

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

FORTNIGHTLY
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

9th YEAR No 6

EASTER 1959

SIXPENCE

Labour must force the Tories to take their

HANDS OFF AFRICA!

After Cyprus comes Central Africa. The four years of "police action" repression has hardly ended when this new outbreak begins to give the period of Tory rule the appearance of an endless colonial war on an ever widening front. The thought of "where and when will it all end" has forced many sections of the non-Tory Press to look aghast at this new adventure, accompanied as it is by a new high in blatant provocation, hypocrisy and downright lying.

The French example, of a nation bled dry and turned sour and poisoned internally, whose example of degeneration seemed so distant so recently from a still relatively stable Britain, now hangs ominously over the thoughts of Britons still able to think. Perhaps this may be the road that Britain must now travel, with a reactionary ruling caste that will never learn and a Labour opposition that fears domestic division and will never seize on historical opportunity that rarely allows a second chance.

But Nyasa is not just another Cyprus. What is involved is not simply a face-saving or a new Government blood sacrifice to the demands of the back benches. It was from the Cabinet ranks that there came the wild concoction of a "massacre" plot which was later admitted to be unknown even to the Rhodesian Government until the Westminster revelation.

What is so alarming is that this time it is the direct family cartel interests of the front bench and the P.M. personally that are threatened (see article inside).

INSIDE

Nyasaland

pages 4-5

Germans against the Bomb page 7

The Left in the ETU page 2

Behind the colonial shootings, even overshadowing the insidious influence of the South African Government, is the all powerful pressure of the **British South African Company** (the "Chartered"), a huge corporation of colonial plunder, which is owned, controlled and directed by men connected by money and family to the top figures of the Conservative Government, and above all to Macmillan. The very upper crust of the Establishment have a long history of family and financial connection with the Southern Rhodesia settler gang—the colonial "aristocracy".

For this the Tory Government is prepared to split Africa between white and black, hurl itself and Britain against the millennial awakening of a continent, and make inevitable a process stretching over white supremacist Africa to the Union of South Africa which could ensure one of the bloodiest massacres and most murderous conflicts in the history of humanity.

Policy for labour

Labour has been given a chance, so soon after failing to close the issue at Suez, to sound the death knell of Tory Britain, and it must not fail to fight to the limits of national division. As Toryism prepares to fight its bitter struggle, the Labour Party must lose no opportunity or time in stating which side it is on in this struggle.

Labour must give full and unequivocal support to the just demands of the Nyasa African Congress, and no support, implicit or explicit, for federation.

It must oppose the use of British troops and demand the withdrawal of white Rhodesian troops and police.

It must demand the freeing of the jailed freedom fighters throughout Africa.

It must demand the right of secession and self-determination for Nyasa. It must thoroughly align itself with the young African proletariat and the new-born freedom movement.

Labour must use this as a bludgeon to beat the Tories out of office at home and come to power on a fighting Socialist policy which will enable the workers to begin the final battle against British Capitalism.

INDUSTRIAL

S C McHUGH CONTINUES THE DISCUSSION ON

THE LEFT IN THE ETU

AS THE TITLE of these articles suggests, those members who make up the left within the ETU have problems indeed. Having read the past two articles in this series by Bros Nero and Frank Walters this becomes more apparent, although frankly I find it difficult to see what there is in Bro Walters' article to qualify his claim to be of the left. In fact one may be inclined to sense the CP apologist attitude in many of the points he makes.

In reference to Bro Nero's remarks concerning unemployment payment (new rule) and the way in which this often affects militant workers in the contracting and other sections of the union, the point incidentally is a valid one as anybody who has worked in these sections fully realizes.

Smallest item

Bro Walters speaks of some of these articles as embarrassing, this is also true, who is embarrassed by these activities? The Union leadership of course. Their method of combating this embarrassment is to send the appropriate official on to the job to break down militant action, even if the official agreed or was in sympathy with the action, he must still undertake this task as he is under a directive from the Executive Council. The excuse offered by Bro Walters for the alteration of this rule (Unemployment Benefits) is identical to that of the leadership "genuine concern over the finances of the Union and an endeavour to use that part of the funds allocated for unemployment benefit to the best advantage of the membership as a whole." Any investigation into the financial aspect of this matter will show that **unemployment pay in the Union at the present time and for many years past is one of the smallest items of expenditure, consequently the alteration made makes virtually no difference at all to the overall finances of the Union.**

STEEL DIVIDENDS

The "Financial Times" shows that 32 iron and steel companies in 1958 distributed £12 million in ordinary dividends. This compares with £8½ million in 1957. This takes place at a time when the steel industry is working well below capacity, when many steel works are on short-time or have unemployment, and when the taxpayer is having to find vast sums to support explanations in the steel industry.

When Bro Walters turns his attention to the aspects of leadership and change of leadership, possible press influence on the membership's voting and—to Bro Walters—the terrifying possibility of liaison and the possible getting together of the left,

he leaves us with no illusions as to his intentions. To pre-suppose that the unifying of the left leaves us with no alternative but that of the CP or Catholic Action is nothing but the crudest way of attempting to nullify or cancel any such activity.

No positive aspect of this activity is mentioned, no attempt is made to analyse the position within the ETU or to reason the cause of the frustration felt by the active membership. Why? Because it is not desirable in the interests of the present leadership.

Are we to accept the argument that the reason for electricians not achieving the forty hour week, a sick pay scheme financed by employers and other such advances is because the rank and file do not desire it? which is what Bro Walters suggests, his reasoning being that they are the only ones who can achieve these things. If the membership can do this without leadership why then is he so concerned with who leads, why is he so worried about the possibility of the success of Catholic action? Those who find themselves in a position

branches where criticism has been particularly strong and consistent, the treatment meted out by the leaders has been a very simple one: leaving them in splendid isolation, regarding them as a small leper colony not to be contacted personally even when requested, very often ignoring correspondence or else leaving it around for so long that the matter is finally lost. It is an obvious fact that all criticism cannot be correct and only the arrogant and stupid would consider it otherwise, **but all criticism must be answered and actions explained when requested.** This is fundamental socialist principle that must be adhered to at all times, it is the failure to conform to this principle that has created so much frustration within the organization and needless to say an incorrect approach very often to industrial problems.

What then is the role of the left in the immediate future? I mentioned earlier "the getting together of the left." I used this wording deliberately for this reason. At the present time there are quite a number of Left wing political groups active within the

their identity and at the same time make a positive contribution towards the socialist development of our organization (ETU).

On the 21st of March Brian Behan will be released from prison. Not for a moment must we forget that his imprisonment, and the length of it, was a vicious class sentence against the leader of the South Bank building strike. Although we have some policy differences with Behan and his immediate comrades, we welcome his return to the struggle and trust that in the future any attack on socialist militants with trumped up legal charges will be met with the old cry of the Labour Movement, "an injury to one is an injury to all."

With regard to Bro Walters' concern over press campaigns, it is well to bear in mind that these campaigns have served a very useful purpose towards protecting the CP core of the leadership within the Union. They have posed the press attacks in the way Bro Walters does, overstressing the effect on the membership.

Ballots

Ballots and union policy will not be greatly influenced by the press, these things are determined internally mainly by the active members. When the cry goes up from the leaders that the organization is being attacked by the capitalist press, the purpose is to unite the membership around one common factor "the leadership." The issue can then be suitably presented in black and white, one is either for or against the organization, this typifies the CP tactics. By this method a successful counter attack can thus be launched against the internal rumblings of discontent within the union. Bro Walters goes a little further: Bros Haxell, Foulkes and others must not be opposed in forthcoming elections, the Catholic bogey being brought into the picture. **If not now, when are honest candidates to be put up?** I suggest that Bro Walters does not ever desire this, surely here is the place where he and I can find agreement, full confidence in the CP organization to suitably manipulate the Ballots at the present time to their own advantage?

Solution

In conclusion I would say this, let the British CP drop the Stalinist line, let them cease to be a mere appendage of the CP of the Soviet Union, let them operate as a truly Marxist party, analysing the problems of the British

See next page

FALLING RESERVES

At the end of September, 1951, shortly before Labour left office, Britain's gold and dollar reserves were £1,167 million. At the end of December, 1958, after over seven years of Conservative Government, the figure stood at £1,096 million.

Special borrowings by the Conservative Government, listed below, totalled £466 million. Without this aid, Britain's reserves would have been slashed down to £630 million.

Special borrowings	Totals (£ millions)
"Adenauer Aid"	75
Export Import Bank Loan	89.3
International Monetary Fund	200
Postponement of Interest on American Loan in 1956	36.8
Postponement of Interest and Principal in 1957	64.5
Total	£466

at the head are also in a position of control, this factor must have a relationship with the activities of the rank and file.

With this in mind we automatically consider the nature of the conditions of our leadership and their activists the officials, in other words the pay and conditions of the TU leaders. I should like to point out here that **although the theoretical basis of EC of the ETU is a correct one, that it is comprised of rank and file members and not full-time officials, if an investigation were carried out into the activities of some of the leading lights among them we would discover that they are virtually acting as full time officials.** This may not appear to be a very important point but it is as well to remember that **any trend away from the workshop is a dangerous one and must inevitably lead to reaction.** One of the main reactionary trends of our own leadership which is symptomatic of the CP is their complete refusal to accept criticism from the rank and file, in fact in certain

ETU, many having various political differences with one another. This is a perfectly natural state of affairs within an organization such as ours. Unfortunately the situation as it is only creates negative results, **the political differences will not be solved for a very long time to come, therefore these groups must find common ground on which to get together. This can only be done at the moment on an industrial basis, the forming of a basic industrial policy within the framework of basic political aims, this can be turned into a practical possibility, in fact it has already begun.**

This should not develop into an anti CP campaign with the aim of always opposing the CP on the ballot form or elsewhere (this would merely negate any positive aim). Candidates must and will be put forward for elections, the main purpose at the moment, to create a platform for explaining and developing the program which will be drawn up mainly via liaison activity. In this way groups can maintain

NAN MILTON WRITES FROM SCOTLAND

INDUSTRIAL

OUR FIGHT IS YOUR FIGHT

THIS WAS the inscription on the banner carried by Frankie Jones, British fly-weight champion boxer and Stirlingshire miner, as he marched through the streets of Falkirk with three thousand other miners and supporters. Normally I dislike the

big-wigs—the Provost, MP Malcolm McPherson, the chairman of the Trades Council and others—expressed complete solidarity with the miners, and made fighting speeches in an atmosphere which I have not experienced since before the war. Wild en-

biggest rude awakening waiting for them in the very near future.” “Our main fight is against the Government, but if the Coal Board is to carry out the Tory policy of the Government we must come into conflict with them.” He also made it clear that the Union would come into conflict with any Labour Government that carried on the Tory policy, and failed to carry out a Socialist program.

the threatened closure of 30 Scottish pits and the suspension of new sinkings. Such a policy will only increase still further the already high level of unemployment in this area.

We demand a policy of industrial expansion and the granting of a seven-hour day and three weeks' summer holidays now; increased wages and better social and working conditions for all workers; the suspension of interest payment to the former coal owners; the ending of open-cast workings, and the continuation of

Once again the miners are on the move. Scotland has already seen the most impressive demonstrations against the Tories' policy of pit closures; London, in the shape of that other victim of the Tory anti-nationalization campaign—the busmen—has welcomed them and pledged our solidarity when they acted as hosts to a protest delegation of 500 from over the Border. Our correspondent, NAN MILTON, Secretary of the Avonbridge Labour Party, daughter of one of Britain's greatest revolutionaries, John MacLean, describes the first stirrings of the miners' campaign. We hope to keep readers informed of its development in future—Editor.

“noble art” almost as much as Edith Summerskill does, but good luck to this boxer. He has the right idea!

As I watched this colourful procession of confident well-dressed, well-fed men demonstrating their opposition to the threatened closure of 30 Scottish pits, my thoughts winged back to the days of the Hungry Thirties, when public demonstration was the only weapon of that pitiful army of unemployed which a heartless Tory Government hope to resuscitate. Stirlingshire is not yet listed as a depressed area; only 5 per cent of the insured population of Falkirk, compared with 10 per cent of Lanarkshire industrial towns, are unemployed. But when that 5 per cent does not include the large numbers of boys not yet registered, the short-time workers and the men cast out at 65, then

enthusiasm greeted the more militant parts of the powerful speech made by Scottish miners' leader, Abe Moffat. “The National Coal Board had better beware where it is travelling” he warned. “If they think they can afford to ignore this Union there is the

Socialist Review expresses its sorrow and consolation to all those who knew and worked with Wally Jones, the Docks' leader, whose tragic death has recently occurred. Wally Jones was a workers' leader who knew how to talk and bargain hard with the bosses, and his loss will be a hard blow to his workmates.

As a man who devoted his life to principles and to bettering the conditions of his comrades, his death deserves the fullest obituary of the Labour Movement.

The following resolution was carried unanimously:

This protest demonstration of mineworkers, joined by the workers of Stirlingshire and district, declare their complete opposition to the Government and the National Coal Board in relation to

new projects.

We believe that only a Labour Government committed to a Socialist policy can meet the requirements of the present situation, and we pledge ourselves to work for this in the forthcoming General Election.

BEAT REDUNDANCY NOW!

says Karl Dunbar, Willesdon AEU

REDUNDANCY, the modern equivalent to the sack, is now a really serious threat to the working class. The Tory Government and its friends, the Economic League, have put the present figure of unemployed at 600,000 odd. In fact we can be sure, as a number of people in the Labour movement have hinted, that at least a million are drawing the dole.

So far as the factory worker is concerned, he knows that such industries as machine tools, heavy engineering, aircraft and shipbuilding, are already in the throes of “laying off” workers and that all the signs are there of a serious slump in the motor car industry. One small hope for the engineering industry is a trade pact with the Eastern bloc, Russia, etc., but this is something in the future and subject always to the conditions under which capitalism is forced to trade with these countries.

Compensation

We must of necessity be concerned with the present state of affairs, facing as we are an ever growing army of unemployed and a boss class becoming ever more aggressive towards organized labour, ever more ready to attack the rates and conditions won by the working class over many years of bitter, relentless struggle. It is with this in mind that I bluntly condemn the attitude of our national body, who consistently shy away from a united struggle against the engineering employers on the issue of “work or full maintenance.”

Because of this mouse in the corner attitude of our so-called “leadership,” we are forced to consider not what should be the national policy of our union, but how best we can tackle the fact of sacking as it applies to our own individual factories. This in itself is a retreat, as I see it, but I repeat we are forced to adopt this reasoning.

It is well known that some unions in the Confederation are pursuing a policy of compensation for discharged workers. There has been quite a considerable amount of controversy over exactly how large this compensation should be. Personally no amount of money can compensate for the loss of livelihood, unless it maintains the workless and his family for the entire period he is without work.

If we reject the “compensation” argument, the fact that workers are being sacked still remains, and we have still to decide exactly how we are to combat unemployment. It is argued that we should “fight to retain all workers in employment even though we have to pay a price.” This “price” would mean, for instance, the downgrading of skills, plus, of course, the applicable reduction in earnings. Or the breakdown of existing piece-work rates on the basis of the management pleading that, “we cannot compete unless the price is reduced.” Or maybe a relaxation of the principle one man one machine, so that an operator may work two, three or four machines.

In other words, the structure governing wages and conditions

in each factory is placed on the table as a bargaining force against a certain number of workers being sacked. To my mind the dangers of such a policy are considerable. Once we give the employer the opportunity to cut one established rate, to downgrade one worker, then I know, from past experience, the whole structure goes in the melting pot. The price we would pay if we adopted this policy would, to my mind, be too high.

Finally we come down to an old principle which was adopted many years before I was born, namely, “first in last out.” Now I have had some experience of this principle and being faced with a reduction in our workshop, I moved, “first in last out.” It may have been that as I was one of the last in that the motion was carried. I don't know. All I do know is that this is the only way I can see to resolve the problem of sackings on a local factory basis. At least this ensures that the boss is denied the happy moment of ridding himself of active trade unionists wholesale.

The Future

Whilst we are facing redundancy in our particular factories, we should not altogether forget the future and what we need to obtain, namely a national policy against sackings. Whilst it may seem fruitless to send resolutions to the EC, we should still keep up the pressure. Also, we can call upon local branches of the union to meet collectively and discuss local problems of redundancy on a wider scale.

PALS TOGETHER

At the Krupp stand Khrushchev toasted Herr Krupp in brandy drunk from a cup made of Krupp steel. He asked the director of the firm in attendance to convey his personal good wishes to Herr Krupp, who is in Japan.

—Times, March 7.

the picture becomes grim indeed. Our thanks, and the thanks of the whole working-class, should go to the miners, for once again they are taking up their traditional role as the shock troops of our movement.

At the mass meeting which followed, all the local Labour

working class in the orbit of the period of industrial development reached in Britain, accepting criticism and answering it, associating itself with other left wing movements, thereby bringing the British working class movement to a stage whereby Socialism can be achieved. I would suggest that primary moves in this direction would automatically solve “Problems of the left in the ETU.”

COLONIAL

IMPERIALISM

I SOME FACTS and Figures

• Companies and MEN

NYASALAND where a state of emergency has just been declared is primarily an agricultural country; the available mineral resources have been little developed as yet.

The mineral rights are largely owned by the giant **British South Africa Company** — known as "Chartered" to the initiated—it was set up by royal charter and once governed the whole of Southern and Northern Rhodesia. In the early 20's it relinquished the administration of both these territories; in 1933 the Southern Rhodesian Government bought the company's mineral rights in its territory for £2 million; the Company's assets now consist of (a) mining rights throughout Northern Rhodesia, subject to payment to the Northern Rhodesian Government of 20 per cent of net revenue derived from exercise of their rights in the territory, (b) mineral rights over 16,000 square miles in Nyasaland, (c) half interest until April 1st, 1964, in net proceeds of disposal of land effected by Government in North-West Rhodesia, (d) 134,000 acres of citrus and other estates in Southern Rhodesia, (e) 99 per cent of shares of Rhodesia Railway Trust. Royalties in the year ending September 30th, 1958, totalled £6,120,829; consolidated profit £7,971,197; dividends paid out £2,266,780.

Classes

Until 1957, **Mr Julian Amery, MP**, son-in-law to Macmillan and now Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, was a director of "Chartered." Among the present directors is the **Marquess of Salisbury** who resigned from the Cabinet in March, 1957 because of a disagreement over the release of Archbishop Makarios.

President of the British South Africa Co. is **Lord Robins** (formerly Col. Robins, but elevated to the Lords only last year). In a letter to **The Times** on March 3, 1959, he said:

The predominance of the white man—the British white African—must continue for at least another generation. . . . Different classes and types of white Africans are not forced to meet socially or to frequent the same clubs, or each other's houses; why should it be supposed that a black African, just because he washes, speaks English, and wears European dress, must of necessity be accepted in the society of white men of the top grade?

Lord Robins is also on African Explosive and Chemical Industries, De Beers Consolidated Mines, etc. Seventy-five years

old, he was Literary Secretary of the Anti-Socialist Union of Great Britain 1909-14.

Nyasaland Railways Ltd. owns the railway system; it has an issued capital of £472,459 of which £54,081 is owned by the Federal Government; the latter has the right to appoint two directors but not to vote on the appointment of other directors. Non-Government directors include **Mr. C J Holland-Martin, MP**, brother-in-law of Macmillan and Joint Hon Treasurer of the Conservative Party since 1947.

• Wages

WAGES IN NYASALAND.

Minimum wages for agricultural workers were fixed at 1s. 3d. a day in July, 1957; where the employer provides food, he can deduct 4d. per day from this sum. (**Hansard**, June 26, 1957). For an eight-hour day this works out at under 2d. an hour. With unconscious humour the official Colonial Office Report for 1957 observes: "the Nyasaland African places a high value on leisure; he is inclined to work sporadically when it suits him."

Wages of agricultural workers are usually paid by the 30-day ticket—i.e., after 30 days' work has been completed. A weekly cash advance is, however, given on request for the purpose of buying food where rations are not provided. The Colonial Office Report says: "It is obligatory for employers to provide housing for any employee who is unable to return home at the end of his day's work. Much of the housing provided, until recently, consisted of wattle-and-daub buildings with grass roofs. It is now becoming more widely recognised, however, that not only is such housing uneconomic, but that modern and comfortable housing must be provided to stabilise labour in its working conditions." And later the report says: "Year by year a steady improvement in the standard of African housing may be noted. Wattle-and-daub houses now more frequently contain windows and have separate kitchens and pit latrines."

Town and Country

Minimum wage rates in the towns are slightly higher than the 1s. 3d. per day in agricultural areas as follows:—

(1) Blantyre/Limbe township, 2s. 0d. per day; (2) Zomba and Lilongwe townships, 1s. 9d. per day; (3) Salima township, 1s. 4d. per day. (Colonial Office Report, **Nyasaland**, 1957.)

In every case deductions from these rates are permitted if the employer supplies cooked meals or rations. Housing is not included in these rates of pay.

• SOCIAL OCCASION

SOCIAL OCCASION. "Viscount Malvern was the chairman at the dinner of the Rhodesian and Nyasaland Club on November 11th in honour of the Marquess and Marchioness of Salisbury. Those present included Lord and Lady Robins, Sir Gilbert and Lady Rennie, Major-General Sir John and Lady Kennedy, Lord and Lady Twining." (**New Commonwealth**, December, 1958.)

Lord Twining's full title is "Baron Twining of Tanganyika and of Godalming in the County of Surrey." Governor and Commander in Chief of Tanganyika, 1949-58. Viscount Malvern (né Godfrey Huggins) is "of Rhodesia and of Bexley." Born in 1883; Prime Minister S. Rhodesia 1933-53, of British South Africa Co. in a non-executive capacity. He is also on the local board of the Standard Bank of South Africa and on the Merchant Bank of Central Africa.

Lord Malvern, in a speech to the Institute of Mining and Metallurgy at Kitwe on May 11, 1957, referred to outside troublemakers who increased the difficulties of the Federation by their

interference. People in Britain seemed to have given up their sense of spiritual values, he said. "They have become idolators worshipping the idol of a universal vote." He gave warning of the danger of paying too high a price for dominion status, for instance by designing the franchise law to please the United Kingdom. "It would be a complete sell-out because you know the sort of thing that would satisfy them."

• IN THE PAST

A LOOK BACK. "The admission even to the inner financial circle of a few members of the British aristocracy, attracted by the sheer spirit of adventure, was valuable, not only for the vulgar purpose of prospectuses, but for the slower and more delicate work of constructing political and 'social' supports for the Rhodesian bubble."

But this was 50 and more years ago — John A. Hobson's **The Evolution of Modern Capitalism**, 1906, "The financial system is illustrated from South Africa." The great props of "enterprise" in South and Central Africa are the de Beers combine (Oppenheimer), the copper companies (with Mr Prain) and the Tanganyika Concession—Union Minière (Belgian Congo) tie-up. This has Charles Waterhouse, ex-Tory MP in the Tanganyika end.

Reprinted by kind permission of **LRD Publications Ltd.** from **LRD Fact Service**, March 7, 1959.

FORUM

DOMINIC BEHAN
REPLIES TO N HARRIS

POLICY FOR IRELAND

"FILLED with clichés; and not one of them 'new'." Mr. Sam Goldwyn might almost have been referring to your contributor, Noel Harris (SR, March 1). Indeed, if I had one single penny paid me for everything said by Mr Harris which has been said within my earshot over my thirty odd years I'd have enough to buy back the six North Eastern Counties of Ireland, let alone pay for resolutionary stationary.

My fellow-Irishman is of the opinion that most of the forms of struggle—if not them all—maintained by the natives of the country in question are all wrong; should never have been embarked upon, and only lead to confusion in the ranks of those who would be desirous of achieving the Unity of Ireland. Who are these abstract Worker-Republicans? In what mole-hole

or burrow, in which Irish bog do they hide and carry on their unknown fight against British Imperialism? I, for one, Mr Harris, have no knowledge of anyone outside the IRA carrying on any struggle against the forces of occupation, either North or South of the border; political or purely physical force. Yes, Mr Harris, I am an Irish Republican, and what you and the **Daily Mail** would dub a "Petty bourgeois terrorist"; and for all that, **I'm a Socialist!** (Don't take my word for it, read the **Dublin Catholic Paper** "The Standard." They'll vouch for my Socialism, any time.)

In being a Republican, I hope to keep strictly in a tradition, created by Britain, opposed by Tone and furthered by Connolly with gun and pamphlet. I'm sure Mr Harris will not object if I am
(contd next page)

IN NYASALAND

2 WELENSKY'S RACIAL DICTATORSHIP by John Rex

THE "Boston Tea Party" which Rhodesia's White settlers have so often threatened now seems to be well under way. It is the culminating point of the revolution carried through by Sir Godfrey Huggins and Sir Roy Welensky—the British Government during the past ten years with the object of setting up a racial dictatorship.

The revolution began in 1950 when Huggins persuaded Jim Griffiths to accept as a "basis

foolish enough to believe that before criticising the young men who have taken up arms against John Bull, I should, first of all, examine the conditions which gave rise to their movement.

To begin with. England invaded Ireland, butchered anybody daring to oppose their Imperialistic ways, reduced the entire country to a slave camp, and, for close on eight hundred years carried on a relentless policy of repression designed to destroy the language, habits and culture peculiar to the Irish people. Not a single decade went by but Irishmen asserted in blood their unquestionable right to independence and self-determination. This struggle, became completely Republican in character, under the leadership of Tone and Emmet, the fore-runners of Socialist thought in Europe, was carried on by the Fenian organization—who played more than a small part in the founding of the great **British Chartist movement**, and won the worthy support of the great **SOCIALIST**, James Connolly, who thought the idea and ideal worth giving his life for in 1916. After Connolly, no less a person than the **SOCIALIST** Liam Mellows elected to face the firing squad, nor was he the last **SOCIALIST** to swear allegiance to "The petty bourgeois terrorist IRA."

National Independence

In 1936 Frank Ryan (ever heard of him?) led the Irish contingent of the International Brigade against a gentleman called Franco in defence of the young Spanish Republic, and I might add, for Mr Harris's information, that most—if not all—of the men under his command were drawn directly from the "Petty bourgeois terrorist IRA." On then to the "petty bourgeois terrorist Irish Republican Army" of the moment. What is their published policy? FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE AND AN END TO

for discussion" that the notion of "partnership" should replace the notion of "trusteeship" as the basis of British policy in the African territories. Perhaps "trusteeship" never meant much in practice, but its meaning was clear in the Devonshire declaration of 1923 which spoke of "exercizing a trust on behalf of the African population" and said that the British Government was "unable to delegate or share this trust the object of which might be defined as the protection and

OCCUPATION EITHER BRITISH OR AMERICAN! I'd sooner accept their word than that of the Northern Irish **SOCIALIST'S** like Mr Andy Barr who don't even think the partition of Ireland worthy of mention. (See Mr Barr's election manifesto for the last GE.)

Now Mr Harris, I am not a member of the IRA and indeed if I was a Greek Cypriot I would not be a member of EOKA. Got me? At the same time I cannot forget that without the British military occupation of the two places, the Socialist movement could have developed as it would in lands where no National problem exists. In short—as you nearly say—the agents of Capitalism—domestic and foreign—in Ireland are using the problem of Partition to stultify the development of Socialist thought and create a position (false) where Irish workers are led from Socialist organization. How then, can the ground in Ireland be made ready for a really progressive struggle?

Get out!

Firstly, I believe that the workers of Ireland should be asked to support the demands of the Irish Republicans for self-determination — this does not need to mean support for anti-working class policies. Secondly, the causes of poverty directly attributable to the ECONOMIC division of the country should be correctly attributed. This would result in our people coming to understand the manoeuvres of Capitalists (North and South) with regard to their respective positions in relation to Irish Unity, and expose their real intentions (divide and conquer, etc.). Lastly, the Labour movement in Britain must be made to demand that not one penny of the British tax-payers' money must now be spent on bolstering a tottering Empire's lackeys' institution in Ireland against the expressed wishes of the vast

advancement of the Native races."

By contrast "Partnership" was defined by Sir Godfrey Huggins as a policy "which assures the survival of the European in this part of Africa." This was Jim Griffith's basis for discussion.

"Ensuring the survival of the European" was spelled out in terms of a constitution for the Federal Parliament in which the settlers were given control of 21 seats out of 30 and took the major part in determining the representation of Africans in the other nine seats. Even this, however, was not enough to satisfy Welensky who introduced a "fancy franchise" scheme to ensure that an even greater proportion of the African representatives would be chosen for them by the Europeans. At the last election there were less than 750 African voters in the Federation.

Organizing

A concentration of power like this in the hands of the White minority (about 250,000 as against 7,000,000 Africans) reflected the sort of economic class structure of Rhodesia where all the best lands, the industry and marketing facilities are in the hands of Europeans. And they proposed to use their political power in every possible way to exploit the African proletariat.

majority of the Irish people.

Mr Harris believes (I wonder, does he?) that the passing of resolutions which get good press in the North of Ireland is a bad thing. What rubbish! What utter stuff and nonsense! And you an Oxfordman too! I'm really surprised at you Noel. Isn't it quite obvious to a man with even half a head that British Imperialism would have ridden roughshod (completely) without the watchful "resolutioner's" of the Labour movement. Cyprus, Malaya, Kenya, Nyasaland. . . . Or maybe National independence is good for them and bad for Ireland? More power to the workers who will put forward resolutions in defence of the oppressed, and more fool the capitalist who will publicise their passing—he'll be well advised to read Charlie Marx, or even listen to the frothings of Roy (Rogers) Welensky.

The partition of Ireland is wrong! The occupation of any part of Ireland by a foreign army is wrong! Two "separate" Socialisms is a false, dangerous argument and one only designed by jingoists to betray the Irish Workers' Republic. The only truly progressive slogan for us can be Unity AND Socialism. Get to hell out of here John Bull and let us clear up the mess ourselves.

With the co-operation of the Colonial Office there began immediately after Federation a process of breaking up African political and Trade Union organizations. The leaders of the Northern Rhodesia Mineworkers Union were illegally deported from the Copper Belt and immigration orders restricted the movement of Congress leaders between the territories. When the very faintly liberal Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia accepted an official report recommending a minimum wage of £6 per month for African factory workers, Sir Roy Welensky stood by and saw him driven out of office.

As to the economic development which was supposed to bring great benefits to Africans following Federation, the history of the Kariba scheme serves to illustrate the bloody cost of such development to Africans. Well over 100 Africans have been killed in industrial accidents on the site, and of the 50,000 moved from their homes, 8 are admitted to have been shot while at least 81 have died from diseases resulting from the removals.

The African Congresses have responded to this situation by going on organizing and holding meetings to demand the breaking up of the Federation even in the face of Police bans and intimidation. The situation flared into violence, however, when police began breaking up these meetings in Nyasaland and arresting Congress leaders. The masses of the African people who know that they must fight now before Welensky gets independence have fought back magnificently, have stormed the prisons and have often succeeded in releasing their leaders. But now Welensky has intervened and has sent in young White Rhodesian troops, whom the record shows, have begun indiscriminately to beat up and arrest Africans. After consistent reports that Church of Scotland Missions were being attacked by Africans, an astonishing letter appeared in the **Manchester Guardian** from one of these missionaries claiming that what was happening was that Rhodesian troops had been beating up the mission students.

Withdraw

Finally the arrogance of the Federal government was shown by its action in deporting John Stonehouse who was investigating the situation on behalf of Christian Action. To this piece of effrontery the Tory Government simply capitulated.

Labour has already demanded that a Parliamentary Commission should visit Nyasaland. This demand must be backed in every possible way. But there are even more important things

(contd page 6)

CND CONFERENCE — end

A Merseyside Amendment urging that more work be undertaken to win Trade Unionists, and urging also that the establishment of TU groups was accepted by both Conference and EC. Eric Heffer, speaking for Merseyside, made the valid point that if the Labour Party was to be won then the TU had got to be brought to our side, as in fact 75 per cent of the Labour Party Constituency Parties were already supporting the basic aim of the Campaign. It was felt by the Conference that the Labour Advisory Committee had been too restricted in its work and by 126 votes to 121 a resolution by Oxford University group was carried which stated that the committee should be strengthened by the inclusion in it of two delegates to be either TU or LP members. It was after this that the debate took place on the

EAST HARROW

HELP IS NEEDED IN THIS
CRITICAL BYE-ELECTION.
REPORT TO
LABOUR COMMITTEE
ROOMS, LABOUR HALL,
RAILWAY APPROACH,
WEALDSTONE, MIDDX.

question of the "Voters' veto." Pat Arrowsmith whose sincerity and dedication to the campaign is unquestioned, made a speech of high emotional quality, stated that this was the overriding issue of all time. Speakers were so numerous that at one time they lined the walls, and had to be urged to resume their seats. The EC speaker, AJP

JOHN REX — end

to do. Labour must demand the withdrawal of Southern Rhodesian troops immediately, even if it means sending in British troops to ensure compliance. It must demand the immediate release of the Congress leaders from Nyasaland now detained in Rhodesia and it must see to it that talks are initiated with the Congress leaders about constitutional changes in the various territories so that the overwhelming desire of the people for secession may be officially and publicly stated.

Above all Labour should say quite unequivocally that it is on the same side as the African Congress in its struggle for freedom. Far too many Labour MP's still talk nonsense about "partnership" as the policy of the Rhodesian government. What must be realised is that the peasants and workers of Nyasaland are fighting for their very lives against a vicious racial revolution, which if it is successful will leave them as near to slavery as makes no difference. They will have no protection in this fight from the Tory ruling class in Britain. Everything depends for them on how the British Labour Movement acts.

Taylor, who, on other occasions showed a definite flippancy was, on this occasion, very sound and urged the Conference to reject the veto as a dangerous thing which would isolate the Campaign from its main support, namely, the Labour Movement. The Conference voted 103 for, and 166 against a Walthamstow addendum and even more decisively against a Worthing group amendment which sought the complete veto on all candidates of any political colour who supported nuclear warfare.

The Sunday morning session was the most explosive. Three motions were composited into one, thus being a very watered-down version of the original. This motion, however, gave full support to the Swaffham demonstrators while, at the same time, saying that the Campaign believed in political action rather than Civil Disobedience.

Amendment

The debate was furious but proceeded in an orderly way until the Halifax delegate, Dorothy Thompson, said that although her group had put forward an amendment, that if the EC were making it a vote of confidence she would be forced to vote against the amendment, which she herself had seconded. The Chairman, in reply, stated that the EC were making it a vote of confidence. This horrified whole sections of the delegates who became exceedingly angry. The voting then finally resulted in 77 for the amendment, 109 for the EC and, to use Cannon Collins' words, approximately 60 abstentions. These abstentions being quite deliberate as a protest at the EC's decision.

AGAINST THE GRAIN

Dealing with Malenkov, Mr. Khrushchev said: "Malenkov deceived the party and the people when he said at the party congress in 1952 that the grain harvest in the country had reached 8,000 million poods (one pood equals 36.2 lb.), whereas it had actually been less than 6,000 million. The State received in that year no more than 2,100 million poods," he added. "Malenkov's statement was nothing else than a blind designed to cover up grave failures in agriculture, whose direction had been entrusted to Malenkov." — *The Times*, December 16th, 1958.

At this stage, after a brief consultation with the EC, the Chairman then moved a resolution, which had been originally part of an amendment of the South Hendon group. This was: "The Campaign EC, while paying tribute to the courage of those who risk and suffer imprisonment in the cause of nuclear disarmament, states that civil disobedience is not, at present, its official policy."

This placation from the platform was overwhelmingly accepted, but it was some time before the temperature dropped.

On the issue of organization, the Campaign kept, quite rightly in my opinion, a balanced view that improved its democracy on the one hand, yet did not in fact organize a new political party. On a composite motion moved by Jim Roche, of Leeds, the EC is to be strengthened by the inclusion on it of two representatives from each regional committee.

Details

There was some criticism of the EC because it was felt that it did not consult its area groups sufficiently. Most of the other amendments were accepted by the EC and the afternoon session devoted most of its time to the working out of the details for the Aldermaston March at Easter.

Labour's task

My overall impression of the Conference was one of liveliness, of the mixing of age and youth, and of dedicated enthusiasm. Yet the Conference is really an anachronism. What the campaign is doing ought really to be done by the Labour and Trade Union movement. However, the next best thing is to ensure that we get the movement to support the aims of the Campaign. The setting up of a trade union group of the Campaign, and orientation towards the Labour Movement would, in fact, be the first step in that direction.

THE USES OF TELEVISION

by Chris Barker

"NEW Fields for Television" was the heading of a feature article in *The Times* of February 27, and the writer used it to assess various ways in which television could be used to assist western imperialist domination of under-developed territories. Of course he didn't say this in so many words, but here are one or two suggested uses which he found:—

- "The prospect of a set is an incentive to work hard and save."
- "A government can use its time for propaganda . . . or it can rely on the commercial peak hours to damp down the fires of unwelcome agitation, and encourage the traditional unit of family life."
- "It can be regarded as a means of spreading western values, as well as a conquest for the brash enterprise of commercial television."

For sheer contemptuous arrogance it would be hard to beat.

SOCIALIST REVIEW is published twice a month by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd. Subscriptions, post paid: 1 year: 16s. 6 months: 8s. 3 months: 4s. Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of **Socialist Review** which are given in editorial statement.

All communications to be addressed to the publisher, M. Maddison, 21 Aubert Park, London, N5
Printed by H. Palmer (Harlow) Ltd. TU, Bush Fair, Harlow, Essex

WHAT WE STAND FOR

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

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

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments based on a means test. Renationalisation of all denationalised industries without compensation. — The nationalised industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.

- Workers' control in all nationalised industries ie, a majority of workers' representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and receiving the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.

- The establishment of workers' committees to control all private enterprises within the framework of a planned economy. In all instances representatives must be subject to frequent election, immediate recall, and receive the average skilled wage in the industry.

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

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

- The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, the abolition of all payments for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.

- The expansion of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities and the right to requisition privately held land.

- Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fee paying schools. For comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants — without a means test — for all university students.

- Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection to all workers whatever their country of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.

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

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

- The abolition of the H-bomb and all weapons of mass destruction. Britain to pave the way with unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb.

- A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington nor Moscow.

INTERNATIONAL

FROM HAMBURG, H D ALEX WRITES ON

GERMAN WORKERS AGAINST THE BOMB

THE CAMPAIGN against nuclear war went further in Western Germany than it did here. For a short period last year it embraced hundreds of thousands and became a central issue in the German working-class struggle; something which it has yet to achieve in this country. The following article by H D Alex, of Hamburg, gives a clear insight into the rise and decline of the movement, the role played by the workers and their "leaders" and similar matters of interest to British readers. We are grateful to *The London Letter* for permission to reprint it from 1958 and the *Campaign Against Nuclear War—Editor*.

SINCE 1945 all anti-war organizations and outstanding pacifists have warned of the dangers of an atomic war, pointing to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In Western Germany, however, people seem to have had other worries. The desired television set, refrigerator or motor car has been much nearer their heart. They have heard about the terrifying consequences of the Atomic bombs on Japan, and of the Bikini tests, but they have allayed their fears by thinking of the great distances between them and these places, and have devoted themselves to the pursuit of the "economic miracle."

The US Information Service has organized large "migrant" exhibitions in many German towns, which demonstrate the peaceful developments of nuclear physics. The US Sub-Committee for Atomic Energy reported: "... the present and potential effects of the slow increase of radio-activity in the atmosphere are within tolerable limits." A highly placed person in America went so far as to point out that the dials of luminous watches represent a greater danger than all the atom tests which have taken place to date.

The world was also allowed to hear the joyful message that the scientists have succeeded in inventing a "clean" bomb. And everywhere the propaganda went on for the creation of a Civil Defence Service against nuclear attack. The German Federal Post even applied a date-stamp to frank envelopes with the inscription "Air Defence in the Atomic Age."

The well-fed Federal citizen may enjoy his well-earned and restful sleep—did not the Strong Man of Bonn give him every assurance of safety? Were not his slogans for the 1957 election campaign "No Experiments!" and "Wealth for All!"? Did he not win the election, and establish firmly his paternal power?

This tranquillising propaganda received its coup de grace when on January 13, 1958, Dr Linus Pauling handed to the Secretary-General of the UN a declaration signed by 9,235 scientists from 44 countries, an act which was widely publicized in Germany and made an immediate impact.

Just at that very time the Federal Government caused great disquiet among the opposition and large sections of the population by declaring their intention to provide the Federal Army with atomic weapons. There were passionate discussions in Parliament. On March 25, 1958, however, the Government obtained a majority of 72, and atomic re-armament became an accomplished fact. The German Social Democratic Party declared that the Government had not been authorised by the electorate to make a decision of such fateful consequence. They declared they would continue their struggle against atomic re-armament outside Parliament.

It seemed as if West Germany had become overnight a centre of resistance. The long and sharp debates were broadcast, causing a sudden awakening from the "economic miracle" day-dream. Opinion polls ascertained that 83 per cent of the population disagreed with atomic re-armament. Hiroshima, Nagasaki and the Bikini atoll seemed suddenly very near. Anybody

with a modicum of imagination realised what the consequences of nuclear war on the territories of the Federal Republic and the DDR would be. In every town people of varying political colours demonstrated against the atomic danger.

The Social Democratic Party started committees called "Campaign Against Nuclear Death." New organizations sprung up everywhere. The appeal issued in March, 1958, by the Göttingen nuclear scientists demanding a voluntary renunciation of atomic weapons, found a ready response among the people, who had at last become aware of the danger.

A few days later, in Hamburg, more than 150,000 men and women staged a demonstration in front of the Town Hall in protest against nuclear re-armament. **The demonstrators called upon the Social Democratic Party and the Trade Unions to organize a general strike against the atomic plans of the Government.**

No one seemed more surprised at the response to their slogan "Campaign Against Nuclear Death" than the Social Democratic Party and Trade Union leaders themselves. The Trades Union Congress was just at that time convening in Hamburg, and both they and the SPD leadership dissociated themselves from this clamour, which lacked respectability, and, instead, suggested that a plebiscite be demanded which would show the Government that the majority of the German people opposed nuclear re-armament.

Counter — offensive

Thus they abandoned their unique chance to force Adenauer's resignation through a campaign of civil disobedience. Many people, aware of the individual's responsibility for the developments did not know what to think of the ambiguous attitude of the Social Democratic Party and Trades Union Congress and began to organise isolated actions, such as the "wild" protest strikes in several large industrial concerns. In many towns, such as Hamburg, Berlin, Cologne and Munich, they organised Nuclear Warning Pickets. Day and night, students and others guarded huge posters "Against Nuclear Death," giving the people an example of non-violent resistance. The appeals of Dr Schweitzer, broadcast by Oslo radio and transmitted by the German stations, also made a strong impact everywhere.

The Social Democratic Party was unable to make better use of the opportunity than to place a Bill before the parliaments of the Federal states, aiming at a plebiscite. This Bill became law in those states where the SPD has a majority—in Bremen, Hamburg and Hesse.

In the meantime, however, the Federal Government had recovered from its surprise, and went into counter-offensive. They published giant posters calling for a "Campaign Against Atomic Death in the Whole World." This piece of impudence served to direct the unpopularity of nuclear war into a channel more convenient for the Government.

To prevent the plebiscite in preparation in

the three states already mentioned, the Government obtained an injunction from the Supreme Constitutional Court.

In Munich and Berlin organized attacks took place against the "Warning Pickets." A counter-picket was planned, but did not materialize since the pro-atom fighters could not man even the first two hours' guard. The Bavarian police made a search of the HQ of the organization against nuclear re-armament, and confiscated the donations of sympathisers. Finally, the Government proceeded against the Warning Pickets in many towns for "obstruction of traffic" and forbade the erection of posters, since "there was no verifiable need or interest in such posters."

Before the plebiscite was prohibited altogether, the irritation of the populace was vented once more. On 1st May, 1958, the slogan of the TU Congress—"For Social Justice and a 40-hour Week"—was completely ignored and the May Day demonstrators carried almost exclusively posters and banners protesting against nuclear re-armament. Popular participation was stronger than ever before but, alas, this was the swan-song, at least for the time being, of a vigorous movement.

The plebiscite was prohibited following Dr Adenauer's reproof to the effect that the West German democracy was "representative" and not "plebiscitarian." The ruling of the Supreme Court was accepted without demur by the opposition and the majority of the population. The General Strike did not take place, since it appears that in Germany civic courage is not to be shown except with the explicit permission of the Government.

In the 1958 elections in Schleswig-Holstein and Nordrhein-Westfalen, the Social Democratic Party tried to make capital of the popular rejection of nuclear re-armament. It soon became evident, however, that the well-nourished Federal citizen is more concerned with the full shop-windows than with radio-active danger to the health of his children. When confronted with the alternatives "Fight Against Nuclear Death" or "Wealth for All," he chose wealth, in accordance with the ancient concept: After me, the deluge.

The Social Democratic Party drew their conclusions from the election defeats and allowed the slow disintegration of their anti-nuclear re-armament committees. More than that, they issued an appeal to their members asking them to volunteer for the new Federal Army! What are we to think of the Social Democratic politicians who have taken this course? It appears that their ability to turn somersaults is unlimited, as we can well see from the abject history of that Party. What happens in the mind of a party member who, having just carried an anti-nuclear war poster at the May Day demonstration, then voluntarily joins the Army, to receive instruction in the use of atomic weapons? Are they all disillusioned who once believed that they could abolish war, and especially nuclear war, by painstaking work in the Party?

The promising Campaign Against Nuclear Death ended in defeat because the mass of the population, abandoned by its political and trades union leaders, was not ready to translate its fighting slogans into actions. All that remain now in West Germany are small groups and single individuals (together with the pacifist organizations and the permanent Anti-Nuclear Congress in Gelsenkirchen) to continue the struggle with their meagre resources. It is they who fight to re-awaken the conscience of the people, who continue the campaign against nuclear pollution of the globe, and who try to frustrate those who, in their power-madness, may one day press the button that would seal the doom of humanity.

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

Turn to Labour

AFTER ALDERMASTON

A YEAR has passed, and for a second time many of us are expressing our protest against the Government H-bomb policy by the Aldermaston march. We march not only as opponents against H-bomb war, but also as opponents who see reason to carry on the protest this way for a second time. The march itself signifies the continuance of the struggle, a repetition of the previous year.

But, we must ask ourselves why is this protest still expressed in this way? Why is it still only a feebly small conscious minority that marches, why is the anti-H-bomb protest still only expressed by this minority marching? Why have we failed to bring new numbers to the fight with new methods of protest? In a word, we must ask ourselves have we failed? Is the present Aldermaston march itself an expression of the fact that we have failed, that we are still only marching.

Where are the people who did not join this march? Where is the action that did not come? Where (as a German comrade puts it in an article on page 7) is the General Strike that did not take place?

Towards the mass movement

Socialist Review said then, as it says now, that only militant action by the mass of the Labour movement in the form of workers' action to black the rocket bases and ban the bomb can stop the march of the power warriors. Despite the importance of Aldermaston marching we must never forget that those marching are only a insignificant minority. If our ideas do not percolate deeper, and in twelve months they have not, then we remain only as a token of resistance. It is a truism that such a token will not stop the war drive.

Now, as then, we say to our pacifist comrades and others participating in the march, we must carry the anti-war campaign from our own small groups to the workers in their trade unions, labour party and factory organizations, and campaign within these organizations. If Aldermaston-type campaigning has not awakened the majority of the labour movement directly to the anti-H-bomb struggle it is necessary to advocate struggle on all points from wages to Labour Party policy. The short period of awakening of West German labour last year showed what can happen if the official workers' representatives can be forced to mouth opposition to H-bomb policy.

Peace means socialism

If they do not, as the British Labour leaders are obviously doggedly determined not to, it remains for conscious dissenters to work for a movement that will force the Labour Party to action through an anti-capitalist campaign on all fronts beginning where the workers are ready to begin. The struggle for peace remains a struggle for socialism, the struggle of the workers themselves from lower to higher demands where their voice and actions can be heard by the power-determining class.

It is good that we carry on the Aldermaston March from year to year. But it is even more important to apply our energies to constructing a Labour left that can reach the great majority and bring them into a march of protest against the whole system, towards peace and socialism and democratic workers' power.

Report of the first annual conference of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament

by a delegate

THIS CONFERENCE brought between three and four hundred delegates from all parts of the country. The conference was lively and quite heated at times with delegates showing tremendous emotional feeling.

The highlights of the conference were on the discussion of the so-called "Voters' Veto" sponsored by the Direct Action Committee, the question of support for the Direct Actionists at Swaffham, the need to win more support amongst the Trade Unionists and the Labour Movement, and lastly the plan for the Easter, 1959, Aldermaston March.

Develop resistance

The Conference was opened by its Chairman, Canon Collins, who said that after the first flush of activity, those who opposed the campaign were now strongly fighting back. Since summer there had been a slight sense of gloom, which was really unnecessary. Our task was to develop resistance, particularly in ourselves, and decide that we are on the winning side.

This was slow hard work but he was confident that at least in the Labour Party it would soon be possible to win complete victory for the ideas of the campaign. He was confident that after the General Election, a majority of the Parliamentary Labour Party would be taking our view. The great need was to work through Parliament and concentrate on the political side.

The Aldermaston March was planned to go to the place where the seat of political power is, and he urged everyone to give it wholehearted support.

The Conference then got down to discussing the EC report and the many resolutions and addenda sent in to the various groups.

The first argument arose on the wording of the EC report which to some delegates appeared to retract on the categorical position of Unilateral abandonment of the bomb. However, after J B Priestley gave assurance to the Conference that Unilateralism was the definite objective and that the report was not good English prose, the delegates agreed that the amendments be referred to the EC.

A further amendment from the teachers' group, which J B Priestley considered "mischievous and dangerous" and which again watered down the position on Unilateralism was defeated by 159 votes to 80.

An amendment from Wimbledon and from Greenwich and Blackheath group which sought to extend the activities of the campaign also against germ and bacteriological warfare was defeated not because the campaign did not agree with the sentiments expressed but because it was felt that all energies should be concentrated on the main issue.

The section which brought the Conference at times to a high emotional level was the one dealing with strategy, tactics and activities.

See page 6