

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

FORTNIGHTLY
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

9th YEAR No 8

MAY DAY 1959

SIXPENCE

May Day Slogan

OUT WITH THE TORIES!

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

★ ★ ★

Tory rule means murder in Nyasaland (5 bleeding years of Cypriot history have just been buried).

Tory rule means a showdown with organized labour (remember the rehearsal with busmen, meatmen, dockers and builders).

Tory rule means unemployment and short-time working (still over half a million on the books and another half million uncounted).

Tory rule means slow starvation for pensioners (nothing in the Budget while Big Business got some £300 million on and off the record).

Tory rule means taking £200 million from the workers in higher National Insurance contributions and giving it to high income earners in the Budget.

Tory rule means a cut in council house building to below what it was just at the end of the war in 1945; it means jacking up rents to private landlords by an extra £150 million a year (before the effect of the Rent Act was felt last October); it means mortgaging for ever the lives of those compelled to buy houses of their own (loans are now dearer than they have been for a generation).

Tory rule means strangulation of nationalized industry (like London Transport's death by mutilation).

Tory rule means all this and more: stagnation in industry and exports, paring away of education, sowing the seeds of racialism.

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

★ ★ ★

THE job of Labour, of every section of the movement, is clear: rout the Tories, smash their confidence, defeat them and theirs whenever we meet them. Only Labour can do it. Do it it must.

It won't be done by watching the swing of 'public opinion', or by getting into a huddle with Dr. Gallup. We'll not do it by creating a 'party image' instead of a program.

Labour must enter this election period with a clear message:

Freedom for Nyasaland and all colonies!

All out support and recognition for embattled workers in their daily struggles!

Work or full maintenance! No sackings!

A fair-deal for old age pensioners!

A massive housing program, expanding education!

Full national planning under workers' control!

The abolition of the Bomb immediately, unilaterally!

Let Labour march this May Day with a clear purpose: Out with the Tories, out with their world! Labour to power, armed with a goal!

Let massive marches prepare a massive defeat for the Tories at the local polls; let this be a clear pointer to the General Election later on.

- **Aircraft Steel Structures** page 2
- **Building and Printing** page 3
- **London Buses** page 8

INDUSTRIAL DUDLEY EDWARDS, CONVENER, writes on SMALL STRIKE — BIG ISSUE, AT AIRCRAFT STEEL STRUCTURES

Engineering workers are once again becoming the defence corps of the Labour movement and bearing the brunt of the bosses' current attack. It is not long since the BOAC dispute was the storm centre; Handley Page is now—in the last week of April—demanding all our moral and financial support (we shall be dealing with the issues involved in a later number). But there are others, many others. One of the most important for the general lesson it presents to industrial workers is the dispute at Aircraft Steel Structures in North West London. It shows how industrial amalgamations and the concentration of control in industry are always made at the expense of the workers in the firm, that the daily civil war of Big Business finds its casualties amongst the working class non-combatants. It makes a powerful case for national planning under workers' control—Editor

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

THE strike of 160 members of the AEU and some other unions at Aircraft Steel Structures—now a subsidiary of Simms Motors and Electronics—is in itself a small affair, but it raises very big issues for the whole trade union and Labour movement.

The direct action resorted to and supported 100 per cent. by the workers of this factory since March 26th is of particular importance because we are facing a period of increasing industrial amalgamation and take-over. If the type of ruthless action in which this large combine is indulging is not stopped, then monopoly capitalism can inflict a very serious blow on the whole trade union movement.

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

Bosses tactics

As the recently published statement of the Engineering and Allied Employers' National Federation boasted, this body had hoped to stage a fight to the finish which would have "drawn the teeth" of the whole movement in the factories. Indeed these Tory employers went into print fiercely criticizing their political representatives in the Government because at the time of the national strikes in 1957-8 the Government had not the nerve to carry through this policy of a fight to a finish against the unions. Of course the Government was more sensitive to the true feeling in the country and the difficulties arising from the widespread labour opposition to its disastrous Suez policy.

Temporarily thwarted in this policy of frontal attack on the growing strength of the unions,

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

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

Model agreements

Here we have 160 engineering workers who over the past 18 years had succeeded in creating a model shop organization. They worked for a comparatively independent employer. In some respects even benevolent in comparison with the ruthless approach of the "take-over" type of big business executive which has since moved in.

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

Many of the craftsmen involved had been with the firm since its inception—proud of the part they had played in putting this enterprise on the industrial map. Gradually the union succeeded in obtaining a series of model agreements; and although the workers were still far from earning the "full fruits of their labour", they were fully conscious of the benefits won by the 100 per cent. trade union membership which the management had recognized as a necessity.

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

Judgement

What went wrong?

By 1956 this industrial unit, which started with a couple of lathes and a drill and now had £250,000 worth of machinery in-

stalled thanks to the labours of its engineers deserved to be better housed, better equipped, in order to make a still better contribution to the nation's economy. In a sanely planned society it would be provided with credit by the state to carry out this justifiable expansion. Unfortunately no such planning exists. The technical and financial changes required are entirely dependent on the resources, judgement and often on the whims and fancies of private individuals, whose judgement is often quite unrelated to what is happening in the capitalist world outside, with its booms or slumps. For these reasons the "best-laid-plans of mice and men gang aft a-gley."

New factory

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

The reason it has not done so, has nothing to do with the rela-

contd next page col. 3

CLASS WAR DIPLOMACY

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

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

* * *

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

* * *

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

* * *

From the Federation's point of view, once the resistance to the union's claim had ceased to be one actuated by principle, the settlement of the claim in terms of money was a simple enough procedure.

Looking at Industrial Relations, published by the Engineering and Allied Employers' National Federation.

Omar says

ONE UNION FOR THE BUILDING INDUSTRY

BUILDING Trade Unions are agreed in principle that there should be one union for the industry; beyond that they are not prepared to go.

Almost all the leading personalities in the trade union movement believe that industry should be rationalized and that power should be centralized and concentrated in one unitary force. But when it comes to their own organizations they express their preference for anarchy and disunity.

What are the reasons for the reluctance to institute more rational forms of organization?

This attitude may in part be attributed to tradition and its influence on the minds of craftsmen.

We agree with Omar in deploring the present state of bickering disorganization in the building industry. We agree too with the necessity for one union for the industry. What we cannot accept—and believe that no building militant can—is his conclusion that because “the TUC has charted a course which aims at merging the cognate trades within the industry as a first step in the direction of forming one single union” this is necessarily “a practical way of dealing with an almost anarchic state of affairs.” On the contrary, any attempt to impose unity from the august heights of the TUC, any attempt to accommodate the vested interests of office-holders and seekers by paper mergers is pretty certainly doomed to failure. Unity, if it is to be at all, will only be built on the job, through strong site organization, the natural unity created through militant action and despite officialdom’s petty vested interests—**Editor.**

False pride and prejudice also have their place in the lives of craft unionists and, in a way, determine their actions and the structure of their organizations.

But the facts of life must be faced. Social and technical advancement has affected the craftsman just as much as other social and industrial groups.

One significant change is the

conversion of the craftsman into a fixer of products fabricated by other workers in other places.

Another is that division of labour has been developed to a very high degree not only in building but in the ancillary industries. This has had the effect of converting the operative into a specialist and an expert in the performance of a specific operation after a brief, intensive training.

New groupings

The effects of these and other changes have not yet been fully appraised but they are casting shadows which give a clue to coming events.

Already new groupings are taking place among the men who

have acquired new skills and experience and more, they have new ideas. They are not accepting the view that hegemony should continue to remain with the craft organizations.

These changes have exposed the true role of crafts in modern times. They have shown that there is no magic inherent in their vocations and that the value of

their labour power is only slightly higher than that possessed by others.

The craft unions must cease to

BIG ISSUE — contd.

tively decent wages and conditions obtained by the workers organizations. It is partly due to the planlessness of capitalist economy, but even more to the insatiable search for new profits increasingly conducted by big business.

It is precisely because the up and coming industrial combine of Simm’s Motors saw in Aircraft Steel Structures a new well-equipped and potentially profitable enterprise, that it became interested in it.

In fact among the trade union employees there exists the strongest suspicion that after taking over a third of the ASS Company’s shares, Simm’s Motors adopted a policy which contributed to the further financial difficulties of the smaller firm as a means of getting full control at a later date. It is certainly an indisputable fact that once this third share holding had been obtained the smaller factory rapidly became dependent on orders from the larger combine, and these orders were never realized to the extent which could have been reasonably expected.

Having made its preparation, Big Business then moves in, not as Mr. Ayres, the Managing Director, cunningly implies, to save the sinking ship, but because it sees in the smaller enterprise the possibility of a very lucrative investment later on. However, to bring about this desirable state of affairs, some manipulation with labour force will be required. The workers will have to ‘behave themselves’ and help pay for the period of disorganization caused by the ‘take-over’. Therefore, Mr. Ayres’ demand for his now famous free hand.

Duty

A new type of cheaper and less well organized labour will be required, in his own ‘delicate’ language, the Stewards must accept boys, girls and greengrocers suitable to the lower standard of work it will be necessary to engage. The closed shop must go, both because, again to use his words, he is “opposed to it in principle”, and because it does not correspond with his economic interests. The present wages structure which he regards as ‘fantastic’, must be broken down into component parts resulting from the introduction of an incentive bonus scheme—a scheme which must result in a worsening of wages and conditions which no shop steward could accept if he is to abide by his union rule book.

When the stewards and the Divisional Organizer, give the obvious reply of self-respecting trade unionists, that to accept this ultimatum would be to abdicate as representatives of their members—that in fact it is

be bastions supporting a productive system which is rapidly fading away. Gone are the days

See page 6

their duty to defend the status quo, an added bombshell is thrown on the table in the form of a redundancy list of 30 work-mates to be sacked within two days.

It doesn’t matter to big business that the attitude of their shop stewards represent the views of 100 per cent. of their employers. It appears quite irrelevant to Mr. Ayres that on April 24 the North London DC instructed the members to withdraw their labour as from 8 o’clock on April 25, unless the ultimatum was withdrawn. In order to ensure that the very high dividends and bonus paid out by Simms Motors all this is ignored.

The challenge

Now after some inexplicable delay the strike has been made official by the EC of the AEU and at least formally the 900,000 members have therefore fallen in behind these 160 workers fighting for elementary trade union principle. Still this does not seem to have impressed the Simms Board to date. No doubt one of the reasons for this is Managing Director Ayres’ membership of the Executive of the Employers’ Federation. He has no doubt convinced his colleagues that if he is assisted to impose his will, this will provide the rest of them with the necessary precedent to go ahead and make similar attacks on militant trade unionism by identical means.

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

The emblem upon the badge of all AEU members is educate, organize, control. The lesson to be learnt from this struggle that we have reached the stage when the emphasis must be put on the last word, Control. If Labour still takes seriously its professed Socialist aims, then it must face up to the question it has so far evaded. It must in fact challenge the right to “hire and fire” so loudly proclaimed by the boss. Unless this is done, it will be wrecked by the power that the big employers retain to disrupt industry by financial manipulation and to demoralize labour’s natural supporters by putting the workers on the dole queue.

PAY CLAIMS IN PRINTING

by Jobbing Printer

AS from 20th April, the agreements of the National Society of Operative Printers and Assistants with their employers are terminated. NATSOPA are trying to negotiate a new agreement.

The main points of the claims are as follows:

1. Forty hours a week as opposed to 43½ hours worked now. All workers on newspapers—36½ hours a week.

2. 12½ per cent. increase in basic pay.

3. Cost of living bonus to be dropped and the 13/- a week now received to be included in basic pay.

4. Average earnings to be included in annual holiday pay.

There are other points to the case but they will not be dealt with here.

Conditions

We in the printing industry have not had a rise for three years. The last increase cost the employers 8½d. an hour, but the customer was charged 1s. 1d. an hour (**Reynolds News**, April 12, 1959, “You and Your Job”).

Already 40 hours a week is being worked in USA, Canada and New Zealand.

Before both sides met, the employers had issued statements to the press stating why they could not give increased wages. They had also been up to their old tricks of trying to farm work out to the Continent. They did this previously in the 1956 dispute. The People’s League for the Defence of Freedom have also threatened to break any strike that may take place by printing work in rat shops. (Remember the bus strike last year?)

NATSOPA

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

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

Latest: The employers have turned down all claims. The P&KTF has gone back to ballot its members on what to do. NATSOPA will take other action which I cannot discuss here.

LIVERPOOL TRADES COUNCIL and L P's

POLICY FOR THE UNEMPLOYED

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

That is why in the City today, the Trades Council must take up the problem of those already unemployed and become their spokesman, at the same time fighting against an extension of unemployment.

We, therefore, put forward the following proposals:

General Proposals

1. That all sections of the Movement work unceasingly for the removal of the Tory Government and its replacement by a Labour Government, which will make its first task full employment at the expense of profits and the selfish class interests of the employers.

2. That all trade bans and restrictions be removed in relation to Russia, China and the East European countries.

3. That we press for an immediate introduction of the 40 hour week—without loss of pay. That a policy of work-sharing be introduced with the co-operation of the Trade Unions, where redundancy is threatened, and no workers to be sacked until further employment is secured.

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

5. We demand immediate action in those industries where we believe the expansion of Public Ownership in the Building, Shipbuilding and Engineering industries would benefit Merseyside.

Youth**Youth Proposals**

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

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

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

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

5. That there should be more Apprenticeship agreements similar to that existing in the Building industry, where the Unions have joint control with the employers. All apprentices to be taken on with Trade Union agreement and supervision.

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

sidise apprenticeship schemes, such as the Building Masters' Apprenticeship Scheme.

7. That there should be more vocational guidance in all Secondary Schools.

8. That the "Rate for the job" be paid to all young workers where they are doing similar work to those over 21. In order to protect the unorganised juvenile we urge the TUC to take action by introducing a minimum wage.

Lancashire Unemployed Shake Westminster

Far beyond the expectations of the organizers (the Lancashire Federation of Trades Councils) over 800 workers' representatives packed into a hall on Tuesday, March 21. Preceded by a street demonstration and preparing for the greatest mass lobby of Parliament in recent history, the delegates were in no mood to suffer the hesitancy of the assembled Labour MPs on the platform.

Their demand was for "work or reasonable maintenance". There was no mistaking the mood of these delegates. Their numbers and militancy, their distrust of the traditional (and sectarian) leadership, their self-confidence as seen in the continual mass interruptions and unruliness from the floor are a good augury for the future, providing as they do the basis for a genuine rank and file movement geared to unemployment or any other contentious and vital issue.

SR Industrial Report**Proposals for those Unemployed**

1. That the benefits of those unemployed and on National Assistance be immediately raised. The slogan for the unemployed and the Movement should obviously be "Work or Full Maintenance."

2. That the Trades Council set up an unemployment advice bureau, to which the unemployed could bring their problems.

3. That we encourage the unemployed to establish a committee to work with the bureau. This committee to create an ancillary

organization of the unemployed attached to the Trades Council.

4. That in the meantime the Trades Council holds regular meetings amongst the unemployed, explains the policies of socialism and the steps the Trades Council have taken and are taking to fight the growing unemployment.

5. That we press the Merseyside Trades Councils Consultative Committee to urge similar action by other Trades Councils in the area.

Conclusion
In conclusion, we point out that we recognise that unemployment cannot be finally abolished without the introduction of Socialism. This must involve a struggle on the part of the entire Trade Union and Labour Movement.

"NEW REASONER" — end

broad organisation and a journal for militant socialists and industrial workers for whom the "New Reasoner" was on too high a plane. The claims of Victory for Socialism as a broad organisation for left wing Labour Party members and of the "Socialist Review" as a rank and file journal for industrial workers were put forward by several of those who participated in this discussion and Tribune's potential contribution was also raised.

Hard-hitting and amusing contributions from shop stewards and other rank and file trade unionists also featured in the Conference. The 40-hour week and equal pay throughout and a policy for redundancy were put forward as vital issues for the immediate future largely by these contributors.

Although no concrete decisions were arrived at this was the aim of the sponsors, and although there was considerable variation in the views of participants on nearly all questions, the value of the contact was immense.

It gave an opportunity for a wide exchange of views between socialists scattered throughout the country and focused their attention on common problems. It created at the least a fund of

Nevertheless we are convinced that it is our duty to put forward proposals that can immediately assist the working class.

We wish to stress that one of the greatest crimes of this Tory capitalist government is precisely their one of creating a growth of unemployment. That it is partly deliberate goes without question when we examine the Cohen Report and take note of the statements by the various Employers' Federations and Associations. The Tories and their allies, the employers, wish to use unemployment as a means of disciplining the workers and breaking down the gain made particularly since 1945. This policy must be resisted by all sections of the movement, and we believe our proposals are a step in that direction.

goodwill between socialists of different backgrounds, which was certainly not prolific beforehand. Finally it gave a considerable stimulus to many to realize that other similar people were discussing and acting on the same issues throughout Britain.

In calling the Conference and making it possible, the sponsors of "New Reasoner" made yet another contribution to the painfully slow but essential work of regrouping and recruiting the forces of the non-Stalinist Left.

This is precisely the job that the "Socialist Review" is attempting to do in a somewhat different field. Important as the excellent work done by the "New Reasoner" is, it cannot, by its very nature, reach the ordinary rank and file in many cases, because of its highly academic level.

While it is to be desired that every assistance should be given to the "New Reasoner" sales, the "Socialist Review" is equally important within its sphere. For this reason while endorsing the aptness of the quotation made at the Conference that "all flowers should be allowed to bloom" it is fitting to conclude this report of a highly successful and useful gathering by suggesting that the gardeners should not confine their watering to one plant alone.

BOOKS

REVIEW by J Comley

VERY RECENTLY there was a series on TV about **Class**. An interesting point is that nearly all of those interviewed considered themselves **middle-class**—just as most of us consider ourselves slightly **above-average**. Both Marx and Engels were aware of this tendency in the English working class, that section of the international proletariat fattened with imperialist crumbs: and it is a tendency most obvious amongst non-manual workers, the **black-coated employees**.

To what class do clerical workers belong? Insofar as they are workers, we presuppose that they belong to the great unwashed, the propertyless class who sell their labour-power. But how do these clerical workers regard their own class position? **For it is an unfortunate fact that a very large proportion of clerks**

don't regard themselves as a part of the working class at all: class to them is hopelessly confused with **caste**, with tastes and opinions that they chance to hold in common with the ruling social group. But what factors have served to alienate the clerical worker from more class-conscious proletarians?

These are the questions which David Lockwood sets out to answer in **The Blackcoated Worker** (Allen & Unwin, 21/-). He suggests various reasons for the ambiguity of the blackcoated vote: the tradition of a relative intimacy between boss and office-employees, especially common in the counting-houses of the 19th century: the **relatively good conditions**—Bob Cratchit notwithstanding—of 19th century clerical as opposed to manual workers: the system of importing future managers from the rul-

attending.

We think that the time has arrived when the Transport and General Workers' Union should officially associate itself with the campaign in order to carry forward the Union's policy on Nuclear Armaments.

ing social group into the clerical side of the business "for experience": the relative dependence of a particular clerical worker to a particular employer: and, as a reaction, the longstanding hostility shown to clerical workers, "bosses' men," by the more highly organized and less demoralized employed groups.

At one time, Mr. Lockwood suggests, clerical work was a highly specialized employment and consequently enjoyed high status: but the Education Act

of 1870, affording a minimum of literacy to all, opened the flood-gates and resulted in a destruction of the one-time privileged position of clerks. This consciousness of decline drives clerical workers in two directions: either to organize in unions, or, regrettably common, to adopt an attitude of pathological snobbery and hatred directed towards "them," the organized working class.

These facts, Mr. Lockwood states, make the simple Marxist definition of class inadequate—your class is a matter of behaviour-pattern; and to regard clerical workers as workers and expect them therefore to behave according to their "obvious" class interests is a risky business! Those of us who had the fortune to hear City-bound workers discussing Frank Cousins during the bus strike don't need to be told this! This book is a **must**

LP FIGHT THE BAN

THE AFFAIR at East Islington, where six people were refused membership of the local labour party in June last year, reached the proportions of a **cause célèbre**. But despite the solid barrage of indignant letters to the local Press, **Tribune** and **New Statesman**; despite a protracted enquiry and a subsequent decision by Transport House that the six should be "admitted forthwith," the local party have, to all intents and purposes, refused to carry out the decision.

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

is that the local officials are behaving in the classic, ultra-conservative tradition of the petty Labour bureaucracy.

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

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

CND—Busmen Lead

While sympathizing with and aiding the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament to the best of our ability, *Socialist Review* has stated clearly that the fundamental weakness of the Campaign is its lack of contact with the labour movement, and its refusal to use the potential power of that movement. Hitherto, CND has been largely the preserve of morally outraged middle class individuals—a voice without lungs.

The time has come for a change. And once again it is London's busmen that are showing other trade unionists the way to

go about it. Recently, the Central Bus Committee adopted the following resolution unanimously. It is a resolution that should be taken up by all sections of the labour movement both in the form of pressure on their executives and in the form of support to their local CND committees. The resolution reads:

This Central Bus Committee records its high appreciation of all who took part in the successful Aldermaston March against Nuclear Armaments and the action of the General Secretary (Frank Cousins) in

Top next col.

THE ETON BOOZING SONG

(To be sung at all Tory election meetings)

LET them scupper us in Suez

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

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

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

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

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

Let the tocsin call be sounded
In all 'locals' through the land,
Let the 'Old Dun Cow' get weaving
For a last defiant stand,
We'll do Hugh Gaitskell in the eye
In this election year,
Now Mac—our wonder boy—has taken
Tuppence off the beer

DISRAELI

INTO ACTION!

FACTS FOR THE STRUGGLE

TORY LIES NAILED

Revving up for the elections, the Tories have produced a pamphlet called **This is What We Have Done**. Its tone can be gathered from the introduction: "These past years have been so rich in achievement—how rich the following pages show".

A hard-hitting answer comes from LRD's counter-pamphlet called **This is How You've Been Done** (LRD Publications Ltd., 161 Drury Lane, London, WC2, 6d). We are reprinting some of the Tory claims below (in bold) and some of LRD's comments. No further comment is necessary.

* * * * *

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

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

Here are the figures for industrial production in the principal countries of the world since 1951.

PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN PRODUCTION FROM 1951 TO 1957

| | |
|----------------|-----|
| Japan | 126 |
| U.S.S.R. | 94 |
| W. Germany .. | 73 |
| France | 40 |
| Netherlands .. | 38 |
| U.S.A. | 19 |
| Sweden | 19 |
| U.K. | 18 |
| Belgium | 16 |

"Exports have reached record levels."

British exports began to decline in 1948 for the first time since the end of the war. The volume of exports in 1958 was about 3½ per cent. lower than in 1957.

For the first time since the war West Germany has surpassed Britain in the export of manufactured goods. The latest figures show that, in the first nine months of 1958, the United States share of world exports (by value) was 23.4 per cent., West Germany's share was 18.4 per cent. and Britain's was 18.2 per cent.

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

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

| | |
|---------------|-----------|
| Japan | 2,067,000 |
| W. Germany .. | 1,429,000 |
| Britain | 1,402,000 |

"Freedom to earn all you can."

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

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

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

S R Report

"NEW REASONER" CONFERENCE

by STAN NEWENS

The next step for militant trade unionists—this was the topic of the Conference organised under the auspices of the heavyweight socialist journal "New Reasoner" at Wortley Hall over the week-end of 18th/19th April. And to listen to the opinions of others and offer their own contributions came active socialists from many parts of Britain.

Probably the most heartening feature of the Conference to those who have struggled for the past ten years to propagate left wing socialist ideas without falling into the orbit of the Communist Party, was the consciousness that there are so many more left wingers with this outlook today than there were at the height of the Cold War. At that time, Marxists who were not also some sort of Stalinists were as rare as the proverbial four leafed clover. Today, however, there are Marxists in practically every town and county in the country who are neither Communist Party Members nor fellow travellers and the work of keeping a number of them together has been done by the "New Reasoner".

Wide discussion

One thing that characterised the discussion throughout was to a very large extent an absence of dogmatism. So many left wingers

of this vintage have been through the mill that rigid party lines imposed from above are absolutely suspect. Consequently, an atmosphere of enquiry and exhortations to carry out research in many fields were part and parcel of the discussion throughout.

The mining industry and its problems, trade union structure, Youth employment and Workers Control, were all pointed out as subjects requiring close and detailed study in the future and those closely connected with the production of the "New Reasoner" intimated that they are hoping to produce pamphlets dealing with some of those subjects on the scale of the New Left discussion booklet by Ken Alexander and John Hughes "A Socialist Wages Plan" in the future.

Heavyweight

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

During the course of the debate, however, a number of speakers stressed that policy formulation and ferment was, although valuable, not enough and urged the need for the connection and contact offered by a

contd. page 4

ONE UNION FOR BUILDING — END

when craft sectionalism can reign supreme.

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

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

Arguments

The objections can be briefly summarized. Some of the larger Unions make play of the fact that they have many members employed in industries outside of Building and Civil Engineering and these, it is said, can only be protected by a craft organization. No evidence given in support of such a viewpoint.

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

When dealing with the organizational position in the Isle of Man, at its December 1958 Meeting, the General Council of the NFBTO provided the craft unions with an opportunity to do something practical in the way of

unification; but they adopted a negative approach and placed on record their inability to deal with the problem.

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

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

A course

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

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

N Sween Discusses

FORUM

NEW TOWN PROSPECT

WHEN the Labour Government launched the policy of building the New Towns (1946), it took the boldest step in social planning ever taken by a British Government. The idea of building New Towns was not merely one of building large housing estates and so easing the problem of overcrowded slums in existing cities, but of creating completely new and independent towns which catered for all aspects of the resident's life — not only accommodation, but also employment, shopping and enjoyment, etc.

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

Housing

The aim was not only to create towns with the advantages of the countryside, but to ensure that they were lived in by balanced communities. A not insignificant feature of the plan, though not clearly stated, was for the residents ultimately to own and control the town through the local authority. And, of course, behind the idea was the conviction that a New Town would get rid of many evils of the old towns.

In terms of housing and accommodation pure and simple, the rise in standards is immense. Roomy, clean houses set amid gardens and greens have provided an opportunity for immigrants which they have grasped with open arms. Standards in furnishing, decoration and gardening are almost everywhere very high and the contrast with the pre-war East End of London from which so many of these people origin-

ated is enormous. If ever there were doubts, the idea that ordinary people would use the bath to store coal has been resoundingly refuted here.

But the cost of all this, however, is high. Rents and rates despite the subsidies for which New Town houses and services are eligible are well above the average. Local stores have enjoyed certain monopoly advantages and the cost of living has also tended to be high. As the result few families have not been heavily burdened with hire purchase commitments at least in the early days of their settlement.

These facts help to explain certain distinctive features of the New Town resident's outlook. Burdened with the work of decorating, furnishing and gardening, he has much less time to devote to outside interests than he had in the town. At the same time, a new element has crept into his horizons—he must “keep up with the Joneses”. Neighbours have TV, a refrigerator, a washing machine, contemporary wall-papers, etc. and one is unwilling to be outdone.

New attitudes

This new outlook has a shattering effect on many time honoured Trade Union and political habits. **Fat wage packets are no longer merely highly desirable but essential and the even longer standing stalwarts are prepared to work excessive overtime, to undertake sub-contracting, to seek promotion and generally to yield to the pressure mounting up against their convictions.** Furthermore, stoppages of work, etc. can be catastrophic when hire purchase payments have to be met weekly and no strike is frivolous.

At the same time the break with traditional attitudes has another side. Most people are

youthful and those who are prepared to take an interest in trade union and political matters find that they have the advantages as well as the disadvantages of pioneers. At least the cake of custom is more easily broken.

Furthermore, the problems of post-war industrial development are very much more prominent in the New Towns where there is little or no pre-war industry to confuse the situation and lighten the blow. Almost all the factories have adopted the use of automatic processes of production and the threat of redundancy or short time is very real to nearly everyone.

Owing to the comparative isolation of the New Towns, alternative employment involves a considerable amount of travelling. Factory development is often lagging behind the needs of the population for work and a skilled man may have only two or three or even less possible employers who might require his skill. This has forced many workers to seek work outside the New Towns.

For youth, the problem is especially acute. Some factories have preferred to engage trained labour to unskilled youngsters who require training and even were this not the case, there are still insufficient jobs for school leavers. Hence the concern of parents, teachers and local people in general about prospects for New Town youth is growing.

Results

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

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

In the New Towns, one is permitted a peep at the newest adult generation with all its weaknesses and strengths, with only a slight colouring from the old. Despite inexperience and lack of tradition of struggle, this generation is promising from the Socialist point of view.

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 ie, 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 establishment of workers' committees to control all private enterprises within the framework of a planned economy. In all instances representatives must be subject to frequent election, immediate recall, and receive the average skilled wage in the industry.
- 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, 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 abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas.
- The abolition of the H-bomb and all weapons of mass destruction. Britain to pave the way with unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb.
- A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington nor Moscow.

LETTERS

“QUIT AFRICA”

Dear Editor,

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

The truth is that the opening up of skilled occupations, and trade union and political rights, on an appreciable scale, to the African, would mean the end of white privilege. It is true that the whole economic system is based on the exploitation of the Africans as cheap labourers. On the other hand, it is also true that industrialists do want to open up skilled occupations to Africans at lower rates of pay

than that of the settlers. This, then, among other things, has driven the white worker to see the African, as a group and as unskilled workers, as a threat to his position. Therefore, to safeguard himself as a skilled worker and to enjoy his privileged position at the expense of voiceless cheap labour, he has fought his way into the camp of the ruling class, and identifies his interests with theirs.

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

I think this brief explanation throws more light on developments in Central Africa.

Yours fraternally, I. Karra.

SR EDITORIAL

Tory's new attack : Defend London workers ! Defend London transport !

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

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

Ex-owners

When transport services were nationalized eleven years ago, two main obligations were placed upon the LTE, by the parliamentary Act. The first was to provide an adequate and efficient service—the second, was that the undertaking must pay its way. Included in the latter requirement is the payment of compensation to ex-owner bondholders, which today, runs at £5½ millions a year.

In the upshot, these two obligations have proved—not complementary—but exclusive. The struggle to "pay its way"—which, in practice involves the making or large annual profits, has been the main inspiration of the "raise the fares—cut the services" policy relentlessly pursued by the LTE during the past seven years.

Twin policy

Even from the purely capitalistic angle from which this alleged "public" service has operated, the policy simply does not pay off. Every one of the 13 annual fares increases so far operated has worsened, rather than improved the net revenue position. Every reduction in services has caused a mass desertion of passengers on a scale far exceeding any economies resulting.

That the twin policy—"raise the fares—cut the services"—does not pay, is not matter of opinion but a matter of fact—and the facts are written in cold, unanswerable figures in every annual balance sheet of the LTE. Yet, the policy continues. The

next "fares increase" is already before the tribunal and will shortly be authorised. The daily carving up of bus services continues. That the LTE's finances will be in a worse state at the end of 1959 than they were in 1958, is certain. That more buses will be cut but and millions more passengers desert, is inevitable.

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

Deliberate

On the contrary. The crippling of the LTE services is not the irresponsible act of stupid people—but a calculated and deliberate political act, connived at, sponsored, supported, and defended by a Tory Government. The existing nationalized services, particularly coal and transport, are being deliberately run down as an "awful warning" to the public of the "folly of nationalization" and the "evils of socialism." Nationalized transport and coal are being sacrificed as an insurance policy to save "private enterprise steel", to provide useful "election propaganda" for Tories, and to force "socialists" of the Gaitskell brand to resist demands for further nationalization.

Public vs staff

It is against this political background that the rank and file socialist in the unions, the local organizations, and the factories must see the London Transport problem and appreciate the need to rouse mass opposition to the LTE plans.

Tactically, the LTE have always sought to put the public against the staff. Thus, when fares go up it is inevitably due to the "greedy wage demands" of the busmen. When the bus is late—or doesn't arrive at all—it is always due to some "restrictive practice"—the busman is working to rule, banning overtime, going slow, or off on some god-forsaken, selfish line of his own. And, as the bus conductor is the only personal representative of the LTE that the public normally meets, this policy pays off by producing increasing friction between staff and passengers.

The proposed "one-man-bus" is being used in this way. After all, it is only single-deck vehicles that are to be used in this way. In the main, they run over "uneconomic routes." Unless the

LTE can find ways and means for "economy", such services may have to be withdrawn altogether. There are no stairs to be climbed in these vehicles, they have a smaller seating capacity, it will not unduly strain the driver to also act as conductor—in any case he will receive higher wages. Let him do his "duty" and help the public in this difficult situation.

Facts

That is the line of the propaganda. What are the facts? The one-man bus is a slower vehicle—a less efficient vehicle—a more dangerous vehicle. Again, these statements are not "theories" but "facts" clearly supported by experience gained with such vehicles in the provinces and the country area of the LTE.

At every stop, where passengers board a one-man bus the vehicle will be delayed while the driver collects fares and gives change, as well as opening and closing power-operated doors. At every stage of a long spell of duty the driver's attention will be divided between his manifold duties—instead of concentrating on the one matter that should engage his entire attention—the safety of his passengers. Inevitably, when the balance sheet for one-man buses is struck, additional entries will be written into the statistics of death on the roads. Thus, when the London busman fights against "one-man" buses, he fights FOR—not AGAINST the interests of his passengers.

Indeed, the job of the socialist in the localities, is, above all, to unite the fares-paying passenger and the wage-earning busman—against the Government, and its LTE stooges who are destroying the people's transport services.

• campaign

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

That this conference, having regard to the inconvenience and hardship imposed on London's travelling public by the LTE policy of continually cutting both Metropolitan and Country bus services, bearing in mind the long term effect such a policy will have on the workers dependent for employment on the servicing and maintenance of the existing LTE fleet on the one hand and the replacement of vehicles withdrawn as unroadworthy on the other. Considering that the present attitude of the LTE suggests a deliberate attempt to create resentment against the principles of public ownership through the medium

of continually worsening the public's travelling conditions. . .

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

It is our view that transport in this area is a social service and a financial loss on its operations should not be allowed to prevent its proper operation.

Conference therefore urges all London and Middlesex Members of Parliament to demand that London Transport be relieved immediately of its heavy financial burden and the present Executive be replaced by the men and women who believe in nationalization and are determined to make it serve the needs of the travelling public.

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

Action now !

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

In every locality the people suffer from LTE policy. In every locality (or nearby) is a bus garage. In every locality there is a local trades council, labour party, and numerous trade union branches. On the local Borough Council there is either a majority—or a minority—of labour members. The job of the rank and file socialist is to bring all these bodies and elements together on a matter of wide public concern, i.e., the state of the people's transport services.

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

SOCIALIST REVIEW is published twice a month by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd. Subscriptions, 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.

All communications to be addressed to the publisher, M. Maddison, 21 Aubert Park, London, N5

Printed by H. Palmer (Harlow) Ltd. TU, Bush Fair, Harlow, Essex