

# SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

FORTNIGHTLY  
FOR  
FACTORY MILITANT  
AND  
INTERNATIONAL  
SOCIALISM

8th YEAR No 3

FEBRUARY 1, 1958

SIXPENCE

## THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

WE LIVE in the terrible shadow of the H-Bomb. American bombers carry the deadly weapon over our heads. The Russian sputnik, a by-product of the arms race, is circling the earth. The search for better ballistic missiles continues. Humanity lives on the brink of an abyss.

What is the way out of this nightmare? What have the politicians—those men who proved themselves unable to prevent two world wars, the men who actively supported them—to offer the anxious people? What is their solution?

Four policies are on offer. First—a disengagement of the Powers in Europe, by which they mean the creation of a zone between East and West in which foreign forces would be limited or prohibited; second—an embargo on, or at least limitation of, arms shipments to the Middle East; third—the banning or nuclear weapons as a step towards general disarmament; and fourth—negotiations on the above measures crowned by a Summit Conference.

The struggle for peace is so urgent, so crucial, that no effort must be spared to discover whether these proposals would help in its preservation. Can they help, or are they, once again, a blind, a criminal bluff?

### The "disengagement" bluff

AT ONE TIME or another, most major politicians have suggested some form of disengagement. Anthony Eden, Bulganin and Khrushchev, Gaitskell and Bevan, Lester Pearson (former Canadian Foreign Minister), the Foreign Ministers of Poland and Ireland, and most recently George Kennan, the former US diplomat, have all put forward the idea.

Every one of those in the West support NATO, support the production of the H-Bomb by the Western Powers, the massing of the 'deterrent against Russia.' Every one of those in the East support the Warsaw Pact and its military concomitants.

What kind of disengagement do they propose? Do they really see eye to eye and mean the same thing? Certainly not.

Khrushchev, master of the sputnik and the inter-continental ballistic missile, wants the whole continent of Europe to be cleared of bomber bases and H-Bomb-carrying missile sites. But he will not countenance a withdrawal of conventional armies. Hungary, if nothing else, has convinced him that the presence of Russian troops in Eastern Europe is the only guarantee against the disintegration of his Empire. Without his armies of occupation, revolution in Budapest and Warsaw, East Berlin and Prague would reach out to destroy the bureaucratic rulers of Moscow itself.

The rulers of the Western capitalist countries see 'disengagement' in a totally different light. Not having managed to make long-range missiles as yet, they are not prepared to shift their missile- and bomber-bases from the borders of Russia. On the other hand, US and British troops have not yet been required to suppress popular revolutions on the Continent. Thus, although they might agree to withdraw their armies, they cannot scrap their missile bases.

What about the third interpretation of 'disengagement'—favoured, it seems, by Gaitskell and Bevan—that neither conventional

Owing to pressure on space, we have been forced to postpone two of the four articles promised for this issue. We have learned the lesson and, in order not to disappoint readers, will not announce a dateline for forthcoming articles. However, we shall soon be starting on an important series of articles by SEYMOUR PAPERT on Strachey and Contemporary Capitalism; PETER IBBOTSON will argue the case for the abolition of Public Schools; HAROLD FREEDMAN will review the New Thinking and the exposure of New Thinking; a correspondent from India will show the plight of the working class in Kerala, under the Communist Party administration; and so on. Don't fail to order your copies now!

troops be withdrawn entirely (as this would not be acceptable to Khrushchev) nor H-Bomb bases be entirely done away with (as this would not be acceptable to Eisenhower and Macmillan)?

Such a compromise could not lead to peace. Hungary, Poland, East Germany and other countries would continue to be occupied; while the Scandinavian countries, Italy, Britain, Germany and France would continue to be springboards for destruction.

What hypocrisy is this talk of 'disengagement' in the mouths of the politicians! Socialists must point it out for what it is—a sop to mass anxiety—and put forward their own, positive, internationalist and realistic version: **the withdrawal of all foreign troops—whether armed with conventional or nuclear weapons—from all countries!**

### Peace and war in the Middle East

THE SECOND PROPOSAL for lessening world tension and protecting peace is just as fantastic.

The most decisive factor in the Middle Eastern upheavals is not the import of arms from abroad but the rising tide of national and colonial revolutions. This tide must inevitably engulf the Western oil monopolies and change the international relation of forces between the powers, and might well lead to another World War.

To pretend, however, that an arms embargo can prevent this happening is to believe that history can be made by whispering charms.

There is only one way to prevent the Middle East (or the Far East, or Africa) from detonating a third World War: **to fight for the freedom from political and economic oppression of all colonies and to grant technical and economic assistance to the peoples of the under-developed countries on the basis of equality and mutual benefit.**

### Can they ban the bomb?

WHAT ABOUT the banning of the Bomb and disarmament? For years the banning of the A-Bomb was discussed by diplomats—without results. Now, it is the H-Bomb. And discussion will go on and on, fruitlessly. Again, negotiations will break down over the key question of control.

For how can Washington's rulers—protectors of Franco and Chiang Kai-Shek—be trusted? Who can rely on the word of Moscow's rulers—the butchers of the Hungarian workers?

### Socialist policy for peace

As long as the control of the economy—including the armaments industry—remains in the hands of a few parasites in West and East, no real banning of armaments production is possible.

Nevertheless, we socialists must press for the banning of the Bomb and for disarmament, and mobilize the masses of workers around these demands. But we cannot, must not, stop there. **We must raise the call for workers' control over armament production, workers' control to see that the ban on the Bomb is actually carried out. We must support every direct workers' action against the production of the Bomb, against the building of launching sites to deliver them.**

IF THERE IS NOT, and cannot be, any lasting agreement on the basic issues dividing the Great Powers, what good can come from a Summit Conference?

In 1955 the Geneva Conference took place. The heads of state conferred and reached an 'agreement in principle.' What happened when they came to translate principle into practice? The search for ever more deadly weapons continued unabated; the struggle for influence in the Middle East did not stop for one second; the 'Geneva spirit' evaporated during the butchery in Egypt and Hungary. And the Cold War continued with unreduced ferocity.

What is needed is not a conference of the warmongers, but international, socialist activity in defence of peace, against war and its instigators;

**the complete withdrawal of foreign troops from all countries!  
no H-Bomb, nor A-Bomb, nor missile sites, nor bomber bases!  
Workers' control over armaments production!  
for international socialism and peace!**

**INDUSTRIAL**

Rank-and-file building workers demand

**HIGHER WAGES, FEWER HOURS  
GREATER LEISURE****An SR report**

SIXTY-FOUR DELEGATES from union branches and 49 from sites in London and Liverpool met in Conference at the Holborn Hall, London, on January 19th. The Conference was called by shop-stewards from the Alderton site at Chiswick.

**Brian Behan** (who wrote in *Socialist Review*, January 1, 1958) explained the purpose of the meeting: **to mobilize the rank-and-file on the sites to transform the existing union machinery into an effective instrument for the coming struggle.**

He reviewed the present state of the industry. He contrasted higher than average productivity (an increase of 18½ percent), higher than average profits (one firm, W C French, showed a 100 percent increase last year), higher than average salaries (Turner Newalls, a building supply firm, paid its directors approximately £600 per week), with growing unemployment, which would affect 130,000 men by the end of this year.

**Realistic claim**

The Tory Government must be held responsible. The credit squeeze is crushing the smaller builders; the cuts in council housing will put up to 30,000 men on the stones. This is what the big employers want.

The present wage claim for 8d. an hour, the demand for a forty-hour week, are quite realistic. As it is, some of the bigger employers are paying up to 2s. an hour in excess of union rates. While the forty-hour week would go a long way towards getting rid of unemployment in the trade. They say the economy can't stand it; but why should we pay the arms bill?

### PLAN FOR ACTION

**RESOLUTION 1**  
THIS MASS MEETING of building trade workers calls upon the Executive Committee of the Federation to launch a campaign around our claim of 8d. per hour and a reduction in the working week to 40 hours. This campaign should include:—

1. Meetings of Shop Stewards;
2. Meetings on every site and specially summoned meetings in the Branches;
3. Public meetings and demonstrations led by the Executive Members.

Bearing in mind that there are other large sections involved in wage claims and that the employers and Tories have a common line to oppose them, it is urgent that our executives call upon the T.U.C. and trade union Members of Parliament to convene a joint conference to work out a common policy of mutual assistance.

We further ask, that before any settlement is reached, we, the members, should be consulted.

**RESOLUTION 2**  
THIS MASS MEETING recognises that the larger the amount of non-unionists in our industry, the more difficult it is to strengthen our wages and conditions. We pledge ourselves to bring in the nons, and strengthen our site organisation. At the same time we call upon the executive committees to defend more resolutely the shop steward from victimization by the employer.

**RESOLUTION 3**  
THIS MASS MEETING recognises the need for co-ordination amongst the organised jobs. We call upon the Federation to organise regularly, meetings of Federation Stewards and, at intervals, mass meetings of all Stewards of the various unions.

**RESOLUTION 4**  
IT WAS FURTHER resolved to form a rank-and-file committee based on job-organisation to strengthen the trade union movement and to fight the bosses effectively.

Our slogan, a realistic slogan, must be "Higher wages, less hours, more leisure."

How are we to attain this goal? **Our strength lies in our shop-steward organization on the job; everything must be done to defend it against attack; unions must be forced to defend victimized shop-stewards; they must**

**abrogate the Working Rule Agreement of 1927 which virtually outlaws strikes.**

**We must have a united campaign by all unions in the industry against the bosses; and a rank-and-file organization to either change the attitude of the present union leaders or replace them with others more in tune with the**

men on the site.

**In London a committee of shop-stewards' delegates is being formed to further these aims and to co-ordinate action on the big sites.**

**The discussion**

The Chairman then opened the meeting for discussion.

**Bro. Harrison**, a Federation steward complained of bureaucracy and remoteness at headquarters: "What do you want? What's your name? Can you leave a message?" is standard practice.

**Bro. Gannon** attacked the unions for issuing permits for overtime with thousands unemployed. He knew that stewards could count on rank-and-file support, but was afraid of sell-outs by the union leaderships. The next job was to organize all big sites in London (only 35 percent of workers in the industry were organized) and build the rank-and-file committee from the job upwards.

A Brother from the ETU stressed the need to insist on the **right to recall all workers' representatives.**

**Bro. Rogers**, Liverpool, explained the position in Liverpool where unemployment was high—7 percent on the Merseyside.

**Bro. Curran** put forward the slogan of **One industry—one union** and thought the Conference did not go far enough.

Many other delegates took part in the discussion which was wound up by the opening speaker, Brian Behan.

For details of future activities of the rank-and-file committee, write to K. Ballach, 114 Fielding Road, Chiswick, London, W.4.

**SOCIALIST REVIEW FIGHTING FUND**

WE NEED £40 a month

up to the end of January

WE GOT £36 10 5

**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.**

Cut along dotted line

**The Long Shift**

HOBART HOUSE, headquarters of the National Coal Board, have issued orders to all pits in Britain instructing them to prepare for a fourteen-day shift. Supplies of food, water and diesel fuel are already being assembled at pit bottoms. Each pit is to be made self-sufficient so that no further supplies would have to be lowered to the workers during the fortnight.

The NCB, in fact, envisages a situation where no supplies could be lowered to them, for they are assuming that people living round about the pits will have been wiped out by an H-bomb attack.

Under such conditions miners at the pit face will just have to

wait, knowing that their families, relatives and friends will either be dead or dying. Their own hopes of survival will depend upon help coming from outside the devastated area—that is, of course, if there is any area remaining untouched by a nuclear catastrophe.

The NCB are also locating mobile winding machinery well outside industrial districts. They hope to have crews standing by these winders who will dash into the devastated zone—after the radio-activity has partially dispersed—to pull up the miners.

Crazy projects like this fit in crazy policy on the hydrogen bomb!

## FORUM

Paul Simon presents a

## SOCIALIST POLICY FOR BUILDING

RECENT ARTICLES in the **Socialist Review** by comrades Heffer and Behan dealt with the immediate demands around which building workers must organize to meet the growing attack by the employers on their living standards in the coming year. Whether this attack will take place under critical slump conditions, or simply during a so-called "minor" recession is not for me to forecast. I leave that to the economists.

In either event the purpose for which these demands are put forward is twofold. On the one hand there is the need to develop working-class strength by building the unions, sharpening militancy, and improving rank-and-file organization to force the hands of the trade-union bureaucrats, build an alternative militant leadership, and wring the maximum concessions from the employers.

On the other hand there is the need to develop the socialist consciousness of the working-class to pose in the struggle the only possible solution to the capitalist crisis—the need for Socialism, and to demonstrate to the workers that they have the strength to dispossess the capitalists economically and the organization to protect their gains politically.

**I believe therefore that if the immediate demands of the unions are the correct demands politically, they will raise in the course of the struggle the question "who is to control whom."**

**Need for transition program**

The building industry employs directly over a million persons. Building and civil engineering with associated materials industries, etc., employ three million. It is one of the most backward technically of any in the country. Waste and inefficiency are bywords. Working conditions are primitive and deplorable. Labour is extremely casual and difficult to organize. Whilst it is not a "decisive" industry compared to say transport, or fuel, it is a large and important industry. The difficulties in organizing only serve to underline the need for correctly posing "who is to control whom."

If we therefore wish to develop the discussion in the course of the struggle to a stage beyond the immediate issues of the right to work and the right to a living wage, we have on the stocks at the moment two alternatives. One is the glorious vision of Socialism—workers' control, atomic-powered automation, land nationalization; the other is painstaking, Fabian-type constructive rationalizations. These latter might even include, as in the case of the Federation's plan **Building as a Social Service**, proposals to nationalize.

I would agree that of late there has been too little of the visionary Socialism, particularly in the party of which I have most experience, the Communist Party. I

imagine that there has been somewhat less than nothing in the Labour Party.

However, if we rely exclusively on the "gleam of Socialism," there is a real danger of us appearing like the right-wing, in reverse, prepared to bring out "Socialism" for the purpose of speechifying but unwilling or unable to present a proposal for immediate purposes.

**No Luddism**

We are therefore back to the immediate demands and their political correctness. It seems to me, that it is not only possible but politically correct to distinguish between:—

(1) Proposals which benefit the employers solely and exclusively—such as bonus schemes, payment by results;

(2) Reforms which rationalize the industry and advance it technologically but which, under private ownership, serve to line the pockets of the employers;

(3) Proposals aimed at reducing the economic power of the capitalist class and democratizing sectors of public ownership.

Obviously:—

(1) **Proposals which benefit the employers solely and exclusively, are to be resisted to the full.** There should be no disagreement on this point.

On (2) reforms to rationalize the industry, there will, I think, be some disagreement with the point of view I wish now to put.

**I think it incorrect to resist or oppose reforms or rationalization aimed at improving the industry technologically. What must be resisted is the introduction of techniques at the expense of the working-class.**

Let me give an example. Plastering is a dying trade and in the course of the next few years, it will be more and more superseded by other methods of surface finishing. **The trade unions should demand that any plasterers made redundant as a result of new methods be re-trained under full pay, suffer no decrease in skilled workers' wages, and that it shall be up to trade unions in conjunction with rank-and-file committees to determine which men shall be re-trained, having gone into age, preference, etc.** The point must be made over and over again that technology exists to serve man, that men are not cyphers to be declared "redundant" at the merest whim.

**Strike against Profits**

Of course such proposals would be resisted by the employers. Their whole point in introducing alternative techniques is to re-

place skilled labour by unskilled labour and so for a time have an advantage over competitors, or in the long run reduce the amount of labour needed in fulfilling a specific function, and so increase the rate of exploitation.

**In fighting the employers the unions must use every weapon, including joint strike action by all unions in the industry to uphold the dignity of all building workers; the unions must not strike against the introduction of new techniques, but they must strike against the employers' refusal to run the industry for the benefit of the men in the industry and society generally but simply for the sake of increasing their already swollen profits.**

**In this way the issue of whether the building industry as at present organized—i.e., as a capitalist industry, is capable of meeting this simple and patently just demands is immediately raised, and in turn raises the question "who is to control whom."**

**Nationalization ?**

With regard to the third section we have the maximum confusion and the maximum disagreement. The only proposal that I know of any importance is the NFBTO proposal to nationalize the industry. ("Workers control" I place on the other side of the revolution to the one we are on.)

If we are to take the slogan of nationalization seriously we must really take it to pieces and see what it means.

**First let us agree (1) to nationalize the land; (2) nationalize the materials industry (brickworks, cement rings, etc.); (3) nationalize the plant-hire firms.**

and could be taken over. The plant-hire firms have got something (plant) that needs to be taken over if we are to plan.

After this, however, where are we? Apart from six or seven top firms actually owning something the rest of the so-called "industry" begins, on examination, to become—nothing. Let any building worker think for a moment exactly what his boss has and does. An office, a yard, a bucket and barrow, a bank account.

Workers themselves set up "on their own" like God Bless You and go bankrupt twice as quickly. They couldn't do this if they actually had to have anything to be a builder.

No, the builder-employer gets the steady work from his clients (usually masonic, rotary or church) his labour from the labour exchange, his materials he gets on tick from the merchant, and on a job of any size, any plant from the hire yard. The bank manager obliges in the case of established firms with a spot of credit for the wages and off you go. If a builder goes bankrupt there is nothing for another builder to take over.

**The Federation's plan to compensate for five years loss of profit is therefore pathetic, confusing and class collaborationist.**

This plan is actually a day dream. Not of the visionary socialism we talked about earlier, but of jobs for the boys in their late middle age.

There are other more practical proposals for reorganizing the industry which building workers could fight for, and which if there is the interest, we can go into in another article. The important

**PAUL SIMON**, is the pseudonym of an architect, member of the Communist Party. We are publishing his article as an important contribution to the argument on the future of the building industry—a future fouled by capitalist control at present—and a contribution to the formulation of socialist policy. Replies and criticism are welcome.—Editor.

What might happen to each of these proposals, if fought for to the bitter end is that the state machine and the right-wing would turn them into reforms of a state capitalist type (i.e., "nationalize the land firms" into "reintroduce development changes") but the issues are still clear and simple and can be fought for.

All value attached to land is communally owned. Practically all materials industries are monopolized, ill-planned, etc.,

thing to get straight at this stage is, in my opinion, two ideas:

**(1) that working for reforms as a technician in an economic process is NOT working for reformism in the political sense;**

**and (2) that transitional demands must make sense and be capable of being won, even if the dialectics of change transform any transitional demand won under capitalism into something not "pure, undefiled, and red-as-ruby Socialism."**

**BUILD THE SOCIALIST REVIEW!**

Please send a free trial copy of **SOCIALIST REVIEW** to the following:

Name.....

Address.....

Send to **SOCIALIST REVIEW**  
35b Priory Terrace, London, NW6

# FORUM

*Eric Heffer presents*  
the case for

# THE INDUSTRIAL UNION — 1

TO MANY in the working-class movement, the question of Industrial Unionism is purely academic, something that is discussed in the abstract, without connection with reality. However, at the 1957 Trades Union Congress, the issue was brought down from abstract discussion and placed squarely on the agenda of the British workers' movement.

It was obvious, beforehand, that it would generate much discussion and arouse many passions. Indeed, so concerned were the TUC General Council at the explosive nature of the issue before them, that they decided it had to be discussed in private session.

The question was brought forward by the NUR, an organization long associated with the Industrial Unionist outlook. Although supported by the NUR, it was, however, shelved, and remitted to the EC with very little encouragement for future hope. With things as they are, this was not unexpected. There are many vested interests in the present trade union set-up, and these will need to be overcome before serious progress can be made.

## New conditions

Does the 1957 Congress decision mean that all is settled, is the issue now a dead letter? My answer is quite definitely, no. The problems which brought the question to the floor of Congress remain, and a vote by trade union delegates cannot get rid of them. Life itself will increasingly force the issues involved before the workers, and they in turn will demand an answer. The fact that things are wrong in the present structure and organizations is reflected in the many books and pamphlets written about trade unions today. Some, like G. D. H. Cole's pamphlet, actually ask the question, "What is Wrong with the Trade Unions?" as does also the Socialist pamphlet written by Tom Brown. Naturally many different answers are given to the question, but what is particularly interesting is that the issue is raised precisely now, at this stage. We need to examine the basic reasons why the question is raised.

The first obvious reason is that the present trade union structure does not tie in with the rapidly changing structure of British industry. Automation, new methods and new materials are breaking down the traditional distinction between skilled, semi- and unskilled and workers are being

brought much closer together as a result. Secondly, employers are acting in closer harmony than in the past, and in most industries workers are finding themselves face to face with powerful national employers' combines or the State itself if they are employed in nationalized undertakings. At the same time, the State increasingly directly intervenes on behalf of the employers, and the interconnection between State and industry has grown closer than ever.

## Inefficiency of unions

These facts alone are sufficient to expose the inefficiency and ineffectiveness of the present union structure. Obviously a change is required, however vigorous the opposition on the part of the more conservative wing of the movement, including those of its adherents who may wear a left label on their coats.

To give two examples of what I mean, let me quote the costly demarcation disputes which take place from time to time (Cammell Laird's has featured recently), and secondly the ridiculous set-up on British Railways where three unions exist in place of one and where inter-union black-legging has actually taken place during strikes. (I realize that union leaders would dispute the use of the term 'blacklegging' but that is what it really was.)

These examples alone show how archaic the structure and ideas are, and how on occasion, narrow craft and sectional interests are put before the interests of all workers in a given industry.

## British trade-unions

Let me briefly set down the various types of trade union in Britain today. The three main groups are: (1) Craft Unions, (2) General Unions, and (3) Industrial Unions. There is also a fourth group which is in fact a hybrid, and which does not really come within any one particular category, but which has features of either one or more of the main types.

Within the first group fall unions like ASW, PTU, ASLEF, etc.; in the second group we have unions like the T&GWU and the NUGMW, and in the third group the NUM, NUR, UPW, and the Iron and Steel Confederation. Within the last group (Number 4), should be included such giants as the AEU, USDAW, as well as the ETU, the AUBTW, etc.

A peculiar feature of the British trade union scene is the exist-

ence of various Federations made up of unions which fall in the many categories. For example we see the T&GWU, the ASW and the AUBTW all existing side by side within the NFBTO. The same situation obtains in the Confederation of Ship-building and Engineering Unions, the Furnishing Trades Federation, and the Printing Trades Federation.

It is obvious from the above that more and more unions within the same industry have been forced to co-operate, to unite around certain basic questions. What needs to be stressed, however, is that in today's conditions we have to take the process further and actually unite federated unions into one organization, creating within each industry an industrial union, capable of dealing with all the problems of that industry in the interests of all the workers and not merely one section.

## The pioneers

Advocates of Industrial Unionism have been many and varied. United in demanding the industrial union, they have often been poles apart on other questions.

The demand was first raised clearly and forcefully in the USA when it found such champions as Daniel De Leon, Eugene V. Debs and Big Bill Haywood. In Britain the main advocate was Tom Mann, ably seconded by that great revolutionary thinker James Connolly. All these men posed the class struggle as against class collaboration and felt that the Industrial Union was vastly superior to the craft union in the conduct of the class struggle.

The pioneers of Industrial Unionism can be roughly divided into two: (1) those who thought that the Industrial Unions, federated together, organizing and controlling industry, could lead the workers to liberation without political action; and (2) those who believed that Industrial Unions, although an important factor in the workers' struggles and one which would form the basis for the new industrial society, could not do the job alone but would need to be supplemented by political action (mainly through the ballot box) led by a political party.

The first school of thought was strongly influenced by the Syndicalist philosophy, and the second was mainly Marxist, its major exponent being Daniel De Leon.

There is no doubt that in the USA the International Workers of

the World (IWW), which at first reflected both schools and later the purely syndicalist outlook, had a tremendous effect on later developments, and indirectly laid the basis for the growth of the CIO (Congress of Industrial Organizations).

The IWW itself did not advance beyond a certain stage and after 1918 went into rapid decline, until today it has only a few isolated adherents who cling desperately to its past glories. The CIO grew on the basis of the mass production plants, and because the old AF of L (American Federation of Labour) craft unions were incapable of meeting the needs of the new type of worker.

However, although Industrial Unions grew millions strong in the USA, they were not what the pioneers envisaged. They had absolutely no socialist content and remained purely organs for economic struggle. Nevertheless, they did, at the outset, adopt novel, revolutionary methods of struggle. They followed the Italian method of 1920 and carried out a number of stay-in strikes, which struck terror into the hearts of the US industrialists, as it raised the vital question of ownership and control of the factories. It was precisely this challenge to their ownership that made the business and state leaders "talk turkey" and forced them to grant many concessions as well as trade union recognition.

Certain lessons must be drawn from the American experience. These are that **Industrial Unionism, although a big advance, is no guarantee against bureaucratic developments within the unions.**

The CIO unions today (now again united with the AF of L) are as bureaucratic as the older craft unions; the struggle for democratization takes place equally in them as it does in the AF of L unions.

**Bureaucracy arises out of material conditions, conditions which give privileges to the leaders and which raise the bureaucrats above the mass, resulting in the leaders struggling to maintain their position, both against the workers and the employers, but which in the last analysis means reliance on the employers as against the rank and file.**

That is why today the American union leaders see their future only in an adjustment of the private property system; they do not at any time raise the question of socialism.

*To be continued*

# YOUNG SOCIALIST

NOW  
TWICE  
MONTHLY

NUMBER 5

FEBRUARY 1, 1958

## Notebook

IN OUR DECEMBER issue we reported the first attempt of the London Labour Party EC to run a Week-end Youth School, and made some major criticisms of the way it was organized. In this report from the West Midlands, we show that the same criticisms are relevant there—only more so.

\* \* \*

... After tea we had a report from Miss Moody, West Midlands Regional Youth Organizer. She dealt at length with the means whereby Youth Sections could increase their membership: dances, socials, and visits to places of interest were her main suggestions. However, we were told that a few meetings where politics could be mentioned would be permitted.

She said Birmingham had been very successful in their recruiting campaign.

At dinner our delegation was fortunate enough to be seated next to two of the Birmingham delegates. The two girls in question were not only unaware of the exact whereabouts of Stoke-on-Trent (a fact which I regarded as purely fortuitous) but they were also ignorant as to which part of Birmingham they lived in. We were undecided whether to put this down to the shortage of teachers in the area or the success of Miss Moody's campaign.

A social evening had been arranged for delegates. But, unfortunately, the sight of Bewdley—a few licensed houses and an ill-attended dance-hall—proved a greater attraction. Soon after 11 p.m., delegates started returning to the guest house, and we expected everybody to behave with due decorum. However, the next few hours proved to be the most active of the week-end. The noise, that somehow or other failed to wake Miss Moody—kept everybody awake. There were sounds of drunken revelry that continued well on into the night.

Next morning, a delegation from Rowley Regis, disgusted at the previous night's activities, left the school. Two Teddy Boys were asked to leave, for they had been responsible for 'an unfortunate incident'—to quote the organizer.

Reflecting on the week-end, I thought it was a failure from the point of view of Socialist Education—however successful it might have been in other ways. **It shows the futility of Transport House's policy of trying to attract youth on the basis of socials and record evenings rather than allowing youth to have a democratic organization with the right to formulate policy.**

DEREK HART  
Stoke Youth Section

## REVOLT IN THE YCL

ANOTHER CRISIS in the Communist Party of Great Britain: an opposition group, based on Islington, has emerged to challenge the leadership of the London Young Communist League. The group have come out into the open and published a **Bulletin** and an open letter to John Gollan, General Secretary of the Communist Party, in which they make the familiar criticisms of their Stalinist leadership; they reply to the leadership's attacks on them for 'revisionism' by pointing to the Party's history of one crude 'revision' after the other. Fair enough. And they also point out that the leadership has committed itself to the crudest 'revisionism' in the future by its bland refusal to commit itself to history: "Here again we have no authentic history, either of the Soviet or British Party to assist us. How can we claim," they ask, "to be a Marxist Party and at the same time not produce an accurate history of past events?" How indeed?

### Moscow versus Marxism

They go on to submit that "the great obstacle to our work in building the Party and YCL today is that we are still known as 'Moscow men' and not as Marxists, who are not afraid to give a truthful accounting of past events, even though these may be unpleasant for some of our leading people." Rather than risk any such unpleasantness, the London District Committee of the YCL duly recommended the expulsion of the Islington comrades at its meeting on January 8th. And more expulsions are planned for the next meeting.

All this need hardly surprise us. But in the **Bulletin**, the Group's criticism of YCL policy (of course, no different from that of the parent Party), both in its analysis and in its conclusions, points the socialist alternative in unmistakable terms.

### Co-exist with Cousins

On the industrial front, they criticize their leadership for its part in the sell-out of the BMC workers which the **Daily Worker** called a 'partial victory.' This was excused by the CP leadership

True, the right-wing leaders don't make the Labour Party the most exciting place: but we believe that the place for the militant young socialist is in the Labour Party Youth Sections; the Labour Party is the Party of the British working class, and although the Sections are still relatively weak we believe they can be built up into an effective socialist youth movement.

A minority of young socialists have, however, chosen to join the Young Communist League. We believe they were mistaken. In the review of recent events there, printed below, we show some of the reasons why, and how the struggle for a socialist program in their organization is even harder than in our Sections. Although we don't agree with all their ideas, there is enough common ground for us to be pleased to play the host to these comrades.—Editor.

on the grounds of necessity to co-exist with the right-wing union leaders. This desire to co-exist with right-wing union leaders, capitalism and anything else that might come in handy to co-exist with, can also be seen in the CP leaders going out of their way to "praise Frank Cousins, when he has clearly shown himself in his true colours as a strike breaker at the Covent Garden Market dispute. Is it because," asks the **Bulletin**, "they hope he will support a policy of not debarring communists from holding office in the Transport and General Workers' Union?" Doesn't this kind of policy result in stupidities like the parodic slogan 'All power to the General Council' at the time of the General Strike? It did, and does. The CP leaders show that the only people they won't co-exist with are the working class.

### Fixers or Fighters?

**If we want to fight redundancy, Young Socialists must fight it on the factory floor.**

On the issue of rents, the CP leadership is shown to be more interested in fixing friendly Labour councillors than mobilizing the workers in the workshops: "In what way do we agitate for support against the Tory Rent Act? We encourage the setting up of Tenants' Associations duly affiliated to the National Association of Tenants and Residents. In itself this is ineffective. Unless this is backed up by an **all out campaign in the labour movement, with emphasis on the labour movement** and not on the tenants' associations, then it will never succeed."

### Peace and Socialism

On the issue of peace, the same preference for 'fixing' other politicians rather than mobilizing the working class is disclosed: "Our energies are spent in demanding Big Five meetings under the auspices of UNO. It is explained that war can be averted by making agreements between socialist (?!—Ed.) and capitalist countries to ban the H-bomb, etc. **Our attitude to peace cannot be separated from our attitude to the overthrow of capitalism.**"

And on the issue of conscription the YCL's 'apology for a policy' is equally roundly exposed. The leadership "still call only for a cut." "We can all see through the Tory promises of eventual abolition once they have an 'adequate' regular army. This makes it all the more necessary to line ourselves up with the entire labour movement and the vast majority of working-class youth and call for the immediate dropping of the call-up.

### Abolish conscription

"The question is posed—should we as a Marxist organisation support a policy of conscription in a capitalist country?"

"Some say it is necessary because it will be difficult to use conscripts as strike breakers or as cannon fodder for colonial wars. They even say that conscripts are a democratizing influence on the army.

"However, the facts are that conscripts **have** been used on many occasions as strike breakers in the dock strike and fuel transport drivers' strike, to name a couple. They **are** used to fight colonial workers, and far from having a democratizing effect on the armed forces, are systematically indoctrinated with imperialist and anti-working class ideas.

"We demand a principled and Marxist policy. **NO CONSCRIPTION IN ANY FORM.** The armed forces forming as they do part of the state machine, will only defend our class enemy, the capitalist class."

\* \* \*

This opposition group has done well to show the hopeless position of Marxists trying to work for socialism in the CP and YCL. The **Young Socialist** believes that Marxists should join the Labour Party and help build up Youth Sections into a strong socialist youth movement.

YS Report

## NEXT ISSUE

SPAIN :  
YOUTH against FRANCO

# THE MOVEMENT

## Labour Anniversaries — I

### FEB. 4 1839 — The First Chartist Convention assembles

By HENRY COLLINS

CHARTISM was the first political movement of the working class anywhere in the world. Though the workers had been a force in British politics fairly consistently since 1815, they had fought for democratic rights under the leadership of the liberal bourgeoisie. In 1832 the first Reform Act extended the franchise to a section of the middle class and the landed aristocracy had been forced to concede a share in political power. The workers had fought for the Reform Bill under the impression that a government under strong pressure from the middle class would be closer to the people than one dominated exclusively by the aristocracy. They soon discovered their mistake.

#### From study to street

One of the first acts of the reformed House of Commons was the New Poor Law, which made the administration of relief considerably harsher. Two years later, in 1836, the London Working Men's Association, under the leadership of William Lovett, a cabinet-maker and an active trade unionist and co-operator, was formed. At first a modest study circle, the Association soon began to hold public meetings and under the impact of a severe economic crisis began to win substantial support among the London artisans.

In February, 1837, the Association convened a public meeting at the **Crown and Anchor**, in the Strand, and began a national campaign for a series of demands, of which manhood suffrage was the most important. These demands, later embodied in the six points of the People's Charter, became the focus of working class politics for more than a decade.

#### People's Charter

**"A vote for every man twenty-one years of age, of sound mind, and not undergoing punishment for crime"; a secret ballot; no property qualifications for members of Parliament; payment of members; equal constituencies; annual parliaments, constituted a program which, in the then state of working class opinion, would have led directly to social revolution.**

The movement for the People's Charter, however, was far from being united because the working class, on which the agitation was based, was not homogeneous. The London artisans, who started the movement, were mainly independent craftsmen and factory industry was almost unknown in the

South. In the North there was a growing factory proletariat recently recruited from farms and villages together with thousands of handloom weavers and others precariously clinging to the remains of their independence. In the Midlands, the agitation was led, for a time, by the Birmingham Political Union, representing the lower middle-class followers of the banker, Attwood.

London became the nucleus of the "moral force" Chartists who, led by Lovett, believed in strictly constitutional methods. The "physical force" Chartists, of whom Feargus O'Connor was the outstanding leader and of which the **Northern Star** was, from its first publication in Leeds in 1837, the main organ, wanted the movement to set up its own revolutionary authority to wrest power from Parliament, by force if necessary. The Birmingham Political Union combined advocacy of the Charter with propaganda for currency reform, as the means to abolish poverty.

#### The Convention

On February 4, 1839, the first Chartist Convention assembled at the British Coffee House, Cockspur Street, Charing Cross. It consisted of delegates elected by mass meetings and the name "Convention" was intended to evoke memories of the revolutionary assembly in Paris in 1792. William Lovett, in his autobiography, **The Life and Struggles of William Lovett**, gave this account of the Convention.

"The delegates to this body were, for the most part, appointed by very large bodies of men. The Birmingham meeting was composed of 200,000, the Manchester meeting of 300,000, that of Glasgow of 150,000, of Newcastle of 70,000, and other towns equally large in proportion to their population. The number of delegates composing the Convention was **fifty-three**, many of them representing several places, with a view to economy. Of this number three were magistrates, six newspaper editors, one clergyman of the Church of England, **Socialist Review**—FOUR — one Dissenting minister, and two doctors of medicine, the remainder being shopkeepers, tradesmen and journeymen. . . . On their first assembling the Birmingham delegates proposed me as secretary, and, though the proposition was at first strongly opposed by some of the physical force party, I was eventually elected unanimously."

The composition of the Convention was, because of its location in London, over-weighted in favour of the middle-class and

professional supporters. Even so, concessions had to be made to the "physical force" wing, which provided most of the driving force to the movement. The Convention published its own weekly paper, **The Charter**, and when the attitude of the Government appeared threatening, the Convention issued a manifesto which was published in **The Charter** of February 17.

#### Manifesto of action

**"Your demand," it told the rank and file of the movement "is for Universal Suffrage . . . a right of which no human power can justly deprive you . . . and which you must regain at any risk—peaceably, if you may, forcibly if you must.**

**"If forced to resort to it in self-defence, even to that last tribunal we are prepared to appeal rather than continue in bondage, and rather to lay our heads upon the block as free men than to rest them on the pillow as slaves . . . such interference, however, depends not upon us; and if the infatuation of those in power prompt them to have recourse to it, so surely as in the exercise of it they dare to trench upon the liberties of Britain, so surely shall they be met with that stern resolve which prompts men either to conquer or die . . ."**

#### Not by bread alone . . .

The Chartists had, among other things, to define their attitude to the Anti-Corn Law League which, financed by the northern manufacturers, was campaigning for the repeal of the import duties on corn which it regarded as the main cause of the prevailing poverty. In a resolution proposed by Bronterre O'Brien, who had edited **The Poor Man's Guardian** (it had been published unstamped, in defiance of the newspaper tax), the Convention unanimously resolved that "the people's undivided attention should be concentrated upon "the success of the National Petition" for the Charter. The resolution, which also appeared in **The Charter** on February 17 went on to say that "the present agitation for a repeal of the Corn Laws was intended and does actually tend to divert the working classes from that permanent object." In fact, "such an unconditional repeal as would alone be likely to receive the sanction of the Anti-Corn Law agitators, would be rather injurious than otherwise to the interests of the poorer classes." This was because of the Chartist conviction that, in the absence of working class

political enfranchisement, a fall in the price of bread would be followed by a fall in the level of wages, and that the manufacturers wanted to bring down bread prices mainly as a means of securing cheap labour.

#### Revolution defeats reform

While the "moral force" Chartists saw, in the Convention, a deliberative and propagandist body, the "physical force" Chartists wanted to make it a centre of working class power. A "moral force" resolution which would have committed the Convention to "oppose and protest against any and every thing, whether in act or in word, which may arise among the members of its own body, and which may be in any degree in contempt of the law" and also to declare "that it is no part of the business of the delegates to this Convention, in their collective capacity and as now appointed, to offer, under any circumstances whatsoever, any dictation or advice for the guidance of their constituents or of any part of the people" was defeated by 36 votes to 6.

#### First chapter ends

Nevertheless, when the Government replied to the Convention by rejecting the petition in July, and arresting a number of leading Chartists, including Lovett, there was no leadership forthcoming from the Convention. The Birmingham middle-class leaders had already broken away and when a half-hearted decision was made to call a general strike—the contemporary term was "Sacred Month"—there was no agreement on tactics or objective. The call for a general strike was issued and then rescinded. In the prevailing confusion, an attempted rising in Newport was quickly crushed. The campaign for the first Petition ended in total failure.

When the movement revived two years later it was under very different, more militant and more working class leadership. But that forms another chapter in Chartist history, a chapter which also ended in defeat but which saw the movement of Labour reach a height of militancy and organization never previously attempted.

**Note:** Contemporary documents quoted in this article are reproduced, in part, in **British Working Class Movements**, by G. D. H. Cole and A. W. Filson and in **From Cobbett to the Chartists**, by Max Morris.

British working class history is rich in lessons for our generation. In this issue, we begin a new series, **LABOUR ANNIVERSARIES**, which will help to keep alive the memory of British working-class militancy, and our socialist tradition, in the face of the deadening hand of official historiography. Our main contributor will be labour historian, **HENRY COLLINS**; but readers are invited to contribute reminiscences and aspects of local history that would be of interest to others.—Editor.

**NEXT ANNIVERSARY**  
**WILLIAM COBBETT**

# PARTY COMMENTARY by Ron Lewis

The purpose of this commentary will be to spotlight events and statements of particular relevance to the struggle for socialism within our Labour Party. In order to give it the widest coverage and a telling punch, readers are invited to let us know what is going on in their own areas—good as well as bad, please!

**RON LEWIS**, our commentator, is well qualified for the job. Experience as Parliamentary Candidate, County Councillor, Organizer for Victory for Socialism, and in a number of other capacities has given him a sharp insight into the character and workings of the Party; an insight all the sharper since it flows from a militant socialist position and a revolutionary idealism.—Editor.

*Error is continually repeated in action. That is why we must continually repeat the truth in words.*

[Goethe]

THE MOST SINGULAR thing about the present political situation in Britain is the apathy of the rank and file of the Labour Party and the obvious failure of the Party to win any significant number of votes away from the Tories. In almost every constituency the story is the same: dwindling attendances at Ward and GMC meetings, a dearth of members prepared to undertake work, and a general lack of enthusiasm. And nothing that the Tories do seems to make any difference.

Contrast this with the situation existing during the last months of the Labour Government. Then the Tories were expanding their membership, raising masses of money, and in a word, were in every field **dynamic**. Such was the mood of the Tories with the smell of victory in their nostrils.

## Tories contrast with LP

In one field the contrast between the Tories on the eve of victory and the Labour Party today, is even more striking; the than they. Every little nuance organization of youth. Young Conservative branches were in existence everywhere and numbered their members—even in the worst of constituencies—in hundreds. They constituted a tremendous militant force within the Tory Party organization. We attributed the Tory success with youth at that time to the natural inclination of the young to be opportunist. But what of today?

True, even in its halcyon days the Labour Party was not distinguished by its success in organizing the young, but even that congenial ineptitude does not disguise the fact that today virtually the only youngsters in the Party are the 'young in spirit.'

What is the cause of this apathy?

A one-word answer is **policy**; but the present situation is the result of a number of other things as well. After all, we have had bad, weak, vacillating policy before without things being quite as bad as they are today. **The chief cause is the failure of the Party to relate its propaganda to the daily lives of the workers.** This has resulted in a growing number of voters thinking that politics are merely the struggle for the fruits of office. All the while the average rank and file Party-member could believe that no matter how little we seemed to progress towards socialism, it was neverthe-

less our ultimate goal, he was not too affected by the apathy of the people at large. Also, as long as he believed that there was a good chance of changing the policy of the Party through various means—including Bevan—there was something to go on for.

The rot really began to set in with German re-armament, for the way in which the obvious majority view of the Party was contrived to be defeated, caused many stalwarts to 'vote with their feet' and quit active Party-work. Finally, Nye Bevan has succumbed to statesman's disease and the chief rallying point of the broad left of the Party has disappeared.

\* \* \*

WHAT OUGHT TO BE DONE about this situation I hope to consider in future issues of this paper. In the meantime, a word about the heart-searching that is going on in the more exalted regions of Hampstead and its environs.

The defection of Nye Bevan from the Bevanites has at last caused some members of the higher echelon of that group to recognize the necessity for organizing a co-ordinating body of left-wingers. Those of us who have been trying to do this for some time might feel a little vexed at being pushed out of the way to make room for the new generals, but such feelings would be premature. **Personally I welcome everyone who wishes to help in the creation of a genuine community of the left within the Party but the important job is on the ground in the constituencies. And it is up to all who care about socialism to take a special interest in the formation of any new group, or "reconstruction" of any existing left wing group. The duty of convinced socialists is to get into it, and especially to prevent its local organizations from falling into the hands of sycophants. Total abstention by advanced socialists will predestine it to become another intellectual mausoleum like the Fabian Society.**

\* \* \*

IF DECEMBER'S ISSUE of the **Labour Organiser** is to be believed, about the only people who are coming into the Labour Party in considerable numbers are ex-Communists. In one of the most stupid articles I have ever had the misfortune to read it is suggested that among the thousands who resigned from the CP over Hungary are some who have publicly announced their resignations in order to enter and capture for the

Communist Party, key positions in the Labour Party. In addition even those who resigned sincerely over Hungary "may . . . still regard themselves as Communists."

I was reminded when reading this article of the caption to a famous American cartoon published at the height of the witch-hunt:

"But Officer. I am an ANTI-communist."

"I don't care what kind of a communist you are."

Nobody who has studied the antics of the British Stalinists over the years can seriously believe that it is the avowed aim of the Party to penetrate the Labour Movement by pretended resignation from the CP. They are far too bigoted a sect for such cleverness; indeed it is to be doubted whether in history a political group has ever existed more dedicated to the death-wish of Soviet changes of policy has been defended no matter what the cost in members, electoral support and their own intellectual integrity.

## The correct attitude

What should be the attitude of the Labour Party to applications for membership from ex-Communists?

**In my view they should be treated like any other application. They sign a declaration that they agree with the principles of the Party and that should be good enough. If after they become members they show them-**

**elves to be working against the Party, sufficient means exist for dealing with them. After all, what assurance do we seek from other applications? The man signs his form pays his tanner and he is in. He might be a secret member of the Conservative Party or even the Liberal Party. I don't think that we should make the ex-CPer a parliamentary candidate straight away like we seem to with ex-Liberals, but apart from that I would welcome him and glory in his conversion.**

## The way of disillusionment

A lot of people argue of course that if these people were really sincere they would have left the CP long ago. But this is an oversimplification of the process of disenchantment which is often a slow one. For years the process consists of small chinks of light appearing in the Party's philosophical armour. But there are one's friends and acquaintances, and the comfortable familiarity which is the fruit of perhaps years of activity. There is also the thought that perhaps I might be at fault, I may have failed to understand. Then, all at once, as in a flash, creeping and isolated doubts become unified and disillusionment is total.

To attempt to brand people who will have undoubtedly undergone quite a serious emotional and intellectual struggle with themselves, pariahs, is another example of the cold, inhuman, cynical view of humanity that bureaucracy so often exhibits.

## SOCIALIST FORUMS

Forum Secretaries,  
use our columns  
freely

## ISLINGTON PROGRAM

On Monday, January 20th, Stuart Hall, co-author of **The Insiders**, spoke on this important pamphlet.

The experiences and lessons of the **German revolutionary movement** will be discussed on Monday, February 3rd. Tony Cliff will open the discussion on the events in Germany up till 1933 and Arthur Urbansky will take over from there and describe the events and the rise of Fascism up till the outbreak of war.

## Future events:

Feb. 17th.—**Lessons of 1926 General Strike.**

Mar. 3rd.—**The French Revolutionary Movement—Martin**

Grainger.

Mar. 17th.—**Today's industrial struggle and the Labour Party.**

Mar. 31st.—**The Chinese revolutionary movement.**

Apl. 14th.—**Religion and Marxism—F. R. Ridley.**

Apl. 28th.—**Spain 1936.** It is hoped to get speakers from POUM and the British and German Battalions not in POUM.

May 12th.—Mike Kidron on **Automation.**

All meetings start at 8 p.m. at 20 Cannonbury Park North, London, N.1.

## PARLIAMENT

*"You have sat too long here for any good you have been doing. Depart, I say, and let us have done with you. In the name of God, go."*

*Cromwell to the Long Parliament.*

One of the greatest difficulties facing Parliamentarians and political correspondents is that the words get worn out.

When one has to discuss anything of importance the bow wave of verbiage soon builds up into what might be called the 'bull barrier.'

Consider the most pressing of our present discontents. A few small groups of men can—and possibly will—wreck the world, destroy it, turn it into a vast radio-active cemetery.

'Oh,' you say, 'That's old stuff, that drum's been hammered thin by now.'

But it hasn't. Only the words themselves have been used up, worn to death until they are mere disaster symbols and no longer carry the truly terrible meanings that are their literal context.

To turn from the macabre to the melodramatic think on the present Government.

## "DEPART, I SAY . . ."

For centuries, three at the very least, opposition MPs have stood up and declaimed, pamphleteers and journalists have sat down and written, assailing the Governments of their day with the most dignified reproaches, the most galling insults, the most memorable quips that their considerable ingenuities could contrive.

Men in ruffs, wigs, cravats, top hats and Norfolk breeches have caught the Speaker's eye and howled execration at Stafford and Cromwell and Walpole and Peel and Balfour for the unmitigated disasters that would flow from putting common pasture to the plough and for not ensuring that sufficient corn was grown; for not providing compulsory municipal sanitation and (over and over again) for interfering with the Englishman's liberty.

### The present government

What would they have said, what **could** they have said to a Government:

Which, by deceit, involved the country in an unpopular war and lost it within a week?

Which gave a foreign Government, indeed that Government's local commanders, the right to declare war for Britain irrespec-

tive of the wishes of the British Government, let alone of the British people?

When workers at Harwell go a long way towards obtaining nuclear power from seawater, in other words towards supplying the world with abundant cheap energy for ever, the Government reaction is to suppress the news until it suits the convenience of the Americans to announce it.

Finally it splits between those who think that it is better to soak the poor and those who believe in hanging on and hoping for the best.

If only Cromwell could speak again in the Commons and put his views once more on the mis-Government of the country he cherished! He would probably shame us all by showing what vigorous use could still be made of our old familiar words.

NB. The observant may notice that no mention has been made of the present opposition. Well, we can't think of anything to say. Can you?

MICHAEL MILLETT

## LETTERS

### Memories of John Maclean

I should like to comment on one or two points in Mr. Harry McShane's interesting article on John Maclean in your January 1st issue.

It is news to me, a founder-member of the Catholic Socialist Society, that we were affiliated to the ILP. The Society welcomed Catholics who were members of, or sympathized with, the policy of any Socialist party. It may interest your readers to know that the author of one of our pamphlets was Hubert Bland, one of the original Fabian essayists.

And I take leave to doubt McShane's version of the incident when chairman John Wheatley is said to have whispered to Maclean that he was speaking to a Catholic audience when he (Maclean) began to talk about the origin of man. There are two assumptions in this story. One is that Wheatley secretly believed in a theory which was opposed to the teaching of his church—in other words, that he was a

hypocrite. I knew John Wheatley well, and I say without the slightest hesitation that such an insinuation is utterly unfounded.

The second assumption, equally unwarranted, is that Catholics are ninnyes who are afraid to face scientific facts, presumably because their church forbids them to do so. Why anyone should think that Catholics are unwilling to discuss man's origin is a mystery I am unable to solve. Perhaps McShane can help me here.

It is almost impossible to lift an "advanced" paper without coming upon some slighting reference to the Catholic Church. Why is it that Socialists have to be reminded that the enemy is CAPITALISM, and that potential fighters against it should not have their attention distracted from the struggle by the red herring of Vatican villainy or any of the other ichthyological monstrosities from the well-stocked aquarium of the reactionary?

I should like to register my agreement with McShane when he pays tribute to Maclean for the unselfish work he did for the movement. He was a tireless worker. Once at the Labour College, of which I was secretary, a teacher was wanted for an Esperanto class. At the time we were all, Maclean included, overwhelmed with work. When I mentioned the matter to him he immediately offered to take the class. I said to him, "I was not aware that you knew Esperanto, John." He replied: "I don't; but I can learn it, and keep one jump ahead of the class!"

He approached more closely than any other man I have ever known to Bakunin's ideal of a revolutionary: "A consecrated man who will allow no private interests or feelings . . . to turn him aside from his mission, the aim of which is by all available means to overturn the existing society."

W. P. LAVIN

**Readers, we like to hear from you — but short**

**SOCIALIST REVIEW** is published twice a month by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd., 35b Priory Terrace, London, N.W.6. (Tel.: MAlda Vale 9258). Subscriptions, from this address, post paid: 1 year: 16s. 6 months: 8s. 3 months: 4s. Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of **Socialist Review** which are given in editorial statement. Editorial communications should be sent to Michael Kidron, 30 Hamilton Terrace, London, N.W.8. (Tel.: CUNningham 9616). Printed by H. Palmer (Harlow) Ltd. (TU), Potter Street, Harlow, Essex.

### SOCIALIST REVIEW SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I enclose <sup>16s.</sup> <sup>8s.</sup> <sup>4s.</sup> subscription for <sup>1 year's</sup> <sup>6 months'</sup> <sup>3 months'</sup> issue of **SOCIALIST REVIEW.**

Name.....

Address.....

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

## WHAT WE STAND FOR

The **SOCIALIST REVIEW** stands for international Socialist democracy. Only the mass mobilisation of the working class in the industrial and political arena can lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

The **SOCIALIST REVIEW** believes that a really consistent Labour Government must be brought to power on the basis of the following programme:

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments based on a means test. Renationalisation 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 election, immediate recall and receiving the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.

- The inclusion of workers' representatives on the boards of all private firms employing more than 20 people. These representatives to have free access to all documents.

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

- The establishment of the principle of work or full maintenance.

- The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, linked to a realistic cost-of-living index, the abolition of all payments for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.

- The expansion of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities and the right to requisition privately 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 to all workers whatever their country of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.

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

- The unification of an independent Ireland.

- The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas. The abolition of all weapons of mass destruction.

- A Socialist foreign policy independent of both Washington and Moscow.