Nationalized industry, the world over, is more and more coming under working class criticism. The British Railway Unions, for example, came out on a 24-hour strike on the third of October, 1962. The reason for the strike, as stated in **The Herald** of the same day:

"The railwaymen are striking in protest at a British Transport Commission plan to close down nearly half of the nation's railway workshops in the next five years, making 18,000 men redundant."

A vivid illustration of the "benefits" of nationalization in Britain.

And in Australia, the railway men of three adjoining states came out for a 24-hour work stoppage on the 25th of September, 1962, in order to give weight to their main demands for (1) payment of overtime rates after working an eight hour shift, (2) no Sunday work without double time, and (3) a substantial increase in marginal rates. According to **The Age,** Melbourne, for September 26, 1962:

"The Union says that it has responded to every national call and requirement toward increased productivity to the point where the unit productivity over each of the past ten years has increased by approximately 400%."

Calls for increased productivity on patriotic grounds pay off — if one is an owner.

One instance more can be shown of the real purpose behind nationalized industry — the solving of master class problems — in the big electricity deals recently taking place in Victoria, Australia. **The Guardian** (an Australian Communist publication that also advocates an Australian shipping line) in its edition of September 6, 1962, tells us:

"Under the administration of the Bolte Government the Victorian people's single asset, the State Electricity Commission, worth nearly 315 million pounds, is the plaything of monopoly capital.

"In recent weeks this has been graphically illustrated by the secret deal made by Premier Bolte to supply the American aluminium monopoly (ALCOA) with electricity at cost price — 6d per kilowatt hour."

This "largest single asset" of the "people" of Victoria is of course an example, pure and simple, of state capitalism. Who are the "people" who own this asset? None other, of course, than the investing, or capitalist class, and the Victorian workers are seriously asked by the Australian Communists to champion state monopoly (S.E.C.) as opposed to private monopoly (ALCOA). The actual difference, so far as the workers are concerned, is nil.

This voice of these self-styled Marxists continues:

"When it is finished (the State wide power grid) electricity in abundant quantities will be supplied to most parts of the State from power stations operating at low cost on brown coal deposits...

"*...And as far as the S.E.C. workers are concerned, the increased production of electricity means anxiety about jobs and lack of security as more and more small power stations become redundant with the progress of the master grid.*" (*Guardian's emphasis*)

Thus, in their own press, do these advocates of nationalization tell of failure after failure of nationalized industry in any solving of working class problems. Yet, so bankrupt are they in an understanding of the real interest of the workers that they persist in pouring forth energies and working class funds, time, and enthusiasm into the desert wastes of capitalism. Were these efforts, directed to gaining an understanding of socialism and spreading this understanding among ever widening sections of the working class, then would trade union political activity change from mere reaction, to the dynamic role of abolishing the present system of production for profit and the establishment of a system of production for use for all mankind. Only through the advocacy of socialism can the interests of the workers, and indeed of all mankind, be served.

C. PETER FUREY

PASS THIS COPY — — ON TO A FRIEND

HOW ABOUT SAVINGS?

To "The Western Socialist":

It is said in your article "That Balance of Payments." p. 14, WS No. 4, 1962, that "The dentist wants to see us only when we have a toothache, and a wallet from which something else can be extracted at the same time." I quite agree, but wonder why WE should want to hold on to what is in the wallet—we hoped. I suppose, to give up its contents for something more pleasant than having a tooth filled or extracted, but be this as it may, shall the dentist work for us because he has been assigned his job by some power above? I see no other alternative.

There is a question that I would ask that perhaps you can answer. (I have yet to hear the answer): Why do so many "capitalistic" dentists favor fluoridation of public drinking water, to the end of *preventing* tooth decay in children? I have never heard of a capitalist disdaining possible customers for his output, did you?

Sincerely,
RICHARD T. HALL

P.S.: Perhaps the reason for the great demand for socialized medicine ("medicare") is that we would rather save our own money for something besides paying for relief from pain, or, we would rather spend it for more pleasant things and have the *financial fear* of sickness removed from us.

ANSWER

The reference made to dentists, doctors, lawyers, and merchants meeting us on a mercenary basis, was for the purpose of showing the nature of the social relations engendered by class society.

The question asked by Mr. Hall, as to why we should want to save our money has no direct connection with the point made. It is an additional matter.

Those who make a living by selling labor power are not noted for their saving propensities. What happens to be in the wallets, pockets, post offices or banks is so reserved on a very temporary basis. The needs that have to be appeased soon absorb it all.

But there is a desire on the part of the social victim to make the limited funds go as far as possible. This can also be seen in the case of the medicare discussion. A minute minority of the 17,000,000 citizens over 65 have saved sufficient money to take care of their ever growing doctor and hospital bills. They exert what pressure they can on getting state assistance. While not an effective solution it is the best that they know.

The dentist is not a capitalist who, instead of being exploited at the point of production, is enriched at the point of extraction. He functions in modern society in much the same way as a skilled mechanic.

Fluoridation of the public water supply is still a controversial question. It is not a guarantee to prevent tooth decay in children. Whether or not it serves to lessen decay has not been sufficiently explored, or fully decided. Dentists are divided in opinion to the same extent as the rest of the population.

To equate the dentist, who would favor fluoridation, with the manufacturer of cigarettes who would pay for advertising space in the newspapers to warn prospective customers to beware of his products because science has discovered their contribution to lung cancer would be, obviously, a poor analogy.

J. A. MacDONALD

U. S. BARES GERM CARRIER

"White Sands, New Mexico, (UPI), Oct. 24, 1962 — Army troops fired a Sergeant Missile on its first war-ready test and the Army disclosed that its 1600-pound warhead could carry chemicals and biological payloads as well as nuclear ones... This is the first time the Army had publicly acknowledged that it was preparing chemical and biological warheads which could either kill enemy troops or render them defenseless without destroying surrounding cities."

Uncle Sam keeps telling us he would not descend to Nazi or Bolshevik atrocities.