faced with pickets next time they go round the corner to pay in their takings. In fact, the history of NUBE has been a tale of extreme moderation being treated by the employers with extreme condescension.

In forty years the Union has been able to obtain recognition only from the big Five “Big Five” banks, and even there it is shared with the bank’s own company union. In the others, despite large membership, the employers barely acknowledge the union’s letters.

Before the formation of the Bank Officers Guild (later NUBE) in 1918, there was no formal staff representation in banking. The initial success of the Guild was contrasted in 1919, by the management of the Midland Bank setting up an internal staff association, which was recognised before it had any members and which had the immediate effect of dividing the staff and crippling the Union. The other Banks were not slow to follow suit and the membership of the BOG, which had reached 30,000 in 1920, fell to under 18,000 in 1939. The idea of
John Phillips Discusses, Inter-union disputes – the danger

In Lancashire

At Jaguars

2. A dispute between the TGWU and National Union of Vehicle Builders put 3,500 men out of work for nearly a week at Jaguars, Coventry.

Who belongs?

The Vehicle Builders insisted that a youth drilling holes should belong to their Union. (There are often disputes between the two unions pledging co-operation and regulating membership). The Vehicle Builders, thinking that they were being coerced, decided not to work with members of unions who refused to work with members of other unions and came out on strike. The rest were sent home. The next day, the Vehicle Builders came out again and the rest sent home. When everybody was back at work, the Union agreed that future disputes would not be settled through striking. An agreement was made to work out an (another?) agreement to resolve the “many demarcation problems” and so the crazy roundabout goes on.

Unemployment

On April 13 there were 511,000 people registered as unemployed in Britain, of whom 468,000 were wholly unemployed and 43,000 were temporarily stopped.

Unemployment among adults decreased by 21,000, but employment among boys and girls increased by 8,000.

Expressed as a proportion of the estimated number of employees, unemployment in April was 2.4 per cent, compared with 1.9 per cent in March. In April 1958, it was 2 per cent.

The number registered as unemployed in Northern Ireland on April 13 was 37,400 (7.9 per cent), 3,500 fewer than on March 9.

Employment exchanges filled 169,000 vacancies in the five periods April 1 to April 8.

The number of vacancies notified to exchanges but remaining unfilled on April 8, 1960, was 96,000; this was 17,000 more than in March.

At the time of writing, one in four of the remaining workers are now out of work. According to reports, the local leaders insist that the issue at stake is victimization, not demarcation, and that it was the company rather than the shipwrights with whom they were at odds. Bro W Kerr, delegate of the Boilermakers’ Society, said that talks were in progress between the two unions to resolve problems, but they could not of themselves produce a settlement because the executives were “clearly unacquainted with the realities surrounding the dispute” (and their only job was to produce a frame of reference in which discussions could be held at local level). But even so, he insists, “no such discussions could be allowed to begin until after evidence has been given.”

Barclays, The National, The Co-operative and the Trustee Savings Banks all recognize the principle of “one union or your union branch has an account with any of the others, remove it and let it be known why doing so.” If your account is as microscopic as mine this course of action will be largely symbolic, but your bank might help to give to the trade unionists in the banks the encouragement they so badly need.

TU COMMENTARY

also said that, in most cases, it had been extremely difficult, in fact, almost impossible, to get an agreement with either the Boilermakers or the Shipwrights. He followed a recent refusal of two members of the Boilermakers to work alongside members of the Shipwright’s Union whom the Boilermakers considered were doing work which should be done by plater members of their union. When the firm refused to place the two men in other work while the matter was being discussed by the two Unions concerned, the Boilermakers’ met and unanimously decided to strike.

Commentary

In the two other union disputes above, it appears that they were inspired by paid officialdom, to which I think no comment need be added. The Cammell Laird dispute, however, is much more disturbing as it seems that the whole thing started when the shop stewards concerned. Unless one is directly concerned or on the spot (with this column is not), it is unfair and dangerous to pass judgment one way or another.

In any case, instances like this should not pass without some comment. Socialist Review has taken no part in the controversy (after first need for industrial unionism, and I think that this point must be hammered home because these disputes arise. Only when officials and workers stop dissipating their energies in fruitless (except for the bosses) squabbles, and fighting the very worker against his boss will the workers succeed in getting what they want.

On more work on industrial unions. Last week nineteen building unions met to discuss demarcation problems. Bro. (Sir) Richard Coppock, president of the SBU, said (after first blaming demarcation disputes on “entrepreneurs”) “The mind always jumps to the idea that the bank is a difficult problem (wealthy unions are loth to pool their resources with their poorer colleagues).

Have you any money in the bank, Dick?
TWO YEARS SINCE MAO’S FAMOUS SPEECH

It is two years since the policy of “A hundred flowers will bloom” was launched in China.

This campaign, in its way revealed, better than anything else, the real social and political character of the Chinese Communist Party. The “hundred flowers” campaign was launched largely as an after-effect of the Hungarian revolution. Mao saw that the same extraneous revolutio nean regime can become isolated from the people and found it advisable to allow popular criticism to be vented in some form or other.

Mao made a sharp attack on “bureaucratism” and stressed the need to deal carefully and patiently with “contradictions among the people” and between the “people and the leadership.” The Communist leaders deferred to the new spirit of the “hundred flowers,” and since late 1957 all organizations and individuals to join with the Communists in open and frank criticism of all the deficiencies and mistakes of the Socialists, especially of the three “evils of bureaucratism, sectarianism and subjectivism.” Assurances were given that no one would be taken against the critics, and that the movement would be carried out “as gently as a breeze or a fine rain.”

As we shall presently see, despite these pledges, a bare month before the party met in November, the new movement turned into a campaign to crush the critics.

CRITICISM SHORT-LIVED

On June 8, the People’s Daily gave the signal for the campaign, charging that certain people and taken advantage of the rectification movement to try to overthrow the Communist Party. The following month saw the start of the anti-rightist” campaign attacking all those who dared to criticise the shortcomings of the Party during the campaign. This campaign, just as if upon thousands both outside and inside the Party became the victims of this campaign. However, the period of free criticism served to reveal the terrific tensions rending Mao’s regime, the great amount of gunpowder lying under the surface. As a result, the Party suddenly turned into a campaign to crush the critics.

One, Liu Tseng, declared that “Party members are secret agents and they are worse than the Japanese agents during the occupation period.” (New China News Agency, June 30, 1957) In Taipai University a number of students and professors branded Communists as a “privileged class,” even “fascists.” (Chung Kong Chiao Nien Pao, June 21, 1957) Hsu Hsiao-chin, Councilor of the State Council, wanted to “end the practice of making the high-ranking cadres a privileged class.” (New China News Agency, May 27, 1957). Again, while commenting on the rise of the standard of living of the people, one Ko Pei-chi, stated that not all suffered: “Who are the people who enjoy a higher standard of living? They are the Party members and cadres who have worn-out shoes in the past but travel in saloon cars and put on wooden uniform now.” (Jen Min Jih Pao, July 31, 1957). Again, in a forum convened by the Chinese Communist Party, one Chun Yung-shan, said: “In leading the masses to carry on the revolution in the past the Party stood among the masses; after liberation, the position was changed in its mind and, instead of standing among the masses, it stood on the back of the masses and ruled the masses.”

Government cadres should differ in duties and status. Some are responsible for the carrying out of official business; they occupy special positions even when they are out of office.” (New China News Agency, May 30, 1957).

Liu Kan, a student in the Department of Geology at Nanking University, called for the political purification of the Party and young Communist League (Jen Min Jih Pao, July 12, 1957). Chu Ta-chio, a student at the Aviation College in Peiping, spoke about the “new class” of Communist Party high officials who “had obtained financial advantages from commercial and social activities” — the “leaders class.” (New China News Agency, July 16, 1957). Liu Ti-sheng, an assistant professor at Nanking University, called upon the Communist Party to “liberate the Chinese people for a second time.” (Jen Min Jih Pao, July 12, 1957). A professor of the Peiping University also noted that the Communist Party “rules the people with Marxist-Leninist textbooks in its left hand and the power in its right.” (Jen Min Jih Pao, August 30, 1957).

Pao Chu-tso, a student of the Normal College at Kwangi, said: “The Communist Party monopolizes all the power in China today. All you can do is to flatter it and cater to its every wish. You will be in its good books by saying yes to its support... and ‘Long live...’ all the time.” What he really meant was that the Party should “be honest.” He also said that “the Party is a hothead for two-facade characters.” (Kwangi Jih Pao, October 3, 1957).

LOYAL STOGO

In an article, entitled “Second Tour of River Village,” published in the June issue of the People’s Daily, it was noted that China matriculated probably the most famous sociologist in China today, and up to then the pride of the Communist regime, asserted that “the peasants do not live so well as twenty years ago.” For this statement he was called a “false prophet” and a “despicable, obnoxious, loyal stogo of imperialism.” (Houch Ho, September 18, 1957).

Reference was constantly made to the “great blessing” which the People’s Bank of China gave the Peking University, Chen Wei-cheng, stated: “This is the eye of the Polish and Hungarian students.” (New China News Agency, July 6, 1957).

MASS DEMONSTRATIONS

In a speech to a forum of the Department of Industrial Economy of the People’s University of Peking, Professor Wang Teh-chou stated: “The Party has come before the situation where it confronts a dangerous crisis.” Speaking of people in a certain land, 12 haikus have been reduced to two. When pork is unavailable, it is difficult to convince people that living standards have improved. Vegetable prices of the year have increased by 600 per cent, compared with the previous year. The common people are constantly putting the Central Committee, saying that in some matters, the situation is worse compared with the days of the Kuomintang... To say that the Party has divorced itself from the masses is not so true as to say that the masses have divorced themselves from the Party. The Party will collapse soon. Most of the people of the Party give themselves to sectarian activities, and after service, they go to the debauch. At any time, might overcomes might. It is as if the machine gun had many streams of trouble. But what is to be feared is that the machine gun may be turned round for action.”

In a number of places, mass demonstrations were in progress. Thus, for instance, on June 12, thousands of school pupils in Hanyang went on strike and demonstrated. (See reference to this in New China News Agency, Wuhan, September 6, 1957). Three of the leaders of the demonstration were condemned to death and continued opposite
Is it really a PLAN FOR PROGRESS?

asks John Crutchley

ECONOMICS

WHAT WE STAND FOR

The Socialist Review stands for international Socialism unconditionally. Only the mass mobilisation of the working class in the struggle for political power can lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

The Socialist Review believes that the nationalisation of the railways, the banks, the insurance and the land with compensation payments being made in a means test. Nationalisation of all demilitarised industries without compensation.

The nationalised industries to forestall a major part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.

Workers' control in all nationalised industries, a majority of workers' representatives and national boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and remuneration on the average skilled wage in the industry.

The establishment of workers' committees to control all private enterprises within the framework of a planned economy.

The extension of the social services by the payment of lump sums in lieu of the abolition of all payments for the National Health Service, and the creation of an industrial health service.

The expansion of the housing programme by granting the right to buy, by local authorities and the right to requisition privately held land.

Free State education up to 18 of免费 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 to all workers whatever the nationality of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.

Freedom from political and economic domination to all colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to all backward and underdeveloped countries.

The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from the world seas.

The abolition of the H-bomb and the United Nations' nuclear disarmaments policy to both the United States and the Soviet Union.

A Socialist government policy subservient to neither Washington nor Moscow.

Not only will a Labour Government have to rely on high interest rates to prevent a flight from sterling after their victory but capital speculation will have to be used throughout their term of office. There is a much wider acceptance (by the Labour Party—J.C.) of the use of interest rates as a regulator.

Wage freeze

Restoring convertibility of sterling at a time when the aim was part of the deliberate policy pursued by the Tories since 1951 will mean the British monetary administration to the international capitalist economy, thus ensuring that "severe limitations of freedom of manoeuvre at home... are inspired by conditions in the world outside." Gaullist recognises this but still says, "we should have to do with a built-in disadvantage." It takes the "moral" and "political" strength of the "socialist" wage freeze to offset its basic deficiencies in business and foreign policy. This means hitting working-class living standards through the wage freeze and other reactionary measures. "If it does not, then every business man and most owners of equities will presently find themselves doing very nicely without the incentive of inflation." They win both ways.

Modify

But if the Labour Party does pursue a "sufficiently firm... financial policy" it will find that "political measures against profits may hold up expansion... but they do not effect necessary recession, and are a constant drag on the pound." Thus if a Labour Government is willing to modify the extremely modest proposals envisaged in its financial programme.

Big Business

Property of the US Defence Department is valued at over $160 billion (£57,000,000 m), "by any yardstick of measurement the world's biggest organization," according to the Coramor Report to the Secretary of Defense. The 60-man staffs alone contain more than 30 million acres of land, and in foreign countries an additional 2.6 million acres. The total acreage is greater than the combined area of all the state forests of Washington, Oregon, New York, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire and Maryland. Military assets of the Pentagon "are three times as great as the 90 state assets" of S.C., W. Va. & T. Me. The assets include General Motors and Standard Oil (NJ), all major giants of the US corporate world. And the Defense Department's paid personnel equals the number of all the employees of these companies." This is a fact from persons engaged in war preparations production work. In 1956, Senator Paul Douglas admitted that 92 per cent of military contracts were negotiated without competitive bidding. (See also the reports in recent years of the House and Senate small business committee on public procurement. From J M Swoboda, Jr, writing in Progressive, quoted by Economic Notes, Labor Research Association, New York, February, 1959.)

our best" to make convertibility work. The Labour Party if it tries to maintain the current level of 1.43 francs to the pound—a capitalist economy better than the bosses' Tory Government. Their answer and "Ambitious Labour leaders whose main article of faith is that we shall be the country better than the Tories may be expected to fight quite hard for financial stability. A Labour Government, continues The Economist, which is dedicated to increasing the efficiency of capitalism will "start freely" and to let the poisonous weeds gain a growth spurt so that the people will be startled at such things in the world and will take action and cut these low branches.

"Some say this is a dark scheme. We say: this is a dark scheme. For we told the enemy beforehand that they could be whitewashed only when they are let out of the cage and eliminated. And they got rid of the cage when they are let come out of the soil. Do peasants not dry their tears over graves where they were removed can be used as fertilizer." (Bhutto, July 3, 1957.)

The victims of the counter-"purge" are very numerous, many of them being Party members of long standing, like Ting Ling, undoubtedly one of the most famous of Chinese authors, who had been a member of the Party for some 25 years. The effect of the Hungarian Revolution was so great that Ting Ling's house in Peking was nicknamed the "Pekin Club."
Vic Pellen asks, NEW TOWNS — WHO CONTROLS?

WHEN Lord Silk in came to Crawley in 1947, before his elevation to the peerage, to a general discussion meeting on the subject of the proposed New Towns, a few of us were able to get an informal supplementary talk over the telephone. One of the points which was taken for granted at that time was that the New Towns would have eventual and eventual control of the local councils. Such indeed was the original intention of the New Towns Act, as Lord Silk has since publicly declared.

With the coming of a Tory government in 1951, the New Towns began to circulate that the New Towns were to remain permanent, and that the councils were to be appointed bodies. Although no official pronouncement was made, several times promulgation of the New Towns Act was again handed over to local councils.

In November, 1955, Rents Control was abolished in Crawley, during the period of the great rent strike. It was attended by local and national representatives, by Tye’s Association delegations from several other New Towns, and by the representatives of the Crawley Tenants’ Association, who convened the Conference. Of the political parties, all the Labour and Communist delegates were present. At that Conference, representing some 170,000 people, a resolution was passed calling for the setting up of a New Towns Federation, one of whose aims should be to work for future Council ownership.

Full confidence

Such a Federation was set up, with the encouragement and assistance of the Association of Tenants and Residents, in April, 1956, although it never functioned as such. At the same time it established sufficient contact to make it clear that the people of all the New Towns felt the same way about their future, and that interministerial campaign were being waged.

In Crawley the matter was discussed by the various Neighbourhoods during the ensuing twelve months, and on 2nd March, 1957, a London Conference was called by the National Association after the intention of the Tory government became clearer.

The complete victory of Labour at the recent local government elections that year—a feature of all the New Towns—undoubtedly stiffened the determination of Tory ministers to retain control themselves.

The Urban Council itself went on record at its meeting the day after the election, saying, "The Tory minority, of course, were dissented." In Crawley, however, the CTU issued a formal statement repeating its views, and supporting the points made by its delegates to the London Conference. This statement said: "The CTU believes that the only possible successor to the Development Corporation is the Urban District Council, which is the effective Housing Authority already in existence. This is the only course which would give the tenants genuine ownership confidence in the future of the town. There must be no cutting out of property assoiciation and the trade unions must be handed over to the local councils.

It concluded with the words: "We are confident that the Council has the full support of the New Towns, and of many of the organizations, including the Trade Unions."

At this period support was given by practically every Trade Union branch, by the Trades Council and by various Workers’ Committees. The Labour Party had been early in the field, and New Town Ownership was one of the planks of their successful Urban election platform.

Petition

In the past six months the campaign has been renewed. Now we are faced with the present position of the government undoubtedly intends to push through any General election.

Recent meetings in Crawley have shown that the people still feel the same way, in spite of assurances about sale to private landlords.

There has been a great smoke screen raised as to the real intentions of the Tories. Play has been made of the possibility of purchase by sitting tenants and perhaps ownership confidence again. How tenants, who often enough find the rent hard enough, can afford to buy, no-one has yet said.

Crawley Tenants’ Association have now launched a petition. It has got its start on a very wet Saturday afternoon recently when nearly 400 had stopped long enough to sign. Now it is expected that the petition will be circulated in the neighbourhood through the factories and TU branches.

Tories exposed

We believe it important to maintain the protests, even though the Bill is halfway through the Commons. It may be possible to hold it up, or make amendments of some sort; certainly it ought to be made quite clear that a Labour Government would reverse the process.

The Tory case has been fully exposed by the complete absence of any positive reason for transferring to a Minister-appointed Council. The main reasons of resistance about sale to private landlords — they do not use.

Excuses vary in their weakness, but they are all weak. The Councils are not experienced enough, or too busy with the right numbers or sorts to take over. Of course, if a Tory Minister appoints his own candidates, he is not even directly answerable to Parliament, we can be sure of non-pollution of the process.

Decentralize

No one would argue that Council housing policies are always right. Hammer smith and Croydon, to give two examples, that even Labour Councils go off the rails at times. But one fact of the matter is that Councils are elected bodies answerable to the people. The Councils are accessible; Municipal bodies are not. Councils are ultimately controlled by the people, some are not.

It would be a very simple matter to hand over control to the elected people, with financial safeguards, such as Corporations enjoy. The Councils could handle the job. (The LCC is a far bigger Housing Authority than any New Town Corporation). The people could trust the Councils—or re-elect them.

The alternative is a New Town in the hands of bureaucracy, and ultimately the hands of the big landlords.

"POWER AT THE TOP"

reviewed by David Breen

If nationalization in Britain has not brought socialism, it has certainly brought into focus the basic issue—control. We know that we own the mines, railways, etc., in theory. Of course, they are nationalized. But who controls them? This is the rub; it is a question that hasn't been answered in great detail.

True, we've always been able to show that nationalization has increased workers' control, and that its privatization has meant that the ex-owners have invested their salvaged capital in more profitable forms. We have shown that big (private) business benefits from special tariffs and subsidies paid for by workers in the nationalized industries.

Links

But we have never traced exactly the myriad links connecting private and nationalized industry (nor shown in detail the mechanism of control of the giant corporations). British capitalism impose their will on the workings of the state-owned sectors.

This Clive Jenkins has now done in his book at the London School of Economics. A Critical Survey of the Nationalized Industries (MacGibbon and Kee, 21s). It is a simple book, but not more than a glorified list of the members of boards of nationalized industries, their private interests and their interconnections. The world it reveals needs knowing.

If of the 14 members of the British Transport Commission’s Board, 7 are company directors; of the AEC and Road, 6 are company directors; of the 5 in each case are company directors. The position is similar in other nationalized industries as seen from the table on pp 41-44.

Directors

And what directors? Take BOAC’s board as an example. There is J R D’Erlanger, CBE, ACA (part-time chairman), Vice-Chairman of Ealing Ltd, Chairman of City and International Trust Ltd, Director of EBE Holdings (No 1) Ltd, Chairman of Forest Land, Timber & Railway Co Ltd, Director of Forest Development Trust Co, General Consulated Investment Trust Ltd, John Mackintosh & Sons Ltd, Pauling & Co Ltd, Vice-Chairman of Provident Life Assurance Association Ltd, and Chairman of Richard Haworth & Co. (Holdings Ltd). There are 14 directors, and only one person from a working class background.

Invaluable

He rejects capitalist control, but refuses to consider workers' control. He shows clearly how the State and the experts are cellared and rubber executives of the companies. He shows the independent status and initiative in his vague hints at a differently organized society.

Power at the Top is, notwithstanding, an invaluable handbook for those who are interested in nationalization. Socialist propagandists will find in it everything necessary for every occasion.

A final note to the publishers: why the skimpy index? The value of the book rises with the number of references workers can readily find to their own neighbouring first.
CLASS IN EDUCATION 1
by Peter Ibbotson

With this issue, we are starting to serialize extracts from 'Class in English Education' by Peter Ibbotson, which first appeared in the October 1958 issue of Labour Teacher, quarterly journal of the National Association of Labour Teachers.

Readers are invited to send their queries on educational matters (at least 50 words) to us. Those of general interest will be answered by Peter Ibbotson in our columns; those of interest to the sender alone will be answered by post. Whatever the question, we shall be glad to help—Editor.

THE present education system certainly denies equality of opportunity for self-fulfilment. The whole system is caste-ridden throughout; attendance at certain schools or types of school confers (sometimes fictitious) advantage on their pupils. The Times of March 28, 1956, analysed the education of the Bench of Bishops. Of 40 Bishops—two stes then being worked—50 less than a third attended public schools, and only 5 had not been to Oxford or Cambridge Universities.

Or look at the Government's recent report on recruitment to the administrative services of the Civil and Foreign Services. The report, published as a white paper last year, includes a table showing the number of candidates for Foreign Office posts in the last nine years, with their fathers' occupations. The report differs from other official statistics on this point in that it mentions the name of the father of the candidate whenever he is a government official. It also lists the number of candidates from the sons of non-officials.

Father's Occupational Class
Unskilled 22
Semi-skilled 36
Highly skilled 778
Professional 1,039
Top professional

No. of candidates
46
12
12

No. of successful candidates
2
2
12
9

FIGHT OMO, says TOTTENHAM L P

The following resolution was passed by the Tottenham Labour Party, sent to the London Labour Party Executive the London Transport Executive and the local press. Other Labour Parties, Trades Councils, etc., should take note:

That this Labour Party protests at the attempt of the LITE to introduce one-man-operated buses. After the recent cuts in services which slowed up transport, this new attack on the service will reduce efficiency and slow transport considerably more, besides causing redundancy among conductors.

It calls on the LITE to run transport for the purpose for which it was nationalised, which was to provide an efficient public service for the people. One-man operation works directly against this.

M. E. EPTON, Labour MP for Brixton, asked how many weekly National Assistance grants had been increased to provide for higher rents since the Rent Acts, and the average amount of these grants.

Mr Boyd-Carpenter said: 'The National Assistance Board inform me that... it is estimated that some 500,000 weekly assistance grants have been increased to provide for rent increases since the beginning of 1957. Of these, about three-fifths have been in respect of increases under the Rent Act. The average amount of the increases is calculated at 5s Id a week.'

Expenditure

This means that there is a direct subsidy to landlords of four million pounds a year! Enough to build thirty comprehensive schools or to increase unemployment benefit by three shillings a week, to provide up to three thousand new Council houses or to make a down payment on an American missile system.

Even the Conservatives cannot be too happy about this particular fantasy and they should be watched closely lest they should reduce the rent-paying powers of National Assistance Boards with protest to secure the tenancies of those affected.

THE results of the beer tax reduction could also do with close observation. Labour arguments against it are that pensions should have been increased and milk and bread subsidies reintroduced, rather than cheaper beer. Labour MPs have a strong suspicion that the tax has been introduced with the purpose of decreasing the disproportionate effect of the price of beer on the out-of-date 31st March, when the tax cut is due to come into effect. The Commons has, however, been unaffected by the continual government appeals to all critics; it is the opinion of the Treasury that the greater amount of beer sold will more than cover up for the loss. Will it? Only time will tell, as the girl was told when she enquired if there was any harm in bluebell-gathering with mixed company.

ONE day in April and it wasn’t the first of the month the Lords discussed Dan Dare whilst the Commons discussed Terry Dene. It being a Monday and the Lords being a bit loopy, it was said that Dan Dare had undoubtedly had a medical certificate there was nothing more to say, except to make the customary jokes about No 9 pills, according to the traditions of army debates. There was one serious question, a strong feeling on both sides of the House that if he could get off by claiming emotional disturbance, retarded personality or whatever it was, either the army is not what it was—a most unlikely surmise; it has been the same since the eighteenth century—or that there had been a fiddle big enough for Mr Dene to play as double bass.

The Dan Dare debate was more profitable. The Macmillan program for a Brighter Britain ("The Conservatives believe in all modern improvements") can hardly be said to be a success if it has to be on the cheap. The heedless skies will be shortly seeing Her Britannic Majesty’s first space satellite. Probably the thing will have a lion stamped on it like an egg, and will be of about that size.
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I COULDN'T agree more with the critics that nationalism calling for the "withdrawal of British troops from N. Ireland," etc., etc., are vulgar oversimplification. The Chinese are socialist and are at best the sincere if misguided expressions of a once radical nationalist mood and are most certainly not the product of the Stalinist propaganda mill speaking through the Connolly Clubs and "modernization" organizations where dupes do their bidding. Stalinist treachery and the ruthless suppression of entire nations and their characteristics in the interest of the Great Russian totalitarian state cannot be apparent to even the most myopic nationalist. Hungary is not a generation away.

So, as noted by Noel Harris (SR, March 1) the genesis of the Northern Ireland situation was dictated by the military preoccupations of the Lloyd George Government; but has nevertheless remained a conflagration with national position as an integral part of the UK, and as far as the majority of its citizens are concerned will continue to be so in the foreseeable future.

Support
It is this civilian support that gives the N. Ireland regime its solidarity. A mass of its nationalists would have us believe—the British Army. Any one who thinks that the N. Ire-

land working class would not take up arms to defend the constitutional position on the withdrawal of the British Army is naively ignoring the realities; and any armed foray by the IRA, particularly where injury to human persons is concerned only entrenches the resolve of those people to refuse to be coerced and incensed, as Noel Harris pointed out the Tory-Unionist Party which has acquired for itself the reputation of being the unrelenting defender or repository of the political union with the UK.

Belfast workers
Fortunately, and in spite of the pro- and anti-partition opportunists inside and outside the Labour movement, North and South, the N. Ireland Labour Party has broken through on the economic and social front and has found a bridge between working-class interests and loyal, Catholic and (presumed by the Unionists) as disorderly—ine the city of Bel-

fast, against the economic back-
ground of a permanent B per cent unemployed figure.

This is a change from the sterile posturing of the Anti-Partition position which traded on (and still does) sectarianism, evocative slog-
gans of republicanism versus the parts and vice versa; loyalty and disloyalty to abstract and essentially bourgeois political formulae allied to stupid eth-


cological theories as to whether a N. Ireland Unionist could be considered an Irishman, or indeed whether the other Irishmen were ruled from Rome or Dublin.

To be sure these manifesta-
tions of working class political consciousness are still on a rather small scale, but once the nationalist working class can rid itself of the self-imposed apartheid in the public and social affairs of N. Ireland that was nur-
turing the anti-Unionist politics of the Tory Nationalist politicians and by the discrimination and gerrymandering of Tory Unionists once a bridge is found and the de jure as well as the de facto basis of N. Ireland society is accepted, then political progress will be made.

IMPERIALISM
"I have listened while young Whites boasting of the number of Africans they have killed in road acci-
dents. I have listened to police reservists talking about their going out and shooting a few demonstrators after a party (the 1953 riots), Brutal but true and, by no means exceptional."—Correspondent in the Manchester Guardian, March 11, commenting on the emergency in the Central African Feder-

ation.

This implies that the Repub-
lic's Labour Party should look to the British, and direct its members to join the N. Ire-
land Labour Party that they left in 1948. In the same way as the Irish TUC leaves affairs of N. Ireland in the hands of its N. Ireland Committee, and which has gone on record year after year demanding that the Stormont administration give de jure and de facto recognition to this Com-
mittee which inverently must imply that this recognition will be reciprocated, the problems of political labour should be left to the N. Ireland Labour Party.

Possibilities
The class consciousness of the workers in the South is at this juncture very important. Quite involuntarily the Tory Unionism Government in N. Ireland has had to—gall and all—swallow the Welfare State, keep in step with the UK and now with no guile in cheek cite the Institution as an additional reason why the workers' interest in the N. Ireland government should be en-

creased by unity at the present stage of economic and social development in the Repub-

lic.

Quite correctly Noel Harris points out that within the con-
stitutional context of each state in Irish socialism can work for the quite immediate objectives of economic and social reforms; for full employment; for an end to the political monopoly of Tory-

ism; the need for the development of democratic processes and an end to discrimination based on religion or politics. We must continue to use a fashionable phrase in the power politics, to lessen the ten-
sions between the English and the minority, by the acceptance of the constitu-
tional position uniting the Republic, and by the development of a relative political position is altered.

Clearly this process will not be initiated by armed attacks or stupid—though calculated—rant-
ings by Tory and Labour politi-
cians in Belfast or Dublin, whose present concern is rallyed towards the instilled constitutional prejudices of their supporters at home. In present budgetary blueprint to the readers of Socialist Review as to how and when the order will get there. A condemned cow of republican absolutism must be driven out of the leadership by the people in Ireland. Even a United Socialist Ireland would not be a viable economic unit expect on a potatoes and salt eco-
nomic union. In any case the choice of South is grossly undercapitalized; with a natural increase of up-
wards of 50,000,000 in the population and economic growth providing less than 5,000 jobs per year. The balance migrates, mostly to Britain where even the people from the South, officially at least, are afforded the same citizenship rights as a person from the North.

Policy
Democratic socialists would welcome even a loose confedera-
ted set-up between the North and South which would at least not be a forcible union of two different countries. Such a union could work to the advantage of both countries and improve not only political but also economic and cultural cooperation. The integration of the two countries would improve the standard of living for both parts of the island of Ireland and help to bring about a social justice in the future. In this way, the democratic socialist idea can be brought to life and the hopes of Irish people for a united Ireland can be realized.

NUR GOES IT ALONE

...leaders go, they are being forced to get a move on. The impoverished railwayman is not sympathetic to the politicians as to whether the cost-of-living index (which is a phoney for the lowest paid) has moved up or down.

Cannnot Wait
The future for the railwaymen is very much dependent on their willingness and ability to struggle. The industry is well in the "red," and most are very sceptical of talks about the railways' supposed ability to "break-even" in the '60s. This is the story put forward by the new year Sir Brian Robertson, BTC Chairman.

But the workers cannot wait for "pie-in-the-sky; they have to live now. If Messrs. Greene and Evans will not properly lead the fight, they will be pushed aside for those who will.

Debt
The experiences of the railway workers, who expected so much from the "strike," is an instructive lesson about the worthlessness of piece-meal nationalization without workers' control.

The industry right from the first was saddled with a compensation debt of £30 mil-

lion a year; now on top of that, it bears more millions on new "modernization" programs. The BTC argues that it will be able to get out of debt when the extra revenue comes in later. Like the other sectors of the nationalised economy, the BTC has not been master of its own fate. It has not been able to increase its service to the country, passenger long-distance fares have not risen any-

thing like the general rise in commodity prices, and freight-

rates have also remained lower than the general extra costs of raw materials used by the railway.

Just as in the case of coal, nationalized transport is put in service to suit the needs of the four-fifths of purely privately owned capitalist profit-making industry.

Spread Demands
In this situation it is not much good looking to the overpaid Sir Brian to proclaim the needs of the workers; and if Messrs. Greene and Evans don't take a far more intelligent and forceful line, it might not be much good looking that way either.

In addition to the overwhelming demand to demote, the railwaymen need to carry their case into the other sections of the TU Movement. The demand that a future Labour Government takes the compensation burden off their backs, and establishes workers' control as part of a planned Socialist economy developing over the whole of the industry field.