

What Sort of Nationalization?

(From the "Workers' Dreadnought," June 26.)

Mr. Shapurji Saklatvala writes:—

"The educated workers of the world have come to realize that it is their concern, rather than that of any other group in society, whether industries as a whole, or some of them, shall work for individual profits governed by the law of competition alone, or whether they shall work for national service as a national asset with no preferential profits to a few individuals in the State.....

"The object of nationalization should be the saving of the profits now paid to private shareholders, in order that the workers in industry may enjoy a life of comfort and enjoyment, instead of one of unmix'd drudgery; the consumer, that is to say, society in general, having the benefit of the balance, either in lower prices or as profits transferred to the general revenues of the community.....

"In the capital account side of industries, like railways or coal mines, nothing can be gained by exchanging royalty and rent "rights" for a stock on which the nation has to pay an annual revenue as interest or sinking fund.....

"The working and maintenance of "nationalized" industries should pay no profits to private concerns or individuals, otherwise the scheme of so-called nationalization must remain not only a huge farce, but even a huge deception and plunder.

"In nationalizing railways what do you nationalize? If you wish to repair or erect railway stations, signal boxes, or bridges you will go to private contractors and pay them profits, you will directly, or through your contractors, pay profits of merchants dealing in bricks, stone, timber, glass, cement, iron and steel, paints and varnishes, etc. If you wish to repair or extend a railroad you have got to pay heavy profits to some steel rail company. If you want carriage wheels or springs you have to pay a heavy private profit to some individuals. To build carriages for your "nationalized (?) " railways you will have to pay profits to private individuals trading in timber, iron, brass, fittings, tapestry or leather (for cushions,) window glass, lamp fittings, etc. So what are we really about to nationalize, and where are we stopping national money from running away to private dividend arrears?

"Similarly for coal mines, you will keep on paying profits on all buildings, and plant required by your collieries after what you term nationalizing them. You will keep paying profits to dividend distributors on coal cutters, boilers, pumps, haulage equipment, electrical equipment, and every little thing that a colliery requires. Where, then, is real nationalization with any real economic object or purpose served thereby?

"Now, suppose you do not agree to any such patchwork and deceptive forms of nationalization which keep feeding private profiteering at every turn. You will require to nationalize your railways and coal mines in such a manner that you will also nationally produce all your requirements, and these also you will produce from materials, and raw minerals brought under national possession and not allowed to remain under private ownership. Your nationalized railways and mines will then have the requisite number of nationalized iron and steel factories, glass factories, brick yards, electrical and mechanical equipment factories, all under nationalized non-profitteering control, and all in their turn possessing national stores of raw materials required. This, and this alone, would mean an effective, real, and honest nationalization of railways and mines, the other being merely an eye-wash. If you are not prepared for it, then plainly vote against it, but not for any make-believe nationalization.

"So far I have merely pointed out to the reader what real nationalization ought to be as against patchwork nationalization of coal mines and rail-

ways. The thoughtful reader might, however, take himself further forward. He may ask, where, then, shall we stop? Nowhere, if you really adopt a sincere and progressive scheme in place of a deceptive, patchy, stagnating form of nationalization..... A complete nationalization would then, in your opinion, lead to socialization of all industries? In my opinion it would not logically stop before that, and must even go beyond it till the Sovietization of industries is reached.

"In nationalizing a concern here and there you do not eliminate private profit, in socializing it you leave the matter of control somewhat in doubt, and a conflict between the producer and consumer remains; in the Sovietization of industries you not only solve the control difficulty, but you harmonize the interest of the producer and the consumer within a given society....."

FURTHER SECRET DOCUMENTS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

(From the "Daily Herald," June 24.)

"Ball Cartridge Only" in the Event of "Riots."

On the 13th of last month we published the now famous secret Army orders issued to Commanding Officers by the War Office in which the following information was sought:—

Will Troops in various areas assist in strike breaking?

Will they parade for draft to overseas, especially to Russia?

Whether there is any growth of Trade Unionism among them?

The effect outside Trade Unions have on them?

Further secret instructions have now been published, for the text of which we are indebted to our Glasgow contemporary the "Worker." These we print below.

The Government's "explanation" of this latest example of militarism will be awaited with interest.

Parliament meets today and unless some explanation is volunteered, the workers of this country will look to the Labor M.P.'s to raise the matter in the House.

In a recent issue the "Aeroplane"—which apparently regards strikers as "Bolsheviks"—asserts that the Royal Air Force

would have but little mercy on a Bolshevik mob if once let loose on them with bomb and machine-gun the R. A. F. pilots and observers have had much excellent practice during the German retreat in operating against mobs on roads and in streets.

In view of the above the Air Ministry Weekly Orders (1380—1433) provide interesting reading. On page 23 appears the following illuminating paragraph:—

961. In the event of a disturbance amounting to a riot, the magistrate present with the troops will, if circumstances permit, read the Proclamation under the Riot Act and call on everyone present in assist in suppressing the riot. Whether the Proclamation has been read or not, he will as soon as he comes to the conclusion that the police can not cope with the riot and that military action is necessary, call upon the officer in command of the troops to take action. No order to charge or fire should be given until the magistrate has called upon the officer to take action. An order to fire, if given, is to be given by the officer in command.

No. 962 is equally interesting:—

962. Full and distinct warning must be given to the rioters that the troops are about to fire, and that the fire will be effectual. The officer shall, if time permits, consult with the magistrate present as to the best means of giving such warning.

But the following paragraph is even more note-

ALLIES—ALWAYS (?)

(Jerome K. Jerome in "Common Sense.")

I am glad to gather from an interview given by Mr. Lloyd George the other day to a representative of the Petit Parisien that "the mere idea of any dissension" between ourselves and our various present Allies can not exist in the future. "Great Britain," Mr. Lloyd George declared, "will always remain the faithful ally of France—always." I beg Mr. Lloyd George's pardon, not "always." He said "always" at first, but seems to have changed his mind and limited the period to fifty years from the present date. I am sorry he did that. It still leaves the more distant future of the world unsettled. But one must not sin one's mercies, as they say up North. It is something to have human affairs guaranteed against all fluctuations of the human mind, if only for half-a-century. I am old enough to be able to look back on the half-century that has just passed. Let us take a bird's-eye view of it. It should make us grateful to Mr. Lloyd George for securing us (till 1969) from similar confusion and uncertainty.

Only a few years ago Russian men-of-war were sinking English fishing boats in the North Sea. Feeling ran high, and we were on the point of declaring war against Russia. Three years ago she was our beloved ally, the steamroller. We are now calling for a volunteer army to invade her. Twenty years ago our press was holding up the Boers to execration as fiends in human shape. The columns of our papers were filled with stories of the atrocities they had committed, and Lloyd George narrowly escaped lynching at Birmingham for not joining in our hymn of hate against them. They are now our gallant comrades, and, according to Lord French, they had always been fine fellows. Twenty-three years ago we were on the verge of war with France over the Fashoda trouble. The Daily Mail was urging us to "roll France in the mud," take her colonies away from her, and give them to Germany. Twenty-five years ago Lord Salisbury and Joe Chamberlain were touring England, advocating an alliance with the Kaiser. A popular novelist wrote a book picturing the forthcoming war between England and France. Victorious France had swept our Navy from the seas, and we were in danger of being starved into submission. From which calamity we were saved in the last chapter by the generous and timely coming to our aid of the German fleet. Lord Northcliffe, then Sir Alfred Harmsworth, thought highly of the book and wrote a preface to it.

As a young man I remember seeing the late Charles Bradlaugh, streaming with blood, fighting his way out of High Park. He had been so "unpatriotic" as to protest against our going to war in support of our then "dear friend and ally," Turkey. The crowd was then singing, "And Russia shall not have Con-stan-ti-no-ple." About that we were (then) eternally determined. The first war talk to which I ever listened (I have heard a good deal since) was the demand of all true Britons that we should sink the American Navy as the only proper and becoming reply to Washington's outrageous behavior in connection with the Alabama business. We will say nothing about the years preceeding, when France was always "the enemy;" when Nelson urged us to bring up our children to hate every Frenchman like the devil; and public-houses were springing up all over England named after the King of Prussia. Perhaps it was thinking of these things that made Mr. Lloyd George finally decide to limit his forecast to a mere fifty years. The wise man does not prophesy too far.

worthy:—

965. It is undesirable that firing should take place over the heads of the rioters or that blank cartridges should be used.

We withhold any comment, pending the official explanation—which will, we think, need to be very watertight to convince the public, in view of our earlier disclosures.