

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

FORTNIGHTLY
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

8th YEAR No 9

MAY DAY, 1958

SIXPENCE

THIS IS OUR FIGHT!

AS BIG BEN sends the notes of midnight booming across the Thames on Sunday, May 4, an unaccustomed hush will descend upon the metropolis. The wheels of 10,000 London buses will cease to turn. Fifty thousand busmen will begin the most important strike of the post-war period.

Only a change of tactics at Whitehall—or a sudden attack of cold feet at Transport House—can avert the collision. The London busmen—and women too—are ready for a fight in which not only their own future but that of all trade unionists will be decided.

Only twice before—in 1926 and 1937—has there been a complete shut down of the capital city's bus services. Should this happen again on May 4, it is mortally certain the Underground Railway staffs will refuse to operate the trains—and some 10 million people will lose all their means of public transport.

Pressing close behind the busmen in the wage fight are half a million main line railwaymen whose claim for a living wage has been contemptuously and utterly rejected by a Tory sponsored and inspired "Tribunal."

MERSEYSIDE TRADES COUNCILS

Conference on Unemployment

Liverpool May 11th

Details from Eric S. Heffer, 54 Avondale Rd., Liverpool 15

Should the railwaymen become involved in strike action, an immediate refusal on the part of dockers and road-haulage drivers to handle goods will be forthcoming. In fact, as the cards are now stacked, something approaching a miniature general strike, is clearly on the agenda of the day. In this fight the enemy stands clearly identified—it is not merely the two "Knights of the Round Table" (Sirs Brian Robertson and John Elliot) who are the figureheads of nationalized British Transport—but the Tory Government, standing four-square at the head of British capitalism.

TWO VITAL LESSONS must be understood and quickly acted upon by the whole labour movement—and every individual socialist. The first is to appreciate that an attempt is being made to use the London busmen as a "cosh" to beat down the living standards of the whole working class—and to take swift action to rally every possible ounce of support for the strikers. The second is to spread understanding throughout the Labour Movement on how this "publicly owned" and "nationalized" transport industry is used—not to provide service to the public, but as a prop for private enterprise and a happy hunting ground for bondholders and tax collectors.

If, as appears likely, the London busmen are first to enter the ring through strike action on May 4, they must not be left to fight alone. There must be no "keeping the ring," no standing by as spectators while a small section of the working class takes on the combined weight of the organized employers and their Tory Government.

What the individual socialist, shop steward and trade unionist does in the local organizations of the labour movement in the days and weeks ahead may well prove decisive. Through press, radio, and television, the government will work upon the minds of the 10 million people deprived of transport facilities to present the strikers as greedy blackmailers, holding a pistol at the head of a defenceless public.

Yet, the engineer, the bricklayer, the docker, the clerk, the typist, the butcher, the baker—and the candlestick maker, who is being forced to walk to work because of the bus strike, has as big a stake in the outcome as the strikers themselves.

(turn to page 2)

H BOMB FRONT NOW BLACK THE BOMB!

writes Raymond Challinor

THE BLISTERS, sore feet and even colds have now gone—so what remains of the 50 mile march to Aldermaston? Not merely those, like myself, who marched all the way, but also the thousands of people who sympathized with the aims of the march must ask themselves: has it made a lasting impact upon the British public? What is the next step?

Undoubtedly, one of the most encouraging signs was the number taking part. Never below 600, the ranks swelled to well over 4,000 on the first and final days.

That so many people are prepared to sacrifice their Easter holidays and to rough it, shows there is a definite, determined opposition to the H-bomb in Britain. A strong and vocal nucleus exists to carry the struggle into every crevice of British life—until the bomb is ultimately banned.

Another encouraging sign was that four-fifths of the marchers were under 30, just the age group politicians accuse of being politically apathetic. But surely this march proves that apathy is manufactured by the politicians themselves. Youth are not pre-

pared to take an active part in political parties because, being without microscopes, they find it difficult to detect the differences between the two major parties. They regard the parliamentary parlour game, where heat is generated over trivialities, as of little consequence to themselves or anybody else. But when an issue of life-and-death importance arises, it is youth that gives the lead. Their infectious enthusiasm, confidence and boisterous energy was in evidence throughout the march.

Public support

Even uncommitted members of the general public were impressed. The march clearly showed that the cause of nuclear disarmament was not the proud possession of cranks, but the fervently-held opinion of many ordinary men and women like themselves. The banners, songs and chants illustrated the dangers of the current Government—and official Opposition—policy of placing faith in the amassing in larger and larger stocks of nuclear weapons.

(turn to back page)

MAY DAY — MARCH FOR PEACE

BLACK THE BOMB! BLACK THE BASES!

busmen — continued

If the busmen go down, the railway fight is lost before it starts. If the workers in the nationalized transport services are beaten, then the rest of the trade union movement will take their licking as surely as day follows night. The greatest service that the London busmen can render to the British people today is not to keep the buses running but to stop the wheels turning until the wage claim is won and the Tory Government is broken and defeated.

Never did the old axiom—"United we stand—Divided we fall"—stand more true than today. It is this understanding and spirit that we must spread throughout the Labour Movement. It is this vital truth that must penetrate every factory and office, every local organization, every working class area. Every single one of us has a personal and urgent job to do.

To win the wages battle is the first and most vital need, yet, even as we marshal our forces for the fight we must also give consideration to the political lessons involved.

* * *

IT IS NO ACCIDENT that the first working class section to take the brunt of the Tory offensive are the staffs of the nationalized transport industry. Yet it was but a short ten years ago that this very industry was held up to us as the shining beacon of socialist progress, as the harbinger of the socialist society, the first magnificent fruit of the first Labour Government. Nationalization was to put the capitalist system in "Carey Street," instead, it turned ex-owners into guaranteed bondholders and put them on "Easy Street" for the rest of their lives, irrespective of whether the industry prospered or foundered. As for the employees, the "promised land" opened up for them has proved the graveyard of their hopes: ten years of nationalization has left the railwaymen the worst paid section of industry—bar none—while the London busmen have witnessed their status descend from 1st to 57th position in the national wages scale.

What precisely were these assets that were nationalized in 1948? What was this "going concern" that was taken over at the stock-exchange valuation of some thirteen-hundred-million-pounds—for the benefit of humanity and the greater glory of the Transport House brand of "socialism"?

Let the **Daily Herald**—then the official organ and mouthpiece of the Labour Party pundits—describe the British Railway Industry. It said:

"This century-old railway system is a decaying anachronism, with its museum-piece goods trains which have to pause at a gradient of 1 in 260 while somebody hops down and pins the brakes of every wagon separately, because there is no mechanism to put them all on together. Now we see why this system could not have been given away to anybody."

There you have it. Here is the underlying reason and cause of the present plight of our railway system. And here also is the classic indictment of the Herbert Morrisons and the rest of the Transport House "experts" who saddled this millstone around the necks of the British people—and called it "socialism."

For ten of the thirty years preceding nationalization Britain had been engaged in total war during which not even normal replacements—let alone improvements—had been made to our railway system. From 1940 to 1944 the railway system was under constant bombing attacks resulting in massive destruction of track and rolling stock.

In 1948 the British Railways were decrepit, decaying, and obsolete—and, as the 'Herald' admits, couldn't be given away. In the last year before nationalization the British railways incurred a working loss of £60 millions. Railway stock was worth as much as Hitler "marks."

Yet, this was the precise moment chosen by the master minds of Transport House to mortgage the future of the British people for 90 years and to the tune of £1,300,000,000 to become "owners" of this gigantic scrap-heap. Since 1948 something in the region of £500 million has already been doled out as interest to bondholders. Loan upon loan has had to be raised—at ever increasing rates of interest—to even keep this clanking skeleton wheezing its decrepit way around the country. And, ten years after this master stroke—the nationalized industry owes the private enterprise shylocks hundreds of millions of pounds MORE than on the day the industry was nationalized.

If ever a monument stood as to how not to take over an industry—it is the British Railways today. If ever a statue is erected to the memory of Herbert Morrison—it should be paid for in deep gratitude by the railway bondholders.

But, the story is by no means ended. Having paid the colossal sum of thirteen-hundred-million-pounds for a derelict industry, it is now known that a like sum must be spent to bring it to a reasonable state of efficiency—and once again the money must be borrowed—at interest.

Now comes the last touch of irony. Facing a capital expenditure which will keep it bankrupt for years to come—hopeless if it does spend the money—and even more hopeless if it doesn't—the British Transport Commission is required by its Tory masters to "pay its way."

Translated at the negotiating table with the railway trade unions, this means that all wage claims must be rejected. Referred to arbitrators, such a rejection is upheld by a Tory sponsored "Tribunal" on the grounds that the big expenditure facing the Transport Commission for its "Modernization Scheme" means that no money is available for wages.

Here the proposition becomes crystal clear. We bought a derelict concern which will be useless until it is modernized. The cost of such modernization must be met—not by the Government—not by the bondholders—not from public funds—but from the pay-packets of the railwaymen themselves.

TU COMMENTARY

by GEOFF CARLSSON

AT THE TIME OF WRITING, industrial struggles are looming large on the horizon. On May 5 the London Transport busmen are due to strike (see page 1). The 'tubemen' will not remain silent on that day.

The three railway unions, pitched into the front line of industrial action by the rejection of their wage claims, are also humming with talk (unofficial) of strike action on that day.

(For the first time for many years the three Railway unions are united in common endeavour. It is to be hoped that from this new-found unity, a new basis will be established for the future, leading eventually to one Industrial Union for all railwaymen.)

London dockers who have already placed an embargo on overtime, have also selected May 5 as the date for a token stoppage in support of their four-point program:

- (1) Control of overtime,
- (2) A rise in the guaranteed "fall-back" pay to £8 4s.

a week,

- (3) Reduction of work calls to one per day,
- (4) Ban on the transference of men.

* * *

CONTROL OF OVERTIME is becoming a priority in most industries now, and with the shortage of work at the Port of London it assumes priority in the four-point program.

Linked closely with the docks is the ship-repairing industry. On Merseyside 3,000 out of 16,000 workers in the particular industry are now out of work, and 300 more have been paid off from the dry dock department of Swan Hunter and Wigham Richardson, Wallsend.

* * *

AFTER THE SHAMEFUL treatment of the Levine dispute by the AEU Executive (reported throughout in SR) we hear of another blow to engineering workers. Three hundred and twenty

ETU : IMPORTANT RESOLUTION

One important resolution to be debated at the ETU annual conference this year is the following:

Conference is bitterly opposed to the attacks of the Tory Government on the living standards of the working class and its attempts to weaken the Trade Union movement. It declares its intention to achieve as soon as possible, the return of a Labour Government pledged to socialist policies. Consequently, Conference calls on the Executive Council to urge on the General Council of the TUC to launch a campaign, if possible in conjunction with the NEC of the LP, which will include large scale demonstrations for the purpose of bringing

about the defeat of the Tory Government.

Conference asks the EC to urge the General Council in the event of this campaign being insufficient to bring about fresh elections to use, the full strength of the Trade Union movement industrially.

Further, because of the importance of winning the Labour Party to understand that only a planned nationalized economy can solve Britain's problems, and that therefore bold nationalization policies must be incorporated in Labour's election program, Conference asks the EC to encourage in every way possible, the active participation of the Union's membership in the Labour Party, supporting that section of the LP struggling to win the LP to socialist policies.

Such a proposition, if it can be put over, holds untold possibilities for employers and government alike. If railways can only be modernized from the pay-packets of railwaymen—clearly schools can only be built from the salaries of teachers—hospitals from the pay of nurses—public lavatories from the pay-packets of the attendants—houses from the wages of building workers—and so on ad infinitum. The case for a complete standstill and wage freeze in all public services is complete.

What has been said of the set up in nationalized transport could be repeated with little variation about the nationalized coal mines—the miners indeed have had their pay claim rejected with similar arguments—and here the burning need for modernization has existed for decades.

* * *

THE SOCIALIST, while participating at all levels in the immediate fight to support the London busmen and win the wages battle, must use the dispute to extend and deepen socialist discussion around the whole question of future policy in relation to nationalization.

Nationalization that accepts as a first charge upon industry the maintenance of the ex-owners in the state to which capitalism has called them, and excludes workers' representatives from any measure of control, has been tried for a decade. The bondholders are laughing their heads off: only the employees in the industries—and the public who depend upon their services—weep. Well might a London busmen's spokesman remark: "In 1948 London Transport was nationalized—in 1958 it is paralyzed."

Never, in the foreseeable future, will the nationalized transport and mining industries be free of the leeches who batten upon them, never will these industries really belong to the people, so long as the existing financial arrangements and system of control is permitted to continue.

There can be no burking this issue of "compensation" or "expropriation." The taking over of the means of production can never be a polite stock exchange operation—it is an act of revolutionary class war.

A real socialist government will cancel all existing compensation payments and never again enter into such arrangements. If, in the process, any transport bondholders become available for work—there are 3,000 London bus drivers and conductors needed immediately.

men employed at the Yorkshire Engine Company struck work in support of Brother Bucklow the Convenor who was sacked for alleged abusive language. (He threatened to "sort them out" after a junior progress clerk had altered the price on a job ticket). Once again the AEU Executive refused to give official backing. Result—after three weeks the men went back to work leaving the Convenor outside. Another one of the many who have been sold.

THE MARGATE CONFERENCE of the Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers, considered the problem of Wage Freeze. The General Secretary told Conference that controls on industry and improvements in social services—both of which could be expected under a Labour Government—would "produce a substantial change of outlook on the part of the trade unions."

A motion (No 26) calling for Conference to reject any policy of wage restraint was opposed by the Executive and defeated by a show of hands. However, one resolution, stating that

the take-over of the economic and efficient industries in addition to those that are uneconomic and inefficient is essential to the success of the next Labour Government

was carried despite the platform.

CLERICAL and Administrative Workers, meeting at Whitley Bay, debated whether the Union

DIRECT ACTION MARCH

an SR Industrial report

The struggle against the Bomb, the Bases and war is sorting itself out. After the Labour Party demonstration at Trafalgar Square on Sunday, April 13, had fizzled out with Bevan asking for "three cheers for a Labour victory" and getting just about three cheers from the 12,000 people assembled, a column formed to march to Hyde Park under slogans calling for industrial action against the Bomb, the Bases and war. For the very first time London heard a demonstration—some 400 strong—chanting 'Stop work on rocket bases! Stop work on H-Bombs!' or 'Black the Bomb! Black the Bases!'

Beyond Aldermaston

Something had happened between Aldermaston and Trafalgar Square. Not, of course, to the 'leaders' speaking from the platform, who continue to drone about summit talks and the like—as if the safest thing in the world is to mortgage our future with the Tories, the American dollar-ocracy and the Russian bureaucrats—but to the audience. The audience had learned that Aldermaston was not enough, that we have to go beyond—into the factories and building sites.

No wonder the banners of Socialist Review and the Newsletter attracted attention. No wonder strangers were willing to march under these banners, to shout their slogans, to gather in Hyde Park and listen to supporters of these two socialist journals explain how war and its ulti-

should buy shares in leading aircraft companies to "give them a voice in the firm's affairs." The resolution, from Brockworth branch, said

By investing £750 or £1,000 the union could have a voice in the affairs of the five leading companies in the aircraft industry controlling 50 percent of the industry. By sending a nominee to annual meetings they could tell the shareholders of the real position in the industry and of the waste and incompetence in it.

Surely, by far the best way to combat waste and incompetence is for the next Labour Government to nationalize the aircraft industry under workers' control.

A GROWING PROBLEM affecting workers in many industries is that of coloured and foreign workers. The April 12 issue of *The Newsletter* featured an article dealing with the subject. It was an account of a discussion at a Labour Party Ward meeting, at the end of which a charter for immigrant workers was drawn up. Here is part of it.

(1) No immigrant worker should be employed at a cheaper wage rate than a British born worker doing the same job.

(2) Immigrant workers shall be on the housing list with British born workers, on the same system of allocation. Rents of rooms, flats, hostels, etc., shall be strictly controlled by a Labour Government, with public ownership of these premises an early target. No "ghettos" for foreign workers to be formed.

Such a charter can go a long way to solving our "problems" and creating the unity needed to fight out common enemy, the employers and their Tory Government.

Industrial action against the Bomb maniacs is becoming more and more embedded in the organized labour movement. We hear that Harlow AEU No. 2 has passed a resolution calling upon the Essex Council to declare black all work on Rocket Sites, calling upon their EC to urge the TUC to do the same and demanding a national stoppage in the event of black labour being employed.

Harlow ASW has also passed a resolution in favour of boycotting work on rocket bases.

Other trade union branches in the area are expected to follow suit.

mate weapon were embedded in capitalism, how the fight against the Bomb is the fight against war and the fight against class society, that only the workers can carry that fight to victory and that it was time to start, by blacking the Bomb and blacking the Bases.

What to do

Every section of the organized workers was asked to pledge itself to supporting such action, to put pressure on the leadership to lead an industrial campaign against the Bomb and war. This was the way to show who stood where, to show who could be relied on in the struggle against war and capitalism, in the fight for a new society—socialism.

INDUSTRIAL

These pages have been set aside for a socialist review of the industrial struggle. Help to make them complete by sending in news and comments.

ASSET: A new plan for what?

asks Eric S. Heffer

CLIVE JENKINS' article on wage claims, "ASSET springs wage surprises on bosses," (*Tribune*, March 14), should cause all in the trade union movement to pause for serious thought. He obviously wants to eliminate the present scramble and thinks that he and his union ASSET have found at least one of the answers.

I do not want to tell ASSET how to do their job. That is their concern. But since he invites us all to consider the position, I will try to do just that.

His main contention is that the wage structure should be related to the annual increase in productivity in a green industry. He suggests that in the "growth sectors of the nationally-owned industries," we might all try the ASSET plan. This envisages an agreement with BOAC and BEA for 3 to 5 years for annual wage increases of 5 percent or the increase in productivity, whichever is the less.

Little to say

What are the objections to a scheme which, on the surface, appears to put more into the pockets of the workers?

My primary objection is this. The proposals are purely sectional; they must lead to certain key unions getting all the plums, thereby creating a labour elite, whilst the mass of the workers would not share the benefits gained.

Secondly, such a scheme could only apply to a small number of industries, industries assured of a definite annual increase in productivity. Can anyone point to such an industry under capitalism with any surety? What about recessions (and how can these be avoided under capitalism?) when the productivity of an entirely industry may well drop notwithstanding an increase in individual productivity due to the added spur of unemployment? Will those who are the production workers receive the benefits from, say, automation, and those who are not still scramble as in the past?

Clive Jenkins' plan results from the need, on the part of some officials, for a quiet life. **The rank and file have very little to say in such agreements**, and are very much relegated to the background. In any case the idea of a net increase of 5 percent or less (supposing productivity rose by 20 percent) is very dangerous.

A bureaucratic fashion

The cost of living could rocket (what then of the 5 percent) and production could remain static or actually drop. Is it then suggested that because production did not increase, the industry would not be able to afford a wage rise to meet the increased cost of living?

Clive Jenkins really knows better, because in one part of the article he hints at the real answer on the wage question—militant action. Militancy has always paid off and I am afraid Clive Jenkins' present proposals, could even further dampen down the struggle. They are obviously something emerging from an office, conceived in a bureaucratic fashion and should be rejected.

Right time, wrong method

By all means let us apply for increased wages at the "right time" (whenever that is) but let us conduct a fight to get them, and not try to solve our problem by looking for a non-existent short-cut.

The last point is that the ASSET plan could tie the workers to capitalism by giving them an interest in maintaining the present capitalist set-up. **Nationalization does not in itself mean any fundamental change and means at this stage purely an extension of State-Capitalism. Socialist nationalization needs workers' control, and Clive Jenkins does not favour that.**

A backward step

At its Easter Conference USDAW approved a recommendation by its EC to cancel its educational scheme with the NCLC at the end of the year. As USDAW is one of the largest financial supporters of the National Council of Labour Colleges, it is a blow to the organization.

Between the decision of USDAW EC decision and the Conference there was only four weeks which did not give all branches time to discuss the matter but the Insurance Agents' national committee in the union passed a resolution of protest and opposed at the Conference.

The logic of the USDAW position could well mean the beginning of the end of the NCLC unless trade union members wake up to its implications. All militant members and the thousands of officials who owe some part of their training to the Movement Independent Working-class Education, will realize that the time for the end of the NCLC is not yet. It remains a valuable and vital open forum of the Movement and still mobilizes a considerable amount of voluntary effort in its work, which cannot be equalled by samples of University academic instruction dolled out to a few trade unionists.

The Easter conference decision deprives USDAW members of their NCLC rights. That is why they must work for a return to company of those in the British TU's who work for Independent Working-class Education.

SR Industrial report

LP COMMENTARY

RON LEWIS

● Labour and the Bomb

AT LAST the movement against the Bomb and for socialism is really under way. The success of the movement may be best assessed in terms of the Party-leadership's reactions. Their coming into Trafalgar Square and resorting to traditional socialist agitational activity is a real measure of the success that we on the left have achieved.

Of course, the stand taking by the Leadership in the Square cannot be regarded as satisfactory. Clearly a deal of opportunism motivated them and their anxiety to control the 'unofficial' movement in the streets was reflected in the speech of Nye Bevan who suggested that now that the Movement was returning to traditional methods that the ranks should be closed, meaning that we should now cease our agitation to ban the bomb.

But let us for goodness sake express our pleasure in the fact that the leaders have at least shown themselves aware of the growing strength of the Ban the Bomb campaign. Let us encourage the Party to sponsor more of these activities. Let us not be so super-critical of everything that they do that we end up not by leading the workers towards socialism and peace but on the fringe of working class life hurling sectarian sounds upon deaf ears.

We have come a long way since 1954 when the Party leaders foisted the obscenity of German re-armament upon us. We shall go a lot further if we are sensible in our criticisms and if we establish an intelligent list of priorities in the matter of demands. We are no longer confronted by a well organized monolith in the shape of the Right-wing leadership. Divisions and cracks are appearing all over the place and providing that we are not too ultra in our demands and demonstrations we should be able to deal a death blow to reaction within the Labour Movement.

● Strachey's 'scrap'

JUST HOW FAR REMOVED the inner caucus of the leadership is not merely from our point of view, but from the impressions they tried to give in Trafalgar Square may be seen by that artfully titled pamphlet, **Scrap All the H-bombs**, which is written by our *bete noire*—John Strachey.

The most significant thing about this pamphlet is that it ever came to be published at all in the present situation when the leadership is quite obviously reeling from the implied blows of the success of the campaign against the Bomb. That it should have a forward by Gaitskell is almost unbelievable.

Waiting for fall-out

Mr Strachey has always been too clever by far. In his latest sortie this cleverness reaches the point of insanity and even suggests that because Gallup Polls have shown the British people to be in favour of the retention of the Bomb and for the usual tired deterrent arguments, the Labour Movement must stand for its retention. **If what the people 'think' at any one time is to be taken as what a Socialist party should advocate, we might as well all spend our evenings worshipping at the shrine of the idiot's eye and wait for the fall-out.**

But in addition to this, Strachey attempts to convince his readers that there is a difference between the Labour and Conservative Parties on nuclear arms policy. This he does by selective and tendentious quotations from Bevan's apostasy at Brighton.

The significance of this work however, is the fact that it has not received official blessing from the NEC, a striking illustration of the change which has taken place in the movement since Lord Luv-a-duck was King.

● County elections

AS I PROPHESED in the Review a month ago, the Party made important gains in the County Council Elections. In many counties the number of Labour members is at an all time high level, and several important counties have been captured by Labour.

Without in any way trying to minimize the significance of this achievement (I have a strong personal reason for not wishing to do that, for I won a seat not previously held by us!) it would be a mistake to assume that these results necessarily have any permanent significance. For in 1952, a similar but not as extensive a victory was achieved but we still lost the General in 1955.

This victory has been achieved for a number of reasons. First, because **the Tory-party machine is demoralized**. The crusading fervour generated after 1945 seems at long last to have spent itself. In these conditions, it wasn't too difficult for the Labour Party generally to put up a better show with knocking up and the like than the Tories. Secondly, **the Tory voter himself was very apathetic**. A more lively Tory-party organization would have got more of the Tories to the poll.

It should be faced however, that there was a large degree of general apathy, and in the seat which I won large numbers of Labour folk did not vote, in spite of the fact that

ELECTION NOTEBOOK

by Stan Newens

IN THE TRIENNIAL County Council Elections which took place last month, Labour gained control in four counties previously controlled by the Tories—Carmarthenshire, Essex, Lancashire and Middlesex.

This brings the total number of County Councils controlled by Labour to ten and represents an important victory. In Middlesex in particular, where the Tories have been supreme since 1949, Labour has done well.

None the less in many areas Party members are disappointed with the results. In Staffordshire and the West Riding of Yorkshire Labour hopes have not been realized to the full and in many individual seats results have been disappointing.

The factors which determine Labour's success in elections are of course manifold, but the three most important are Labour's reputation nationally, locally, and the state of the electoral organization.

The latter is of course, tremendously important in elections to County Councils which seem too remote to have a local interest to the average member of the public and little national significance. Consequently in the face of general apathy only a very enthusiastic band of Labour workers can get voters out.

It is noteworthy that only in areas where a genuine left wing socialist Party exists normally is it possible to call upon a really keen band of workers. Where the ideas of compromise and capitalist reformism hold sway there are few who are prepared to put themselves out to collect votes.

The weakness and compromise of the national leadership of the Labour Party on the Hydrogen Bomb and nationalization have helped to destroy the enthusiasm of many Party workers since the Brighton Conference last October.

Further than this it is, of course, reflected in the lack of interest shown by the working class at large. All too often canvassers are told that both sides are as bad. Nationally Labour has failed to win any significant number of the floating voters or to make inroads on the all too large section

every non-voting Labour voter was called on eight times during the day. Because we had, I think, a very much better than average Party-organization, we got a 41% poll; almost a record in these parts (Surrey) for a County election, where the average this time was 33 percent.

The seat which I fought in 1952 and won, was not won this time, although there has been no substantial change in the character of the area. Indeed, the Labour vote was down 1,300 (17,000 constituency) on 1952, because the Labour organization was below par. Yet the organization was not much worse than in 1952.

This proves to me that this election was an organizer's election. In 1952, the people voted whether the organization was good or not. Clearly, the people are not yet in the definite mood of enthusiastic support for the Party which ought to be the case if we are to have a big victory in 1958.

A councillor's job

But we managed to win power, in some places, and a substantial minority elsewhere and we must make the best use of it. Where we have power we should demonstrate to the workers that they have a strong personal stake in the control of the County, and we must take measures that have a real bearing on their lives. Where we are a minority, we must use the council chamber as a forum (none of this sanctimonious rubbish about doing good work in committee!) A minority Councillor must not merely do good, he must be seen to be doing good. And he must always bear in mind that his duty is to win power for the Party. He should make everything secondary to that aim.

of the working class which still votes Tory. Tory abstentions are today more significant than new Labour votes. Where there is a Liberal choice, these abstentionists often prefer to oppose both Parties.

Locally, of course, it is difficult for Labour to give a real lead, although some Councils have made an attempt. Then, however, one swallow does not make a summer and often the barrage of Tory press criticism, aided by official Labour Party silence or condemnation seeks to isolate and ridicule a socialist lead as in the case of the St Pancras Borough Council.

What is necessary is for more left wingers to realize that they can do a good job on councils and to refrain from scoffing at the idea of administering drains and public lavatories. If there were more genuine left-wing socialists on public bodies, this isolation could be prevented.

When Coventry or St. Pancras alone disbands Civil Defence, the enemies of Socialism and peace can besiege and crush the outbreak of disloyalty to capitalism. If, however, 40 Councils were to do it, simultaneously, the effect would be electrifying.

County Councils, Federations, Regional Councils and other bodies could assist the concerting of attacks on capitalism through many local authorities. But left-wing socialists must participate in all these parts of the movement if the attempt is to be made.

At the present moment everyone is preparing for the next round in the electoral battle: the borough, urban and rural district elections. These may seem to be trivial to the full-blown self-styled left-wingers, but through them it is possible to strike a heavy blow at the Tories and if real socialists are returned to office to capture positions in which it is possible to harass the enemies of a socialist order unmercifully.

The conclusion is obvious: although we are not satisfied with the existing state of affairs, we must fight with might and main to make the May Elections a real Labour victory which will be a defeat not only to the Tories, but also to the faint hearted within our own ranks.

POLICY FOR 'PRENTICES

by Roger Cox & John Phillips
Shoreditch and Finsbury YS

THE OPINION of any employer on the function of an apprentice is a means of obtaining skilled labour at the lowest possible rate in the shortest possible time. The Socialist view is that young workers and apprentices should be thoroughly and properly trained not necessarily in any particular trade—that should come later—but to obtain confidence in choosing an occupation fitting to their character, and therefore enabling them to give the maximum benefit to society.

These two different basic attitudes show clearly, that though the young workers today have supposedly "never had it so good," the approach of the present day employers has not changed since the Victorian era or beyond.

The problems

To put this into concrete terms, let us put forward some criticisms of existing school-to-work and employer-apprentice relationship.

Briefly and generally they are these:—

1. Lack of cohesion between school-leaving and entering of industry.
2. Low wages.
3. An apprentice's Indentures prevent any flexibility or freedom of movement in his industry.

Problem 1 cannot be solved under our present Education System. What we must have is compulsory state education up to the age of 18 years, which would allow for the young prospective worker to decide at a reasonable age (17 or 18) what type of industry he wants to enter.

Not only what type, but what branch, what section or firm in that industry. This latter point is very important because many apprentices today have had to choose a firm to work for at the age of 16 years, and later become dissatisfied and yet unable to move from that firm.

The type of training received in existing schools is inadequate. When the time comes for the transition from school to work, most young people find themselves thrown into a new experience for which they have had no help, no guidance, no training, and for which they are totally unfit. The reason for this is the out-moded system of education which insists on cramming a certain number of facts into as many heads as possible with little regard for psychology or understanding, therefore creating an abyss in which apathy towards work and society are rampant,

and out of which people rarely climb.

We must erase the attitude that people have on leaving school, that never again must they have the privilege of further education, which is necessary for the rise of the working class to take control of the means of production.

The basic curriculum for either technical or administrative training for ages 14 to 18 years must be—an elementary training in all the fields connected with these two great sectors of the working community. For example, to administer in building a bridge, one must be aware of labour available, skills involved, surveying, etc., leaving the exact technical details to the experts. **The curriculum must also include education in art and culture to broaden young people's outlook and stimulate their imagination, thereby creating interest, whether they be concerned with safety pins or atomic power stations.**

First steps

Some advances have been made towards this, but only as far as the "shop floor" is concerned. To quote from the "Agreement between the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions and the Engineering and Allied Employers' National Confederation," September 1948

Preliminary training should be arranged to give the boy an insight into the processes carried out in Engineering works and the reasons why these processes are carried out . . .

It is considered that either a skilled fitter or skilled turner requires a basic grounding in the other's trade. Since a boy normally does not know which trade he desires to follow until he has gained some experience of the work for himself, apprentices should be engaged as "fitters and turners" to start with, but should specialise in one trade or the other after they have received general training in the basic processes, both at the bench and in the machine shop."

Whilst appreciating these good points we feel that they should be extended as we have suggested. This of course will only be achieved with a Socialist education program.

False security

WHY ARE WAGES at present so low? We feel that the reason why these low wages are accepted is because apprenticed workers are led to believe they have more security than non-apprenticed workers. A belief which is completely false. An apprentice is restricted more than other workers at a time (although restraint is needed to act as a minor disciplinary force—lateness, etc.)

when his outlook should be broadened to the utmost.

Although many firms are tolerant towards apprentices there have been many cases where they have been sacked for minor reasons, or even victimized for attempting to organize fellow workers.

To quote from 'Indentures of Apprentice to the Motor Vehicle Repair Trade' drawn up by the National Joint Industrial Council,

The Apprentice and the Guardian bind and oblige themselves jointly for the lawful and obedient service of the Apprentice during the time . . . fulfilling the whole obligations on him under this Indenture, and to make payment of any loss and damage which the employer may sustain through the negligence or misconduct of the Apprentice or by his breach in any respect of his obligations.

The socialist program

To put the whole responsibility on the apprentice in this way is completely one-sided. If an apprentice damage a piece of machinery it must, in many cases, be due partly to the employers, either through bad training or bad working conditions.

Although rare, some Indentures, which are drawn up by em-

Letterbox

We have a space problem. Unless readers get a move on and push up sales in Youth Sections, Apprentice Clubs, Colleges and Universities so that YS can cut loose from SR, we'll continue to have a space problem.

Anyway, this issue can only find room for one-quarter of the material we've received. We'll try our best to publish it in the future. In the meantime, a short summary is in order.

Most communications deal with the H-Bomb and the function of youth in fighting it.

Barry Maude, Secretary of the Leeds University Labour Society, has sent an article demanding that socialist youth unite for political action against the 'bright blue peril of the 1950's.'

A fitting response came with the news that a **Combined Universities' Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament** had been formed, and had already sent out its first Newsletter. Our correspondent in this case, **Tony David Smith**, editor of the NALSO Newsletter, also sent an article on a policy for youth, which fits neatly into our present series on the subject.

From **Birmingham** comes the news that a national conference open to student organizations and others is planned for May 10 under the heading of **Nuclear Campaign Conference**. We hear too that NALSO is planning a **summer camp** for September to which working, school and

employers only, prevent an apprentice from joining a Union. If through some minor offence an apprentice should be sacked, as he is not a member of a Union good legal advice offered by Unions is not available to him, thus giving him less security than that which the ordinary worker enjoys through not having such an agreement.

Higher wages can be obtained by Unions pressing for proper organization amongst young workers and by pointing out very strongly to apprentices that low wages are not necessarily a part of apprenticeship.

What can be done now?

1. **Strengthening and creating agreements for proper and thorough training in all industries.**
2. **Agitation through Unions for strong organization amongst the young workers for a LIVING wage. (Not a wage to be subsidized by the Apprentices family).**
3. **For Unions to draw up model Indentures that are fair to both parties.**

Many of these things will not be accomplished in our present society and we must fight also for the Socialist Society we all one day hope to live in.

student youth are invited. The subjects will be of interest to all young socialists.

There is no space to deal with any of the many letters we have received, except to quote very briefly from Mark Campbell's, London, SW7:

Young people are rebels without a cause, so many people say. The trouble is not that there are no causes, but that there seems so little that one can do about anything. Most young people are dissatisfied with "The Establishment," and this, unfortunately, includes the Labour Party at the moment.

It may be that the Labour Party takes its present stand in order to win the General Election, so that it can then introduce socialism. One might forgive them for this, but how does one know whether it is true? Wait and see, you say! But youth is impatient, and anyway it seems a mockery of democracy to deceive the people as to one's real intentions. . . .

Apathy and irrelevance keep the youth from taking an interest in politics. One has to recognize that there are so many evils in the world, so what point is there in clearing up a small one here and there, when all the important ones are always there and sometimes growing bigger . . .

Today, however, we have the survival of the human race to worry about and if this is not enough to break the apathy and feeling of irrelevance, then either our education system is misleading youth more than we realized (and it certainly is prejudiced), or the human race is not worth saving.

INTERNATIONAL

Andre Giacometti, Paris, presents the politics of the ALGERIAN REVOLUTION-2

THE WAY an organization fights is determined by its political and social nature. Its methods, policies, ideology and program are determined by the class interests it represents.

Ideologically, the FLN has relied on the chauvinist mystique of bourgeois nationalism, lumping together French workers and French capitalists, Arab landless labourers and Arab landowners. The policy of the FLN is precisely calculated to make a common struggle of the French and Algerian working-class impossible. **It is the trade-unionists of the "messalist" USTA who have left nothing untried to connect the Algerian revolution to the struggles of the French workers, and who have been assassinated for that reason (see SR, December, 1957).**

Stalinist support

The sole ally of the FLN in the French labour movement is the Stalinist leadership and its hangers-on, who do everything in their power to prevent or sidetrack any serious action of French workers on behalf of their Algerian brothers. By its chauvinist propaganda, by its neglect of the Algerian and the French working-class, its indiscriminate terror in the cities (bombs in public places, random shootings) the FLN is contributing to turn a class war into an ethnic war. On all these points the policy of the MNA has been the exact opposite.

Land to the peasants?

What about the absolutely necessary radical agrarian policy of dividing the land among the peasants? It is impossible for the FLN to seriously commit itself to such a policy since its supporters include large landowners who would be the hardest hit by a radical agrarian reform. **It is the MNA that has always advocated such a reform, thereby earning the support of the peasant mass and the solid hatred of the whole North African bourgeoisie.** For lack of a political answer, the FLN has had to fall

back on terror: the assassinations of the USTA leaders is only one of the better known instances.

In Algeria the contempt for the people and political poverty of the FLN has revealed itself in the organization of adventures which exposed the population to the full force of repression without any significant benefit for the nationalist cause: thus the school and university strike, thus the famous 8-day strike in Algiers, which enabled the parachutists to smash the FLN city organization. In the partisan fighting, certain FLN units have ruthlessly used the civilian population for military purposes, without regard for consequences. Whenever such units have met with a population that was supporting the MNA, they have attacked them and tried to smash them.

On the political level, the FLN has insistently demanded to be recognized as the only negotiation partner with the government, and will accept subsequent elections only if they take place under the control of an FLN government. On the demand for independence, the position of the FLN has been known to vary; on the question of the monopoly of power, never. The MNA, on the other hand, has consistently called for negotiations involving all Algerian nationalist groups and for internationally-controlled free elections to an Algerian Constituent Assembly which would then elect the Algerian government.

In short, the FLN is fighting a bourgeois battle with totalitarian means, while the MNA is fighting a socialist battle with democratic means.

The Bellounis case

We have said that the policies of the FLN represented a danger to the Algerian revolution. The case of Bellounis is a perfect illustration of what we mean.

Supporters of the FLN say that Bellounis is a traitor. If it were that simple, his case would not be as significant as it is. When Si Cherif, former FLN partisan commander, rallied to the French army with a small group of men

In our last issue, Andre Giacometti, wrote on the internal history of the Algerian revolution and the differences between the two major contenders for leadership in the struggle against French imperialist rule—the National Liberation Front (FLN) an anti-socialist, anti-working class organization supported by as diverse elements as the Pope and the CP, and the Algerian National Movement (MNA) which, together with its trade-union organization (USTA) is the heart of the Algerian fight for socialism. In this concluding article, Giacometti deals with the programs, tactics and characters of the two organizations (and of their supporters, some of whom are occasionally seen in the vicinity of the socialist fight—Editor).

a few months before Bellounis made his agreement, when Adjoul-Adjoul, another military leader of the FLN, surrendered to the French in early 1957 and called for the surrender of the partisans over Radio-Algiers, the press hardly paid any attention. They are ordinary traitors, and they raise no problems.

Bellounis raises problems because he is not an ordinary traitor. What makes the difference in Bellounis' case is the fact that he is not an individual who went over to the enemy, but a political leader who insists on the limited nature of his collaboration with the French, who has mass support for his position and who also exerts some influence outside the territory under his control.

Furthermore, the autonomy of his zone is a fact, administratively and militarily; for this reason his agreement with the French authorities has caused furious protests among the reactionaries and fascists who see in it the official recognition of an independent Algerian movement.

Finally, Bellounis himself justifies his position by claiming that it is the most effective defence of the people's right to self-determination in an immediate sense. In other words, the people of the territory under his administration want neither the FLN nor the French, and consider Bellounis' ANPA as "their people" who defend them against their enemies and represent their interests as they understand them.

Massacre in Melouza

The responsibility for this situation rests primarily with the FLN, i.e. with its policy of terror against dissenting groups in the population as a means of gaining power. There is no doubt that wherever the FLN has attempted to impose itself by force, it has appeared to the population as something foreign and hostile, and that they want no more part of it than they want the French.

It should not be forgotten that Melouza is in Bellounis' zone,

and that there were not one but many massacres of that type. The inevitable result of this policy is to force large masses of people into an attitude of weariness and discouragement with the nationalist fight, leading to neutrality and to certain forms of collaboration with the French authorities—the position of Bellounis.

The lesson of Bellounis is one that concerns first and foremost the FLN and its friends: it means that their policy creates the danger of mass-collaboration with the French as a "lesser evil."

What is the relation of Bellounis with the MNA? Bellounis' position is incompatible with that of the MNA, and he therefore had to leave the party when he made his agreement with the French. At the same time, the MNA has not publicly condemned Bellounis. Yet, the reason for the MNA's reluctance to condemn, is no doubt the recognition of the fact that the people of that area have no alternative and that, **for them**, collaboration with the FLN could be a worse fate than collaboration with the French. One can condemn an individual who tries to save his skin by deserting; when a whole region does it to avoid genocide, it becomes a different problem and that must be approached in a different way.

Moulay Merbah

What about Moulay Merbah's statements at the UN and his messages to Eisenhower? It is clear that such statements represent an attempt to use the contradictions that exist between French and American imperialism, in a situation where the French variety of the kind is the most pressing and immediate enemy. It is true that the attempt is both clumsy and not particularly effective but it is hard to see what this proves, other than the fact that Moulay Merbah's personal courage and devotion to the cause of the Algerian people are greater than his diplomatic ability.

BUILD THE SOCIALIST REVIEW!

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

Name.....

Address.....

Name.....

Address.....

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

The question that has so far remained unanswered is why many so-called socialists lie in the teeth of evidence in order to justify support of the FLN—a minor question but not an uninteresting one.

In a precarious and temporary way, the FLN has succeeded in putting some of its contradictions to good use. Thanks to its very incoherence and heterogeneity, it has gained support from the most diverse quarters.

Thus it enjoys the support of the Tunisian and Moroccan bourgeoisie, who are afraid of the Algerian revolution and like to see it in safe hands; of the majority of French liberals, who identify their own interests with those of the FLN and see in it a negotiation partner inclined to accept solutions which one may call "mendésist," "bouguibist" or neo-colonialist depending on one's point of view; of the Nasser regime, which hopes to use the FLN as tools of its own policy; of the Catholic church, which hopes to come to easier terms with the Oulemas than with a proletarian movement, finally, of the Communist Party.

The stalinist line

The latter has several reasons to support the FLN: first, because Russia supports Nasser in the present international situation; secondly, because the longer the war lasts, the better the chances of the Stalinists to gain influence in Algeria and in France; thirdly, because the type of organization of the FLN (at the same time heterogenous and totalitarian) makes it possible for the Stalinists to gain control of it, which is out of the question in the case of the MNA.

Significantly enough, the Stalinist support has been massive on the level of terrorism and propaganda, and practically non-existent on the level of mass-action: what the CP leadership wants, is the slow deterioration of the present situation, not the end of the war and least of all the end of the war through an active intervention of the working-class.

The position of the Stalinist leadership has determined that of its clients, parasites fellow travellers and satellites: types like Gilles Martinet, Francis Jeanson, etc. It has also determined the attitude of the comical outfit in Paris that calls itself the "International Secretariat of the Fourth International," who discovered that the FLN was the "real mass movement" in the Algerian revolution only when the CP decided to infiltrate it. In short, the CP has betrayed the Algerian people in the interests of Russian foreign policy, while the so-called "Fourth International" is betraying the Algerian people in the interests of its own small-time operations in the French CP.

Fighters for socialism

Recent events have only confirmed that the future of the Algerian revolution is dependent on the future of the MNA and of the USTA. If they go under, the Algerian people remain defenseless.

Fortunately, they have not gone under. Even after the defection of Bellounis, the MNA commands partisan armies in seven distinct zones. The USTA has

SPAIN: WORKERS MOVE INTERNATIONAL

from Xavier Domingo, Comité d'Initiative Antifasciste Franco-Espagnol

AFTER TWENTY YEARS of silence, the Spanish working class has begun a direct struggle against the Franco regime and has just won a first great victory: that of organization and discipline, that of reborn class consciousness.

When the Asturian miners went on strike for the seven-hour day, it was already obvious that impending events would mark a new turn. As the letters from the Asturian comrades arrived with partial news about the strikes, stories of heroism, details of an extraordinary force, we realized that these strikes were taking a definite political turn.

A comrade wrote: "The young people between twenty and thirty years bear all the weight of these strikes, and their wives and girls volunteered for picketing. Sometimes they used sticks and stones to prevent a few old frightened men from resuming work." The nature of the franquist repression confirms the youth of the strikes: over 500 miners have been drafted into the Army and sent to the Spanish Sahara.

On the other hand, the number of arrests has been estimated at about 500 and, according to one witness, shootings have also started. But, for two weeks and a half, the Asturian miners resisted a police "running about in the streets panic-stricken," not knowing whom to arrest, whom to hold responsible. The movement started spontaneously—no one can honestly attribute it to outside influences.

But the most extraordinary fact, the fact that represents a great victory of the Spanish working class is the purely political strike, without wage demands, which took place during more than two weeks in Catalonia, in Euzkadi, in Valencia, as a demonstration of anti-franquist solidarity.

The very day that the government radio announced that there had been "slight labour trouble in the Asturias, provoked by agents from abroad which, thanks to the prompt intervention of the forces of order, have been totally suppressed," the metal and auto workers of Hispano-Olivetti, of Simca-SEAT and of ENASA-Pegaso went on a solidarity strike, soon to be followed by many smaller plants and especially by the huge machinery works of "Maquinista Terrestre y Marítima," "Frabra y Coats" and "Sedas Catalanas." Not a single wage demand, no social protest. For the first time in long years, the Spanish working-class has succeeded in organizing a political strike, a militant united front

survived the onslaught of the killers of the FLN, and it has survived an intense and brutal repression by the French government.

If fascism does not triumph completely on both sides of the Mediterranean, it will continue to survive and to grow. The Algerian people have not fought so bravely for so long to barter their freedom against a neo-colonialist compromise or a Nasserite police-state.

against the Franco regime.

The students soon realized that the working-class was taking the initiative and supported it by courageous demonstrations at the University.

We consider that the events which are now taking place in Spain are of the highest importance internationally, and are directly relevant to the struggle of the international labour movement. Franco has ceased to be anything but a tattered cloak of the traditional Spanish reaction: the Catholic Church, the agrarian

and industrial capital. The fall of Franco obtained by the workers' struggle would be a victory for the labour movement in the whole world.

Now more than ever the Marxist appeal "Workers of the world, unite!" has immediate relevance.

The first aim of the workers in the whole world should be to break through the wall of silence built up around Spain by the franquist Western bourgeoisie. The basic democratic freedoms must be won for the Spanish working-class: first of all the freedom to form its own organizations and to establish its own ties with the international labour movement.

POWER FOR WHAT?

IT WAS recently announced from Harwell, the centre of Britain's atomic and nuclear research, that scientists have developed a successful apparatus for using the energy of the hydrogen bomb in a controlled way.

When a hydrogen bomb explodes—spreading, as it does, its potent radiation—the energy contained in the nucleus (the centre of the atoms from which hydrogen is constructed) causes a tremendous explosion. Very high temperatures are generated.

The mechanism of the process is, in theory, quite simple. It is a direct result of the mathematical work of Albert Einstein, who discovered that when a mass is created or destroyed a vast change in energy results. Hydrogen consists of nuclei called protons, but in every 10,000 atoms there is another kind of particle—a neutron. The proton and neutron combine to make the nucleus of heavy hydrogen.

Heavy hydrogen can be separated from the ordinary sort of hydrogen, and, when two of these heavy hydrogen nuclei combine, they form helium. But some mass is lost in the process. Consequently, a great deal of energy is given out. In a hydrogen bomb the necessary temperature to combine the heavy hydrogen nuclei is obtained from an ordinary atomic bomb, which acts as a detonator.

But in Zeta, the newly designed apparatus at Harwell, the necessary high energy is supplied from a very large electric voltage. Because of the way it is constructed, there is no explosion. Exceedingly high temperatures—as

high as the sun's—are reached, and they could be used to generate electric power.

Sir John Cockcroft and Sir William Penny forecast that this process can produce an abundant, cheap supply of electric power within the next 30 years. However, they failed to add an important proviso—that we are here to enjoy it! For we cannot hope to enjoy the immense benefits that can be derived from the peaceful uses of nuclear energy when, at the same time, we are feverishly perfecting, and preparing to use, the H-bomb.

Therefore, it is illogical to waste brains and money on Zeta while we are developing bigger and better bombs for Mankind's third attempt to commit suicide. It should be either one or the other. And I am sure that the overwhelming majority of the British people would rather see Zeta than a bleak, burnt-out country—a result of H-bomb policy.

The shadow the H-mushroom casts on our lives must be banished. Throughout the ages the slow, painful development of Man, from primitive ignorance to modern sophistication, has been associated with the discovery of fresh forms of power. At first Man was dependent entirely on his own muscles. Then he harnessed animals—to do the donkey work. Later he learnt how to use water, wind and steam to lighten the burden of his daily toil. Now he is able to realize the dream of the ages—an abundance of power.

DEREK HART

SOCIALIST REVIEW BULK ORDER

(Six or more copies post free)

Please send me.....copies of the next..... issue(s) of SOCIALIST REVIEW, for which you will bill me.

Name.....

Address.....

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

Black the Bomb — ctd

Many spectators clapped, made the thumbs-up sign, and offered to help. Others gave food, chocolate and drinks to the Marchers.

All these indications of public support show that the march was a success, an important blow in the war against war, and a danger signal to bomb-crazy Macmillan. There is a need for other marches and demonstration up and down the country to mobilize public opinion against the Bomb.

But, by themselves, these demonstrations will not be enough. It is necessary to wed the movement for nuclear disarmament with the organized Labour Movement and the struggle for Socialism. Without this the campaign will flounder to defeat.

Unfortunately, many of the Aldermaston March Committee would not accept this analysis. Underlying their objection is an entirely different attitude to the causes of, and struggle against war. They attribute war to people's wickedness, fear or misunderstands. Consequently, point to the dangers of nuclear war, promote goodwill and understanding, and everything will be all right. Peace can be achieved without even breaking a vase in the Establishment's grand mansion. Tranquillity and Capitalism can snuggle close together.

The Socialist view

The socialist view, on the other hand, is that war is a function of capitalism and inextricably bound up with that system. Hence, to fight against war, you must fight against capitalism. An analysis of the economy of this country or the United States shows the most profitable sectors are those producing arms. With the growing danger of an American slump—not because of any increased threat from the East—Eisenhower has decided to give a further boost to arms expenditure.

To expect the governments of these countries to pull away the props that are keeping their wobbly economies standing is like expecting Ind Coope, Bass and other brewers to lead a campaign for temperance. It's just not in their interests.

Being opposed to socialist ideas, the Nuclear Disarmament Committee sought to confine the protest march to purely bourgeois limits. Speakers advocating trade union action were not allowed. Banners, such as the Socialist Review's and the Newsletter's "BLACK THE BOMB! BLACK THE BASES!" were discouraged. Indeed, an attempt was even made, at the behest of the Chief Marshal, to take our

banner down by force. So much for pacifist consistency!

While the Socialist Review considers the decisive factor will be workers' action, we can see nothing against—in fact, every-

thing in favour of—a broad movement, embracing many differing views, but all agreed on the urgent necessity of arousing the public to the danger, and need to oppose, nuclear warfare. However, such a movement can only exist if there is respect and tolerance for the other person's point of view.

H BOMB • MASS LOBBY

Tuesday, 20th May 5—10 p.m

Help to

3rd Floor, Pioneer House, Grays Inn Road, WC1
Telephone : TER 9278

PARLIAMENT Colour-bar

PREJUDICES had an airing in the House, when, on the motion for the adjournment for the Easter recess, Mr Harry Hynd (Lab.) spoke of the dangers of unrestricted immigration from the colonies.

Although Mr Hynd only referred to immigration in general the subsequent remarks of a Conservative member, Mr James Lindsay, and of the Under Secretary to the Home Office, Miss Hornsby-Smith, showed that the only real objection anybody had was to coloured immigration.

Canadians, Australians, South Africans (U-type) and Nova Scotians have apparently an unlimited welcome, but West Indians—God alone knows what might happen. Girls won't be safe on the streets.

But the West Indians who pass through Victoria Station on the way to Brixton and the Harrow Road are the heirs of a tradition as old as capitalism itself.

In times of expansion, industry always need to draw in more workers than those available around the factories, and so a vacuum is created into which such economic invalids as the people of depressed rural areas are sucked.

The early English capitalists were land-owners who discovered that it was much more profitable to employ, say, three shepherds and a large number of sheep than a hundred men who would be mainly engaged in growing corn for themselves and their families—the terrible Enclosures, when "sheep ate men."

So ninety-seven families would be turned out onto the highroads, the "sturdy beggars" of Elizabeth's reign. And they were a social problem compared with which a Jamaican slum landlord might as well be Dr. Schweitzer.

Most of us probably have some sturdy begging in our ancestry.

As time went on there were other sources. The collapse of the Highland clans after Culloden and the '45; the failure of the rural industries of Wessex and East Anglia, industries that had quite probably absorbed some of the vagrants of earlier years. Then there was the Irish potato famine and the decline of British farming when cheap American wheat flooded in after the 1880's.

Socialist attitude

It is not then surprising that this last untapped source of labour, the West Indian Islands, should be exploited. What ought the attitude of Socialists be to this most recent immigration?

In the first place, while recognizing the right of people to work in the country that best pleases them, we ought to remember that the majority of those who travel to find work, from the West Indies or from South Wales, are only on the road because there is nothing to do where their homes are. Therefore, Britain, as the economic centre, should provide the capital, education and other facilities necessary for vigorous, modern industries and agriculture.

And if it should prove to be a little expensive in the Caribbean, perhaps we ought to remember that the only reason for negroes being there is that they were brought as slaves in British ships.

In the second place, we need a program for immigrants in this country. Essential elements will be found in my colleague, Geoff Carlsson's column on page 2 of this issue. Readers are invited to add their comments.

MICHAEL MILLETT

SOCIALIST REVIEW SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I enclose ^{16s.} ^{8s.} ^{4s.} subscription for ^{1 year's} ^{6 months'} ^{3 months'} issue of
SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Name.....

Address.....

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

SOCIALIST REVIEW is published twice a month by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd., 35b Priory Terrace, London, N.W.6. (Tel.: Maida 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.

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.