

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

FORTNIGHTLY
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

8th YEAR No 7

Mid APRIL, 1958

SIXPENCE

THE BUDGET and THE BOMB

NEWS OF THE TORY BUDGET will be reaching readers as they open this issue of SR. There will be no surprises. Much will be made of a little adjustment here, a puny concession there; but British workers can be sure that nothing is coming their way.

The Budget is the house organ for property, profit and privilege. Its priorities are their priorities. Its incomes, expenditures, balances and totals are theirs. Their interests are served by its national accounting. Nobody else matters.

But the Budget rules our lives. Are we to get arms or education, roads or unemployment? The Budget decides these. Is it to be money for Hydrogen Bombs or for Healthy Babies? This the Budget decrees.

The Tories are busy with our future. 'No wage concessions,' runs their Cohen Report; 'sack another 400,000' cries their Federation of British Industry; 'no island of inflation in a sea of world deflation' warns their Government. And the Budget, their Budget, continues the ruth-

H BOMB • MASS LOBBY

Tuesday, 20th May 5-10 pm

Details from

16 St Marks Crescent, London, NW1

less business of robbing the living to feed death, of chaining the people to the war machine.

The Budget is the naked heart of British Capitalism. The Bomb and the War Business (half the Budget goes into financing wars—past, present and future) pump that heart and give it life. Without them British Capitalism would be sinking into history.

If we want a Budget for the people not for property, profit and privilege, we must fight the Bomb and the War Business. We must go beyond mass marches to

Aldermaston, down to the roots of Torydom—the factories, the mines, the sites—and their struggle against the Bomb and all it stands for. That is where we can beat the Bomb and tear their war banners. That is where we must

BLACK THE BOMB!
BLACK THE BASES!

and so put a workers' veto to capitalism's orgies of violence as the first step to workers' control of the war machine and the destruction of capitalism.

AFTER ALDERMASTON

Those of us who marched to Aldermaston—slogged more than 50 miles—we marched into a corner of history.

But more is needed.

We need the whole floor

We need to stop the drive to suicide, to wrest the power from the hands of nuclear maniacs, to veto their actions where we can.

Our next step must be to

STOP WORK ON ROCKET BASES
STOP WORK ON H-BOMBS

The Busmen prepare to fight

LONDON'S BUSMEN must not be left to ward off the Tory attack single-handed.

The Tories are working for a showdown. They have offered under two-thirds of the men a miserable, insulting 8/6d., and nothing to the rest, although it would need a full 9/- to cover the rise in prices since the last award. They have tried to use their offer to split Central London busmen from their country service and provincial brothers. They have used every trick in the book to delay, tire and confuse the transport workers. And now they want the final showdown.

This they are going to get. The delegate conference has met the challenge. They have decided on strike action. Notice of intention has been served. Three weeks from now will witness the most important struggle against the bosses and their government since the war.

No distortion and propaganda must be allowed to obscure the issue. The busmen's fight is our fight. Every help must be given,

no strain of solidarity shirked. A defeat for the busmen will be a defeat for workers throughout Britain.

Psychological warfare has already begun. Sir John Elliott, Chairman of the LTE started the campaign of blackmail in a speech to the London Rotary Club when he said:

A large proportion of the traffic lost from a strike is never recovered. At the end, when the buses start to run again, there will be less work for fewer busmen.

Let the socialist in the trade union branch sort out his local bus garage and get his branch to send the busmen a message of support. Let the local trades councils invite the busmen to send representatives to give the facts and counter the lies that will be spread by press and radio as the dispute develops. Let the tubemen and railwaymen show what solidarity action can do in breaking the Tory offensive. All power to the busmen's elbow.

Algerian Revolution—1

page 7

The Industrial front

pages 2-3

Youth—problems and policy

page 5

TU COMMENTARY

• Levine's

THE STRIKE AT LEVINE'S, Master Vending Co, Cricklewood, has been mentioned in this column and in articles in previous issues of SR. The final report, from the Chairman of the Strike Committee and featured on this page, shows that the strike is finished, unfavourably to those immediately concerned in it, and finished in a way humiliating to those other union members who, having given what help they could, had to witness a shameful betrayal of principles.

The report shows that the workers had to face not only the hostility of the management, but that they were further handicapped by the fact that the Executive Council of the Amalgamated Engineering Union refused to give the strikers official backing.

Could anything be more ludicrous? Workers on strike because the management said "We are having no Union here," and the Union bosses refusing to recognize this fundamental struggle.

Surely this was not a problem that could have had two answers when put before the Union leaders? Certainly the rank-and-file of the AEU had only one answer to give, that was, full support for a struggle for trade-union recognition. The EC thought otherwise and in so doing dealt a bitter blow to the trade-union movement.

An injury to one is an injury to all! AEU members must reflect on this when next they have to ballot.

• FBI

EAGER TO SUPPORT the conclusions of the Cohen Committee the Federation of British Industries have issued a statement which makes it clear to all, how they view the question of unemployment. For them "97 percent employed should be considered full employment," in other words the 3 percent representing 700,000 workers looking for jobs is characterized as full employment. With slightly less than half a million out of work at present I presume we are in a situation of "over-full-employment."

It would perhaps have been of interest to the people as a whole if instead of arguing for limitation of wage increases in the coming period, the Cohen Committee had shown exactly what some people do earn. An investigation into Manufacturing and Consumer industries would have revealed that over seven million women have average earnings of £6 9s. 6d. per week.

• US example

IT IS NOT ONLY in Britain that union leaders don't like workers who demand trade union recognition. In the United States, the leaders of the AFL-CIO (the American TUC) have dismissed 99 staff members out of 200 because they wanted to organize and set up their own union to negotiate with their bosses—the AFL-CIO leaders. Most of the dismissed staff were union organizers and they had applied to the

Government Labour Board for a 'collective bargaining election' so that they could be recognized and could legally negotiate with the AFL-CIO leaders.

Shortly after they had applied for recognition the union leaders decided on an economy drive and sacked half of their organizers. (Private Employers take heed how it should be done!)

The organizers offered a quick solution to avoid these staff-cuts. It was for a 10 percent wage cut for those leaders in the "upper bracket." For the President of the AFL-CIO this would have meant his salary being cut down to 31,500 dollars a year. "Hardly a living wage really!"

Today, for the benefit of the American Labour Movement, a picket marches to and fro in front of AFL-CIO Headquarters. It is to be hoped that American Labour will learn the lessons.

• 40-hour week

AT THEIR QUARTERLY MEETING, North London Engineering and Shipbuilding Shop-Stewards pledged full support for the 40-hour week claim of the confederation of Engineering and Shipbuilding Unions. They also decided to control overtime rigidly and ban it completely where trade union organization was strong enough.

• Ban overtime

TO THOSE WORKERS who have been used to systematic overtime the following item will be of interest.

The Tyne district Committee of the Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers claims that the overtime ban imposed two months ago has resulted in several unemployed members obtaining work. About 450 Joiners were workless in the area monthly, but this figure has now been halved.

• Shorter week

FIVE HUNDRED WORKERS of Harland and Wolffs' foundry at Govan, Glasgow, went on strike rather than accept unemployment for any of their numbers. The management wanted to dismiss 86 employees, but the men counter-claimed with a rota that proposed that one-fifth of the labour force should be put off every fifth week, thereby retaining all labour on short-time working. This the management refused to accept, hence the strike.

The demand for a shorter working week without loss of pay must become the paramount demand of the Trade Union Movement.

GEOFF CARLSSON

Your Appropriate Trade

by Peter D Morgan

THE OTHER DAY we were discussing the advisability of all Labour Party members playing a full and active part in their "appropriate Trade Union." And I noticed a marked reluctance amongst some of the comrades not only to do this—but even to join their appropriate Trade Union. This is particularly so amongst white-collar workers.

I know the angle very well. "My organization's dead from the neck up," they say of the National Union of Teachers, Civil Service Clerical Association, National Association of Local Government Officials, National Union of Bank Employees, Guild of Insurance Officials, Inland Revenue Staff Federation, and so on. "I might just as well join the T&G." And they thereupon march happily off to the local district office of the T&G (situated somewhere in dockland (probably) and look forward to happy evenings arguing Marx with the more intellectual stevedores and lightermen in the area.

Escape in double dues

Now may I say at once that I do not regard this as JOINING YOUR APPROPRIATE UNION. It may be that your appropriate union (like mine) is not affiliated to the TUC or the Labour Party. And I think there's something to be said for enrolment in one of the general unions

in order to secure industrial voting rights at a Trades Council or similar body. But let me make it quite clear that I do not consider this a substitute for membership of your appropriate society. It is merely an adjunct if you are sufficiently wealthy to be able to afford double subscription. And such double membership does not contravene the rules of the TUC.

With the majority

What is one's appropriate Organization? It is the workers' body organizing the majority of employees within the industry in which one happens to be working and—more especially—at one's place of work. I would not, of course, class the Foremen's Mutual Benefit Society as a trade union—although there might be good reason for joining even this in order to win its members away. But this an extreme case.

In the teaching world it must obviously be the NUT. In so far as comrades feel that the National Association of Schoolmasters is (a) not based on sex-discrimination and (b) represents a fighting alternative to the NUT as a Trade Union—there certainly might be grounds for joining. Members should also in my opinion join the National Association of Labour Teachers. But, by and large, they should be asked to provide very good reasons if

STRIKE IN NORTH LONDON — post mortem

AFTER SEVEN WEEKS of strike the workers fighting for trade-union recognition at Levine's Master Vending factory at Cricklewood, London, decided to review their overall position.

Positive points were:

- the strikers were solid,
- North West London workers were still giving good support.

But on the negative side, the Executive Committee of the AEU had still not endorsed the strike. Letters sent to the EC from the North London District Committee and various branches asking why have not, even now, been answered.

Without the support of the EC an effective blacking of labour and goods in such a small factory was virtually impossible, likewise

with road transport and docks.

Levine managed to recruit sufficient labour, skilled and semi-skilled to get back into a large degree of production again; but he still need a certain number of the skilled strikers who were difficult to replace.

To get them back he offered (a) Trade union recognition; (b) everyone back except the two original sacked delegates (the action which triggered off the strike);

(c) the strikers would be allowed to return in small groups over a period of 8 weeks.

A full meeting of the strikers decided that to trust Levine over the next 8 weeks would be as stupid as their trust in their EC during the previous seven.

They further decided to end the strike and all strikers would seek employment elsewhere.

A request was made to the District Committee to ask the EC to black Master Vending labour and goods.

Tremendous applause greeted the motion of thanks to the District Committee, organizers Brothers McLaughlan, AEU; Brown, sheet metal; Russell, boiler makers; the Handley Page stewards and workers, and all the other factories and branches who had helped in their bitter 7 weeks (unendorsed) struggle for trade union recognition.

PAT CONROY,
Strike Committee Chairman

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.

Union

they do **not** propose to join the NUT.

Some members join, I know, but remain card-holding members only, inactive. This may be justified on the grounds of excessive commitment in other directions. But I would still not feel very happy about the position.

Marx and the match girls

For about a quarter of our lives we are at work, on the job. Whether we like it or not we are incarcerated with our work-mates, our fellow slaves. We talk Socialism to them, tell them society can be better organized. And yet we fail to play our full part in the common battle to improve wages and conditions of work. They must surely find some contradiction here! They have no such ideals? Then we have failed in our message to them.

What I find even more incredible is the attitude of those comrades who are prepared to join a body of workers with whom they have no common ties—common employer, same industry or trade. How can we expect such workers to accept our authority or hear us sympathetically? Karl Marx himself—with all his erudition and philosophy—would have been looked at askance in the Match Girls' branch or among the dockers.

Acceptability

I have a theory that on the contrary such workers may very well be antagonized by such incursions into a strange land. Someone who they may well be prepared to accept as a fellow member of a Ward Labour Party working for the return of a local Councillor, they will reject out of hand as an "Outsider" if he comes down to the trades union branch and attempts to lecture them on **their** wages, **their** conditions, **their** grievances.

Fire of battle

I know that work in these black-coat unions is not easy. I have had ten years of it. And in this time I have seen a transformation. When I first attended branch meetings, I got up to speak (and sat down) amidst a deathly hush. Booing or jeering would have been bearable. Silence was intolerable. Now we have educated them to express their feelings better. Branch meetings are friendly, sometimes uproarious affairs. I have gathered round me a band of a dozen or more comrades who act as a group. I am educating them in the logic and fire of events. They are not all Socialists. But they will be by the time I've finished. And they've received the finest training they could possibly have had—in battle.

**Peter D. Morgan is
Editor of
The Birmingham
Journal**

INDUSTRIAL

GLASGOW TC — a report from Hugh Savage

The British labour movement is today and for many years has been working in a narrow circle of strikes for higher wages and shorter hours without finding a solution; besides, these strikes are looked upon not as an expedient and not as a means of propaganda and organization but as an ultimate aim.

Engels, in a letter to E Berstein, June 17, 1878.

THIS QUOTATION could fit the present situation in which world capitalism and particularly British capitalism might well be entering its final phase. The out-

back. In this period of pending crisis what kind of leadership is being displayed and what kind of role is the Glasgow trades council playing today?

Glasgow's forum

It is true to say that it is the most representative public organization in Glasgow having an affiliated membership of 83,893. However party politics keep it so evenly divided that unless the Labour Party or Communist Party support your point of view

and win the trades councils for industrial action.

At no time has the movement been so tied and throttled by constitutional control than it is at the present time. Just as the TUC has eliminated the power and authority of trades councils in England until they are but mere shadows of their former glories, so in Scotland the Scottish TUC has tightened its grip until the trades councils have become more or less its rubber stamp.

Revolutionary policy

Under these conditions the prospect of rank and file action is very difficult to imagine, nevertheless it must be fought for. It is not an accident that this control from above developed. Without it the opportunists and careerists would not survive a day. Their whole function is to hold back any mass action, to decry the class struggle and preach class collaboration in statesmanlike speeches. They also can be depended upon to come to the rescue of the capitalist class in a period of crisis and save or attempt to save the system from destruction. No wonder they have been referred to as the "lieutenants of capitalism."

Lascelles once said when talking about a so-called progressive party of his period containing trade unionists of a similar type to our own home brand: "Its principal basic rule is anything but revolution from below, better despotism from above."

Against this background can there be any blueprint or plan that can guarantee a speedy and permanent emancipation for the British working class? Yes, by fighting at all times for a revolutionary policy based on the class struggle we can yet make progress in our efforts to prepare the working class for the big battles that lie ahead.

The SWF?

In the Socialist Workers' Federation we are prepared to cooperate with all socialists who are fighting to save the movement from reformism, and while we cannot claim any outstanding victories we feel our consistent revolutionary propaganda will reap dividends in the days that lie ahead and will help to bring together all those forces that are prepared to fight in a revolutionary socialist way for the achievement of working class power.

We are happy to print the following report from HUGH SAVAGE on the Glasgow Trades Council, although we must state quite categorically that we disagree with a number of the author's conclusions. We recognize that the Labour Party is more often than not dominated by oppressive right-wing elements and hamstrung by their ideas. Nevertheless we believe that anyone attempting to build a revolutionary current outside the Party at the present time is doomed to failure and a sectarian existence. We therefore do not believe that the Socialist Workers' Federation, to which our correspondent belongs, offers any real alternative to British workers whose political development in the coming period will have, as its cardinal expression, an ideological struggle within and around the Labour Party—Editor.

come of the coming crisis can be determined by the extent to which the trades councils and trade unions can be won to use industrial action for political ends. The question is whether the developing movement will continue to be misled by the parliamentarians away from Socialism and to the acceptance of a few reforms or not.

It is necessary for all genuine revolutionary socialists to win all working class organizations away from the reformers. This is not a new proposal. The history of the British labour movement is a record of such struggles in which advocates of the revolutionary method have suffered continual defeat.

The pending crisis

Nevertheless, in periods of extreme crisis the workers have followed a revolutionary lead. Such a period might well be now approaching.

The Glasgow trades council is one of the oldest in Britain. This year it celebrates its centenary. Its record is one of continuous action on issues affecting the working class. E Shinwell, a past chairman of the trades council, writes in his book **Conflict Without Malice**:

In those days the reports of the Council meetings received widespread publicity and were eagerly read by the thousands of workers the organization represented. The high moral tone of the Trades Council ensured its prestige and the unswerving loyalty of the workers.

As this is not a history we cannot dwell for long on past records, although even a short survey would show that on certain principals the movement has gone

the prospect of it being carried is extremely remote. All the supporters of democratic centralism should see it operating in practice to the detriment of the workers of Glasgow. Long-winded arguments and discussions take place on the most trivial subjects and both parties indulge in time-wasting tactics with the CP setting the pace. At present, on most issues, the divisions between the Labour and Communist delegates has become so slight that a stranger entering the council could be forgiven if he failed to separate the two parties.

Bureaucracy

The picture is, however, far from negative and reports of working class action against the employers are received regularly. Also for the first time in many years a new voice is being raised and attempting to get the council back to the militant road it traversed in its early years. Issues like conscription, solidarity action with the workers in Germany, a memorial march in commemoration of the Calton Weavers (early trade unionists who were shot down by the militia) are being raised with the aim of developing the class struggle in every possible way, and trying to win the council for industrial action on political issues. There are outstanding difficulties and the worst one is the attempt of bureaucratic leaders in the CP and LP to use one for their selfish party interests.

TCs strangled

Despite all the obstacles genuine revolutionaries must continue to fight for militant class action

NEXT ISSUE

Algerian Revolution — 2

Current Conflicts

LP COMMENTARY

RON LEWIS

• After Torrington

The most disturbing aspect of Liberal revivalism is the apparent success they are having with the young. Youth, of course, has a strong emotional urge to be against the Establishment; this urge accounted for no small part of the Tory success with the young after 1945. But one might have expected that same urge now to bring an influx of young people into our Party. That it has not done so, I suggest, is the greatest indictment of right-wing policy.

It is not true to say, however, that no young people come into the Party. Plenty come into it, but seldom sufficient at any one time to sustain themselves in the traditional conflict between youth and 'wisdom.' With the result that the old gang up on the few young and either drive them out or destroy their idealism and enthusiasm until they are transformed into something rather unpleasant—the cynically-old-young.

This conflict between age groups seems to me to be more acute at the present time in the Labour Party than I have ever known it at any time in any organization. All over the place one hears the same story of the merciless nagging persecution of the young by a vicious sisterhood of jumble-sale queens augmented in some constituencies by apoplectic trade union organizers.

I was a visitor the other evening at a meeting where this sort of thing was going on and one had to sit silent (regretfully)

while charges of Communism were flung about with careless abandon against a group of youngish people who wanted to organize a meeting against the H-bomb. The fact that the Communist Party is currently opposed to such campaigns made no difference, indeed the only known Stalinist in this particular Party was one of the ring leaders of this row!

The tragedy is that Labour Party Organizers listen to this sort of rot (Alice Bacon's travelling tribunal expelled people on the basis of such ill-founded rumours). And in this connexion, I was glad to see a recent Libel action result in the charge of communism being held to be defamatory and the plaintiff being awarded £1,200. This precedent might well stop those squalid embittered people who for reasons of spite falsely accuse good comrades of being CPers.

The law is not, however, the answer to our predicament. The Labour Party itself must take action to attract the young or the Party will be dead in five years. Of course, when you have young people in an organization, things will not be so easy-going for the machine. There will be lots of resolutions, lots of rows, and they will want to go a lot faster than, maybe, is prudent. But the thing will be alive, one will go to ward and GMC meetings to make history instead of listening to a lot of old people recalling it.

• Co-op Conference

THE FIRST of the big conferences of the year is the Co-operative Party's and an interesting affair it generally is. This is because quite often the Executive is defeated, and while I do not wish to give the impression that I am an oppositionist, all reality disappears from a conference when it is virtually impossible to defeat the Executive, as has been the case with the Labour Party since the war.

One of the most important things considered by this year's Conference was the policy statement, **Care of the Aged**. I commend this statement which costs nine-pence to all readers for it is attractively produced, and its arguments are clear and devoid of technical jargon.

I have not got the space to summarize its proposals but among them is the excellent suggestion that **the responsibility for the needs of the aged should be concentrated in the hands of county councils and county borough councils who should then delegate to local councils such part of those responsibilities as may concern those people living in their own homes**. This suggestion I can endorse from my own experience of these matters gained when I was a member of a county health committee. For at present many old people are committed to mental institutions and other like places because there is not a clear responsibility for these old servants of our community.

Another point which interested me in this document was concerning the age of retirement. The Co-operative Party believe that there should be no arbitrary age of retirement but at the same time they do not advocate as many right-wing trade-union officials were doing not so long ago a raising of the retirement age

generally. For they recognize that this is not in the interest of the workers, who should have the right to retire while still fit and enjoy a life of freedom. What they recognize is that for some people retirement is a kind of death and they should not be debarred from the right to work.

For me, the right to retire at sixty or certainly not later than sixty-five is a sacred one. There are countless pleasures in this life to be savoured, and I would not work a day longer than was economically necessary unless that work was an expression of myself.

I intend to review the decisions of the Co-op Party Conference in greater detail next issue, for this is an important, all too often neglected, wing of our movement.

• St. Pancras

I see from press comments that the St. Pancras Labour Group are to be investigated by Transport House. Apparently one of the devilish things they did recently was to fly the Red Flag from the Town Hall. Poor Keir Hardie must be turning in his grave at the actions of his heirs in the Party-machine. The St. Pancras Council is one of the really lively local government bodies in London, and its patronage of all the arts has done much to bring a spark of inspiration back to the hum-drum contemporary urban-life. But its members tend to think for themselves, and worry about things like the H-bomb, the Rent Act, not to mention Woodrow Wyatt. So now the heavy hand of the Establishment is to be brought to bear on them. My advice to Transport House is leave them alone even if you sincerely believe they are irresponsible and extremist. For they have the kind of energy and soul that can breathe a little life back into our over-machined Party.

AN H-BOMB CAMPAIGNER'S DIARY

THE GROWING RESENTMENT against the Hydrogen Bomb and war preparations in general is finding its reflexions in numerous Labour Parties throughout Essex.

One of the main planks in the County Council Election campaign this year is opposition to the building of rocket bases within the area should that be scheduled. The fact that this is included, although of course the County Planning Committee has no statutory power to interfere in such matters, is a measure of the strong feeling which prevails. Many candidates in the election must be considering ways and means of making their opposition felt should the Government attempt to establish such a site.

Some Councillors on lower-tier local authorities have taken up a stand against Civil Defence which they feel to be a complete waste of time, the only purpose of which is to lull the people into a state of false security.

Councillor Arthur Sullivan of the Chigwell Urban District Council resigned from the Civil Defence Committee this year and the rest of the Labour Group has since adopted a similar attitude.

In Harlow a sub-committee set up by the 100 percent Labour Urban District Council after receiving resolutions from the Trade Council and the Society of Friends, discovered a ludicrous state of affairs. Total Civil Defence equipment was listed as including only 1 rubber bandage, 6 blankets, 4 sandbags, 4 stirrup pumps, 2 stretchers and other miscellaneous largely obsolete equipment.

Though the Council determined to continue Civil Defence, practically every speaker denounced the complete uselessness

of existing equipment.

Two Councillors were sufficiently bold to demand that the Council should end the farce and ban Civil Defence completely.

• Essex responds

THIS DEMAND that Civil Defence activities should be banned is known to have been discussed in several other Essex Labour Parties and it is rumoured that the question is to be raised both at the Essex Federation of Labour Parties and at the Eastern Regional Council later on this year.

The wave of opposition to H-bomb preparations is thus spreading and deepening in this area.

• But not the LP leaders

SO THE NEC decided on a demonstration in Trafalgar Square after the Aldermaston march.

The NEC has been bewildered by the way in which it has been bypassed by the strong feeling generated through the Labour Movement. Consequently it is making a bold attempt to head off the lead achieved by the organizations organizing the tremendous movement against the Bomb and to divert feeling into more "responsible" channels.

The whole burden of the NEC Campaign must therefore be one of damping down present demands for unilateral renunciation of Bomb. **It is not a campaign designed to convert H-bomb supporters to the idea of unilateral suspension of tests but one to convince thoroughgoing opponents to accept the idea of British manufacture and**

possession.

This was brought out clearly at the West Midlands Conference held at Birmingham on the 29th March. Hugh Gaitskell and Robert Willis spent the whole of their time trying to convince delegates that Britain should retain the Bomb.

Such a policy is calculated only to spread disillusionment and cynicism among the rank and file of the Movement. Having refrained from opening any campaign until 6 months after the Brighton Conference—only when it became clear that there was going to be a large scale unofficial movement—the Party leaders and clearly showing their genuine attitude on this momentous question.

They want Britain to keep the H-bomb and to make no fundamental change in the disastrous policy which has led to the present situation in which whole nations, including our own, are in the danger of extinction.

• Next step

THE CENTRAL THEME in this great wave of protest is, of course, the Aldermaston march. Few events have stirred the mass of the Labour movement as has this magnificent demonstration.

Now it is clear that the mood is there, we must prepare to make the next step in the campaign.

Everywhere Trade Unionists must work for the acceptance of the idea of industrial action. Our program now must be

**BLACK THE BOMB
BLACK THE BASES**

STAN NEWENS

YOUTH — Problems and Policies

YS Report from Shoreditch and Finsbury day-school

COMRADES FROM A DOZEN SECTIONS AROUND LONDON attended a day-school held by Shoreditch and Finsbury Labour Party Youth Section on Sunday, March 30th, and made it a great success. The subject was 'Youth'; the first session was spent in examining the basic problems, the second in discussing solutions.

In the morning Michael Kidron, of *Socialist Review*, presented the situation of youth in industry: although much is made by the organs of the capitalist class, such as the *Economist*, of the improvement in the standard of living of Britain's young workers since the war, we should first take a look at the position in those pre-war years.

Not a very pretty sight. Young textile workers being paid 25 shillings a week, young miners just half-a-crown a shift. And, by the time they reached the age of 17 or 18, young workers were soon faced with unemployment — younger labour was cheaper. Of the 800,000 young people who tried to escape from these grim conditions between 1925 and 1934 by joining the army, 60 percent were rejected on medical grounds.

So today, we've never had it so good. But not because of some change of heart from the bosses — simply because of the labour shortage resulting from the low birth-rate during the war. Also the increased specialization of industrial processes has considerably broken down the differentials between skilled and unskilled jobs, so that many young workers are now classed as semi-skilled.

Education

Nevertheless, there are big problems to face. Education for the young worker stops at 15; only 5 percent go to technical schools and only 3 to 4 percent were found to be attending evening classes at the age of 20 in a recent survey. The transition from school to factory life is hardly thought out, while there is usually little co-ordination between the young workers' job and the course of part-time study he may be doing at the same time.

Skills are difficult to obtain against the forceful appeal of the fat wage-pocket from dead-end jobs, and inadequate training facilities; employers tend to rely on each other to provide them. A Glasgow survey showed that 50 percent of apprentices at 17 were not working in skilled jobs at the age of 22, and this wastage was partly due to National Service.

Frustration and 'crime'

Education in capitalist society is seen merely as a training for work, and where work is unsatisfactory and takes up most of the

workers' time, there is no possibility for cultural expression or participation for young people, and delinquency and dissatisfaction results.

Faced with the Tory policy of wage-freeze and the prospect of unemployment, the next few years are likely to see a sharpening of the class struggle, with big industrial battles. And young workers will be in the front line. With the number of school leavers 50 per cent greater in 1962 than in 1956, with a decreased demand for juvenile labour from the widespread introduction of automatic processes, young people will be hard hit by unemployment.

Well, how to fight back? By building up a militant socialist youth movement with a consistent socialist program. Youth is fundamentally revolutionary; uprooted from the sheltered life of home and school and put down into the impersonal world of the capitalist system, young people see life in a more generalized yet clear-cut way than their elders.

A program

What sort of program? A socialist program would include:

- 1 Free state education to 18
- 2 Comprehensive schooling with adequate maintenance grants
- 3 Continuing education in the bosses' time (no night school)
- 4 Free time for cultural activity; no overtime; a 40-hour week
- 5 Higher wages—a man's pay for a man's work for young workers
- 6 Full apprenticeship training under fully paid instructors
- 7 Apprenticeship to the Shop-Stewards Committee or trade union with no private indenture to employers
- 8 The vote at 18
- 9 No conscription

National youth section

How do we get it? In the second session of the School, Robin Fior, Youth Organizer of the Uxbridge Constituency Labour Party suggested the kind of organization that we need:

The old League of Youth had shown fatal weaknesses long before the NEC administered the final back-stabs. Firstly, it was too narrowly based, purely on the local parties. As a result it was too specialized: Young workers and students were not represented in an organized way. Secondly, it was not allowed to discuss "politics." Since Suez and Hungary the new Youth Sections had done quite well, but, alone, they

wouldn't be able to cope with the difficult problems ahead described in the first session. **To do this we needed a Youth Section of the whole Labour Party—a National Youth Section, consisting of youth sections of trade unions (eg the AEU), Labour student organizations (now in NALSO merely 'associated!' with the Labour Party) and the local Sections, with an autonomous national structure competent to make policy and represented on the NEC.**

Discussion

In the discussion that followed, comrades pointed to some of the difficulties—to politicize apprentice clubs would be against the terms of indentures, and in any

case, it was hard enough to get young workers organized into their unions; the same kind of difficulties existed in 'non-political' student unions in technical schools and colleges. But the difficulties ahead are even greater and if we are to succeed in the fight for socialism, such an independent socialist youth movement will be an invaluable weapon.

And where do we go from here? At the end of the discussion a comrade pointed to the coming London Youth Conference and suggested delegates should ask why only constituencies and youth sections were to be represented. If unions and NALSO affiliates could be invited, we might be getting somewhere...

NOTEBOOK

THE FIRST DETAILS of London's long promised Youth Conference have now appeared. It is to be held on Sunday, May 18th, at Harold Laski House, 861/863, Fulham Road, SW6 at 3 p.m. A Social will follow. Two delegates from each Section or CLP without Sections plus Youth Organizers are due to confer for the short time allowed. Until we have any more information we can't comment further; meanwhile Sections should make sure of being adequately represented.

* * *

THE ANNUAL YOUTH CONFERENCE of the AEU held at Bournemouth last month came out with some realistic, militant demands—not to tolerate any longer

the continued refusal of the Engineering Employers' Federation to grant increases to junior workers

with action to force them to reconsider their attitude—the abolition of overtime working for apprentices under eighteen as technical college homework and night school cut down free time; while Bro O'Neil of Glasgow accused the EC of failing to comply with the policy-making national committee's 1955 decision to organize a campaign for higher wages for apprentices; he called on the Conference to

Go back to the workshops and factories and start campaigning immediately. Use all the official means you have of doing something about this, and if obstacles are put in your way do not be afraid to use unofficial methods.

* * *

THE LABOUR PARTY'S YOUTH RALLY has now been fixed for June 28th at the Co-op Sports Ground, Abbey Wood, Wool-

wich. The Rally will combine both the political and social aspects of Youth Section activity; as Transport House puts it, 'two of our leaders—Mr Hugh Gaitskell and Mr Tom Driberg—will be there to speak... a wonderful attraction.' But the Rally will provide an opportunity for young socialists to get together.

* * *

AND FINALLY, WE ARE PLEASED to print this report we have received from Vivien Winter, secretary of the new Chingford Section in Essex, which may be of interest to active Section members:

Stan Newens, the Epping Constituency Agent, was anxious that Youth Sections should be formed in various parts of the rather widespread constituency. After preliminary discussions several young people who were interested formed a Youth Section in Chingford, which had for several years lacked any Socialist Youth Movement.

That was in November 1957. Since then the Section has grown to its present membership of about a dozen; members were canvassed from families who belonged to the Local Party, and they in turn brought their friends along.

A balanced program of political and social activities is planned three months in advance by the members themselves, and includes talks by local Party members, MPS, NCLC speakers, together with jive and record sessions, theatre visits, etc. Socials have proved popular and a good source of income.

The Section members try to attend as many Labour Party activities as possible outside the Youth Section; two delegates attended the recent week-end school at Debden House, Loughton, and proved for themselves that politics can be fun. A small party also attended the Eastern Region finals of the National Youth Speaking Contest at Ilford. The Youth Section members have also offered their enthusiastic assistance in the forthcoming Borough and County elections.

YS continued YOUTH and the H-BOMB

ON MARCH 14 the **Daily Mirror** opened its campaign, not for direct action against the H-bomb, as its hysterical headlines would lead you to believe, but for—Summit Talks: The British working class must demand the suspension of tests and the building of bases as a gesture of goodwill for the success of Summit talks and also so that

scientists may have time to discover whether the bomb has any poisonous effects—in other words, if the Summit wants it, we shall eventually be murdered and poisoned!

Crossman seems to believe that the students at Oxford are representative of British youth; he does not realize that their majority opinion to pin their hopes on the Summit is essentially a middle-class attitude. He praises these individuals for truly serving king and country.

We are told that those 'escapees' who are abandoning destruction are relying on US defence and are doing so because the Government has not explained adequately the need to support the American arms manufacturers.

Thus we learn that Crossman and the **Mirror** do not want to ban the bomb by working-class action.

They want to play follow-my-leader, and we have learnt where that leads to . . .

We can see therefore that the only way to remove the threat of the bomb is for the workers to protest—Black work on the Bases and force the capitalists to abandon world suicide by DIRECT ACTION—NOW!

SUSAN LANG
JANET WALKER
Hackney YS

JAZZ • Dave Brubeck by JOHN PHILLIPS

Dave Brubeck is a nice guy! This has been said time and time again about the man whose music we have been able to study at first hand quite recently. I wonder whether we haven't become just a little too nice! Back in the old days of Brubeck's experimental period there was always a tremendous originality in everything he played, though not always easily acceptable jazzwise. He often had to suffer materially during this period and it was difficult not to admire him for his devotion to the music he believed in.

Now, Brubeck has a fine house, large family, and a very comfortable future guaranteed by colossal sales of records. In consequence, I think his contribution to the contemporary jazz scene has suffered to an extensive degree. During the recent British tour by his Quartet, Brubeck's reliance on extended drum solos, humorous, but inconsequential, 'quotations' inserted in improvised passages, to the detriment of all the things he has fought for—quite apart from being a sad sight for jazz lovers—is an indication of how his move up the social scale has destroyed his searching individuality and desire to progress.

Looking at popular music as a whole, we see the purveyors of 'skiffle' music pretend to be practising the art of negro folk music from which it originated. Do they think that by aping the bodily movements of an oversexed gorilla, accompanied by blatantly over amplified instruments, that they are expressing the desire of a subject people to be free from the shackles of our society. Oh, no, the very opposite. They

are like the wall of death rider, who, when asked what kept him going round, said, "Man, it's the money."

These commercial institutions are deliberately smashing the musical culture of many nations. One only has to listen to the mire of monotonous dance band music, reputedly to have come from the African native rhythm, to realise to what abysmal depths we have fallen. It isn't—as the music monopolists will argue—'What the public wants.' It is what the public has rammed down their throats every minute of the day by 'Auntie BBC,' the appalling banality of commercial television, and the highly pictorial weekly magazines which add the final humiliating rub of the public's nose into the dirt.

To come back to the question of jazz, there is one example of how this wall of commercialism can be overcome. When the progressive jazz movement came into being in 1940, the negro pianist Thelonius Monk was in the vanguard of musicians who sought a new path for the advancement of his people's music. During the last eighteen years he has not deviated one fraction from his chosen path and today remains the most original and inventive of all jazz musicians. To do this he had to live in pitiful conditions for many years, and for a time was forgotten altogether by the jazz public.

What a damning indictment of our society which demands that these men should be ostracised for not succumbing to the heel of vested interest.

So, in conclusion, I would like to say to Mr. Brubeck, be nice, but please be honest.

INTERNATIONAL

H-TESTS

THE DECISION of the Russian Government to suspend nuclear weapon tests cannot but be welcomed by all genuine opponents of the Bomb. Any step which provides the opportunity even for a breathing space in the headlong race after bigger and more destructive methods of mass destruction is to be applauded.

At the same time it is important not to be lulled into complacency by a move which falls far short of any really effective step to peace. Those of us who are campaigning for unilateral renunciation of the bomb by Britain and who denounce the feeble and sickening stand taken up by the Labour Party leadership cannot condone any Government—Russian, American or British—which retains the Bomb. Gaitskill and Bevan after all are in favour of unilateral suspension of tests.

The chief conclusion to be drawn from the Russian suspension is that once again the American Government has been outwitted by a much more astute set of men. The Western governments have been put on a spot and millions of people—particularly in the backward areas of

the world—will consider that the Russian Government is free from blame in the present nuclear war drive.

However, nine major tests were made by Russia during the month preceding suspension and on April 1, atmospheric radioactivity in Norway was three times as high as normal, according to the Norwegian Defence Research Institute.

Clearly the Russian suspension has been announced only when there is no need for further tests for a time and when its development will not be hampered. Since suspension is only for a limited period, tests can be resumed quite easily if America fails to fall in line.

On the other hand the Western Governments are in the middle of a big program of tests and both Macmillan and Dulles have indicated that they have no intention of suspending them.

The truth of the matter is that the governments on both sides of the Iron Curtain are interested only in prosecuting the cold war and building up their potential strength and power.

A Correspondent.

B K and S R

Now that K has finally kicked out B and has shown himself to be the undisputed ruler of the Russian bureaucracy, the arbiter between the warring factions in the army, police, state and industry, we can tie up the story started in SR as early as May, 1953. We can say that our analysis of the class nature of Russia, and the predictions derived from that analysis have been proved correct in every way.

This is what we said:

The whole of Russian society is built in the form of a pyramid with the principle of one-man management in every field. The factory is run by its manager, who appoints the departmental managers, who in turn appoint the foremen. The manager himself is appointed by the head of the State trust, who is appointed by the Minister. The Minister is actually, if not nominally, appointed by the Prime Minister and General Secretary. During his lifetime Stalin was responsible for making the most important appointments: he was the supreme bureaucrat (SR, May, 1953).

We explained that collective leadership could not last long in a society based on one-man man-

agement, and that Russian society would revert to its pattern of totalitarianism. We said:

The group administration at the top of the Russian regime today is in conflict with the set-up of the Russian economy, society and state. Such a conflict cannot exist for any length of time. A regime of bureaucratic state capitalism with the terrific social strain it involves, needs the blood of a purge to make the wheels go round. The present set-up at the top is therefore temporary (SR, May, 1953).

A few issues later, in the heyday of Malenkov's rule, we predicted the final success of Krushchev, General Secretary of the Party, in the bureaucracy's factional struggles. We wrote:

Malenkov's position is complicated by him not fully controlling the administration. If he is to become the supreme dictator—as somebody must ultimately become if the regime is to continue—he must exercise complete power over the bureaucracy. But Nikita S. Krushchev holds the vital post of general secretary of the Party (SR, October, 1953).

With the ousting of Bulganin, Krushchev has verified our prediction and confirmed our analysis.

LETTERS

Rally!

I was glad to read in the "Young Socialist" for mid-March the headline "Rebel for a cause."

The writer has put his finger on a problem which is vague and intangible to young people—that they have the energy and initiative and the desire to change the world in which they must spend the rest of their lives, but that society in every way frustrates and perverts these energies.

It is said that young people are interested only in Rock 'n' Roll. We know that they are more interested in the growing insecurity of their jobs, in conscription and its future, in education and apprenticeship.

But, they can see no way in which they can affect these things. All the propaganda of the Capitalist class is directed to reinforcing the idea that policy is made by governments and international conferences. The power of the working class, the greatest power in modern society, from the point of view of numbers and the fact that they create all wealth, is never mentioned.

This is our task in the Youth Sections of the Labour Party. We must show the young people the direction for their energy, where to use their power. We must offer to them a program of demands for the betterment of their conditions and call on them to join with us to press these demands.

The paper **Rally** has begun to produce such a program and the **Young Socialist** can help to do the same.

Discussion to clear our ideas is essential, and every paper which directs itself to youth must participate in this and give a lead. Our job is to show young workers the strength that is in their hands and where the enemy lies.

A Socialist analysis of society, and a program to mobilize action on the political and industrial field; a program for youth, a lead for the coming critical years—these are what we must offer young people.

Yours fraternally,

BERYL DEANE
Liverpool

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

Andre Giacometti, Paris, presents

THE HISTORY OF THE ALGERIAN REVOLUTION-I

INTERNATIONAL

WITH THE EXCEPTION of Guy Mollet, everybody now admits that a consistent socialist position involves full support of the struggles of colonized peoples for their national liberation, even when these struggles are led by the native bourgeoisie of the territory involved.

There can be several reasons for this position: because the foreign imperialism is the most powerful exploiter and the main enemy at that given moment; because the foreign imperialism is an obstacle to the economic development of the territory and because the working-class is in no position to wage an independent fight if this development does not take place; because the oppressed people feels its oppression most vividly as a form of cultural alienation, and that the first step for its social emancipation is the assertion of its national identity. Until this national consciousness is achieved, the class issues remain obscured; for a class-consciousness to emerge, the national issue must be settled.

The common consideration in all these cases is that the working-class is not strong enough, or not developed enough to lead the struggle on a socialist basis. For this reason, socialists that take their socialism seriously have supported the struggle for independence in India, in Ghana, in Tunisia, in Morocco and in other countries where its social content was initially no more than an assertion of the native bourgeoisie against foreign imperialism, and where the nationalist movements have remained to this day under the leadership of this bourgeoisie.

The important thing to realize about Algeria is that this familiar situation does not really exist there: the struggle for national liberation does not have to depend on bourgeois leaders, and, to a very large extent, the class issues were clear from the beginning. The difference arises from the extreme weakness of the native bourgeoisie.

In Morocco and Tunisia, French rule was mostly exercised through the intermediary of a native ruling class; the military conquest of Algeria, on the other hand, more or less completely smashed the social structure of

the country, reduced the bulk of the population to the status of landless agricultural labourers and replaced the native ruling-class with a foreign ruling class of settlers and capitalists.

A nation-class

Because the national issue and the class issue could be identified to a much greater extent in Algeria than in other colonial countries, the Algerian nationalist movement was not only the earliest to appear in North Africa (1926), but, from the outset, a basically proletarian Movement, successively named ENA, PPA and MTLD. Its founding group was composed of former communist workers, trained and led by Messali Hadj, himself a former auto-worker at Renault. Its program was socialist and called for the nationalization of banking and of such industry as there was, and, most important, for a radical agrarian reform. Its followers were the Algerian industrial workers in France, and, very soon, the landless proletariat in Algeria.

A bourgeois nationalist movement did not really appear in Algeria until 1945, when Ferhat Abbas' UDMA appeared on the scene with a program of federal integration into the French republic. In proportion to the weakness of the Algerian bourgeoisie, it remained small, cowardly and ineffectual.

Origin of organizations

What is the origin of the MNA and of the FLN? They have both arisen from an internal crisis in the MTLD. After 1950, the combination of police repression and the government's sabotage of its own legislation placed the Algerian national movement in a position where an armed showdown with the government had become inevitable.

In this situation, a group developed in the MTLD which shrunk from the consequences of this course and instead advocated a collaboration with the liberal "neo-colonialist" wing of the French bourgeoisie represented in Algeria by Jacques Chevallier, mayor of Algiers. The fight against this group was opened in 1953 by Messali who advocated, on the contrary, a revolutionary

The most ghastly of Imperialism's current wars is raging in Algeria. Torture, murder and massive repression are the everyday tools of the French colonialists now engaged on the 'civilizing mission' so well-beloved by their British counterparts. Anything that can bring about their defeat is a step forward for a world blighted by oppression and exploitation, a nail in the coffin of the Imperialists everywhere.

Socialists want to know how to fight Imperialism. They want to know what will guarantee an independent Algeria. Is it enough merely to denounce French atrocities (or British, when it comes to Cyprus or Malaya)? No, we must be able to present a positive alternative to the imperialist regime, something that can offer hope to a people weary with suffering. We must know which is the socialist movement in the fight for Algerian independence, whom to support.

This article, the first of two, deals with the history of the Algerian revolutionary movement. It pins down the rubbish being written by so-called socialists on its internal politics. It reveals the criminal irresponsibility of those who support reactionary elements abroad while sporting a revolutionary policy at home. It shows why every militant socialist should support in every possible way the Algerian National Movement (MNA). The second article, to be published shortly, will pin down the character and tactics of the National Liberation Front (FLN), the anti-socialist, anti-working class movement that has attracted so many strange supporters in this country, including people who believe they are contributing something to the socialist fight—Editor.

course leading to an armed struggle such as was taking place at the time in Tunisia and Morocco. Throughout that period the MTLD was paralyzed as a revolutionary organization due to the fact that the reformist faction controlled a majority on the Central Committee of the party (hence the faction's name: "centralists").

The real heirs

The conflict within the MTLD was resolved at the Congress of Hornu (Belgium) in July 1954, when the "centralists" were expelled by a vote of (approximately) 750 against 100, with 50 abstentions. There was absolutely no question at the time, in any sector of public opinion, that the "centralists" represented a small minority of intellectuals and professional people, while the "messalists" had carried practically the whole rank-and-file. By July 1955, just before joining the leadership of the FLN, the "centralists" had shrunk to a handful of politicians based solely on the MTLD's treasury, which they had appropriated, and publicly admitted that they did no longer know what they represented, if anything. The "messalist" MTLD, having shed its reformist wing, proceeded to prepare armed insurrection.

What, then, was the Revolutionary Committee of Unity of Action (CRUA), and why did the

MTLD not actually initiate the insurrection?

Since 1950, a number of leaders of the MTLD (Ben Bella, Khider) were residing in Cairo, where they had become much impressed by Nasser's regime and had adopted his politics. They had maintained contact with a group of underground cadres of the MTLD in Algeria who, being cut off from open political life, had been unable to follow the issues in the fight between "messalists" and "centralists". These illegal cadres were only aware that the party was not making any headway (paralyzed as it was by the "centralist" politicians in Algiers) and decided to push for direct action. At no time did they represent a distinct political tendency, nor did they view themselves as a permanent grouping.

In fact, the bulk of the CRUA represented in the Algerian illegality the same aspirations and principles as the "messalists" represented in open political life. This became clear at the outbreak of the insurrection: many CRUA members thought they were rising "in the name of Messali" and soon afterwards joined the "messalists" (among others, the partisan leader Goffal, who was later captured and sentenced by the French, and Ben Boulaid, who spectacularly escaped from the Constantine prison only to be assassinated by the FLN in the

(continued on back page)

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.

Algeria—ctd

underground). As to the "messalists," they joined the rebellion within the first week.

Why did they not initiate the November uprising? Because they were preparing the uprising for January 1, 1955, and because the Cairo group, knowing this and hoping to take control of the coming struggle by anticipating the move, issued orders for an uprising on November 1, 1954. Actually, the operation did not succeed. A limited insurrection set off by people without any real political basis became a revolution through the massive intervention of the "messalist" MTL.

Who regroup

The MTL had been declared illegal by the French government the day after the insurrection; it went underground and took the name of MNA, which it had used before on various occasions since 1951. **The "messalists" did not have to "regroup": they were the MTL. As to the FLN, it did not yet exist.**

An "Algerian Liberation Front" was formed in Cairo, which included representatives of all elements involved in the uprising: the CRUA, the Cairo group

and the MNA. The latter was represented by Ahmed Mezerna, a former streetcar worker and deputy of the MTL, and Chadli Mekki. When the "messalist" representatives refused to go along with the policies of the Egyptian government, which was attempting to take control of the Algerian revolution, they were imprisoned by Nasser, and the Cairo group took over the leadership of the "Front," which then became the "National Liberation Front." These events, which occurred in the beginning of 1955 are the origin of the FLN.

The band wagon

The Cairo group was then joined by the following elements, in that order: the "centralists" (Kiouane, Yazid, Lahouel) in July 1955; the bourgeois of the UDMA (Ferhat Abbas, Ahmed Francis) in April 1956; the religious leaders of the Association of the Ulemas at about the same time; then, in the course of 1956 and 1957, by various kinds of corrupt collaborators with the Government who were running for cover (Fares, Ben Bahmed, Boumendjel, etc.).

Consequently, it turns out that the leadership of what some people believe to be the "decisive

organization" of the Algerian revolution is made up of people most of whom have one thing only in common: a lifelong record of opposition to Algerian nationalism and to the idea of Algerian independence.

Class issues

The paradox is only apparent: given the inescapable revolutionary pressure of the Algerian people, with armed struggle as its only possible outcome, given also the outbreak of armed struggles in Tunisia and in Morocco, the Algerian bourgeoisie was compelled to give up the perspective of assimilation or federal integration into France, and had to seek new ways to safeguard its class interests. Since this could no longer be done outside the framework of the struggle for national independence, the leaders of the Algerian bourgeoisie resolved to take over this struggle. Since this was not possible as long as a proletarian mass-movement was leading it, they resolved to smash it. Since they were too weak to do it by political means, they decided to do it by terror. This is the political background of the struggle between FLN and MNA: the issues involved are class issues.

PARLIAMENT

OH, WHAT an exciting fortnight we've had.

A Mr. Krushchev duly received his promotion (temperate habits are a sure rule for success in any walk of life) and the prospects, etc., of a Group Captain Townsend seemed distinctly improved. A Mr Royle sailing at Torrington under the Nat-Lib-Con flag of convenience was sunk while navigating in fog guided only by the tolling of a bell.

The other sort of flag of convenience the "Pan-Hon-Lib," standing for Panama, Honduras and Liberia, has been debated in the Lords. These countries own considerable shipping fleets, but own hardly a ship. The ships are owned abroad by people who think the regulations and taxation of Britain and America irksome and find these democratic governments infinitely more obliging. It is said that shipping registered in these countries is tax-free but it is hard to believe that their governments put themselves out so much merely to please some bouncing sailor boys, most of whom never go near their adopted countries—if they ever go to sea at all.

This business is more serious than a loss of taxation by the British Government. Seamen are one of those groups of workers who have frequent difficulty in

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

SEAMEN and the FLAG

dealing directly with employers and often have to advance by arguing with their governments who, suitably stimulated and not without reluctance, put pressure on the ship owners.

The difficulties of trying to influence the "Pan-Hon-Lib" ship-owners are so appalling that, so far as I know the attempt has never been made. **So the phoney fleets of these nations are a permanent threat to the working standards of seamen and a barrier to further advance.**

Lord Mancroft, Minister without Portfolio, said that the growth of fleets operated under flags of convenience might well menace the whole prosperity of the British mercantile marine. The Government were powerfully aware of the anxiety with which the rapid growth of tonnage operated under those flags was regarded by British shipowners and seamen.

The British merchant fleet existed and prospered on the free exchange of shipping services. It was most important that no action should be taken against flags of convenience which was in any way discriminatory or restrictive because that might in the long run, by a chain effect, lead to restrictions being placed elsewhere on the operation of British ships.

In other words, when the car is running away don't try and put on the brakes since this has been known to lead to a nasty skid.

How much **British** capital is there in "Pan-Hon-Lib"?

OUR NO COMMENT DEPARTMENT, or Harold bluffs it out again:

Mr Zilliacus (Manchester, Gorton Lab.) . . . this bomb blew a hole 50 ft. wide and 30 ft. deep. Such a bomb dropped on a built-up area would cause damage which even the Government might regard as not negligible. If the bomb had been loaded with plutonium, that plutonium would have been scattered over a wide area, and it was so poisonous that

one-millionth of a gramme was all that human beings could breathe and survive. (In other words, a teaspoonful could poison the whole population of the UK-MM).

* * *

MR MACMILLAN said that he must have notice of scientific questions.

The explosion of a conventional bomb caused considerable damage. But this form, which was the charge for the nuclear bomb, when regarded as a TNT bomb, was not as dangerous as some that had to be suffered during the war.

Mr Emrys Hughes (South Ayrshire Lab.) asked if the Prime Minister

could say whether any of the bombs would be transported to the American base at Prestwick. There was widespread feeling in that area that one of them might go off. Could there be a categorical assurance that no harm might arise?

Mr. Macmillan said that he was not prepared to say at what precise

stations the bomb would be at a particular moment.

* * *

THERE HAVE BEEN some interesting questions about the interaction of rent increases and National Assistance payments.

Up to January 25th about 260,000 weekly assistance grants had been increased to provide for rent increases under the Rent Act. (Minister of Pensions and National Insurance, February 10).

The average weekly payment for England is not known but in Wales it is five shillings per week. Assuming it is the same in England, this is a sum of over three million pounds a year and the Rent Act is far from being in full operation. Three million pounds—and the rest—out of taxation into the landlords' pockets!

Conservative Freedom works, but you, dear friend, will have to work considerably harder.

MICHAEL MILLETT

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.