A STARTLING change in mass political attitudes in Britain was recently uncovered as the result of a survey conducted on behalf of Washington by the official United States Information Agency (which, it may be presumed, is reasonably equipped with the stuff and techniques necessary to the proper gathering of such information). Asked whether Britain should, in the present world situation, side with the United States, with Russia, or with neither, the largest single group (46 per cent of the sample) replied: Neither. The Administration was so alarmed at this proof of what is rightly called the spread of "neutralist sentiment" among its allies that it suppressed the report from publication.

What is even more interesting than the actual findings is the fact that it should have taken a survey commissioned by a foreign government to register the progressive sentiments of British working people. In the normal course of events it might have been expected that so marked a disagreement with the foreign policy of a ruling class would have been disclosed, expressed and fostered through the activity of a political party of Opposition. In fact, of course, up till now the "official channels" of political expression have been closed to any expression of fundamental dissent. The electorate has at no stage been asked to vote for or against NATO, the Bomb or a neutralist alternative; these questions have been decided in advance for them by the Right-wing (Labour or Tory) politicians. On foreign policy the British people has since 1945 always had to face a "single list of candidates."

We do not exaggerate the scale of mass disillusionment with traditional imperialist solidarity. No doubt the Kennedy Administra-
tion will take energetic measures in the Public Relations field to reinstate the myth of the Western Alliance in the minds of the cynical working classes of Europe. While we are proud of the striking popularity of the slogan Neither Washington or Moscow! for which this journal has campaigned (sometimes in considerable isolation) for the last ten years, we are under no illusions that we are responsible for more than a limited growth of "Third-Force" Socialist consciousness, in certain sections of the committed Left. Nevertheless, the lessons are plain: it should now be clear that, in their zeal to preserve NATO at the expense of the Party Constitution, to save, not the Party that they love, but the H-Bomb that they love, Gaitskell and his clan are not, as they claim, preserving the Labour Party from the prospect of electoral "massacre" (a word which comes oddly from the lips of those whose only objection to Polaris is that they will not be "consulted" in the decision to launch annihilation.) On the contrary, they are now exposed as men determined to block the only channel whereby a clean, clear, socialist alternative to bourgeois foreign and military policy might be effect-
vably offered. They, not the proponents of official Labour policy, are the apostles of impending massacre, whether electoral or thermo-
nuclear.

Vigorous steps must now be taken to ensure the success of Labour's anti-nuclear policy. The Appeal for Unity campaign, representing hundreds of Constituency Parties all over the country, must be supported to the hilt. (Readers will find details of this campaign printed elsewhere in this issue). Particular prominence must be given in demand for official platform speakers to the role of the Bomb as a necessary counter-balance to Gaitskellite speakers, and for official pamphlets and leaflets (and, especially, radio and TV broadcasts) stating the case adequately.

Secondly, the Gaitskellites must never again be allowed to get away with plausible arguments while Labour's nuclear disarmers flourish in emotional isolation.
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STRUGGLE AGAINST ALGERIAN WAR

BY JEAN-JACQUES MARIE, ed. Correspondences Socialistes (Paris)

ON the 1st November 1960 the Algerian war entered its seventh year. Launched on the 1st November 1954 by a govern-
ment of the left-centre (Mendès France-Mitterrand), it has be-
come the turbulent of French politics. It was because the fourth parliamentary republic was un-
able to find a solution to it that it collapsed to make way for the buonapartiste regime of General De Gaulle.

De Gaulle assumed power on the 1st June 1958. In contrast with his predecessors he was perfectly aware that it was im-
possible to crush the Algerian Revolution with a military victory that would allow a return to the status quo. What he wants, and this emerges clearly from his speech of the 1st Nov., 1960, is the establishment in Algeria of an autonomous bourgeois state, capable of keeping order and protecting the basic interests of French imperialism (Saharan oil, the maintenance of private property, and preventing land-
sharing). This presupposes con-
cesions which are at the same time both great enough to dis-
arm the rebels without provok-
ing a rising of the ultras in Algeria, and limited enough to

SFIO

But such a programme needs time; and De Gaulle has taken his time. It is this, much more than the real content of his policies, that has little by little stirred anew the agitation against the Algerian war; it is almost solely the agitation of students and intellectuals. The Com-
munist Party has, since 1958, done everything to prevent any sort of mobilisation of the work-
ing-class against the War; the SFIO, now integrated into the Gaulist regime, no longer stands for anything in the working-

class: the Partie Socialiste Unifiée, formed in March, 1959, by the fusion of the dissident left-wing of the SFIO and of various
groups on the left, still has little influence... The sabotage of the CP therefore automatically signi-
fies the absence of the working-

class, as a class, on this front of protest against the War.

The students form the mass of those determined to 'do some-

contd page 7
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THE unofficial national Con-
tract awards in electricity supply industry should be disband-
ated.

by D. O'NEILL

In spite of the fact that earlier this year they declared the shop steward now to be the trade union's most important man in power, they said, was at the bottom—a couple of notes left in trade unionism, the Frank- Foulkes and Cousins—have de-
cided to act against him.

The unofficial contract awards' committee in the electricity supply industry is the target. The committee was formed because the delaying tactics, successfully used by the management, continued to defeat the brains of the union's paid officials: it was felt by the stewards and the rank and file, that direct action had become necessary. For some time the committee has certainly jerked the full-time officials into awareness; they now have close liaison through the com-
mittee by closer liaison between themselves and the stewards at District and Works level if the employers agree to the changes in the constitution of the National Joint Industrial Council which is necessary to make the closer liaison possible.

One cannot honestly see the employers refusing this request: rank and file activity is frowned upon by the employers and by the shop stewards—work one for fear of his life, the other for fear of his job and if his job is his life, as it is for many stewards. It has been printed somewhere that Mrs. Cousins is further left than her famous husband. Perhaps this is so, but on the above showing, who isn't?

No doubt there is a great scheme afoot to settle all the problems in electricity supply: Mr. Foulkes will dip into his contract awards fund for a two-year agreement, with the usual escape clause to keep that tenuous contract afloat. For example, on similar lines to the one he has recently negotiated on behalf of contract electricity, Glory will once again be in its proper place.

JUNIOR WORKERS' COMMITTEE

by Frank Harwood

THE recent national apprentices' strike, which resulted in a national recognition of the type of work apprentices does not seem to have stimulated any significant enthusiasm among the junior workers for trade unionism. Only eighteen delegated apprentices attended the AEU London Area Conference, and that the leadership gave little support to the national strike. It was said that the JWC must be a rallying point for young work-
ers and branches should be set up in every factory to assist the young worker in the harder struggles ahead. This is an ex-
celling idea, if we can get support for this from the District Committees: then by next year it is possible that we may have to hire a bigger bull to accommodate the meeting. It is obvious that now blood must be infused into the JWC. Apart from the attendance there were some who considered the app-

to some of the comment is printed in next month's "Journal", or will the EC play the whole ex-
pulsion card? At least your comments, etc., etc., and then slam the door in our faces?

Why is the EC inviting our opinions, now, so late after the event? It is within its power to test the feelings of the membership, at any time and on any issue, by opening up the pages of the "Journal".

UNILATERALISTS must view the Executive Council's ap-

d by J. BENNET

THE AEU monthly "Journal" has, at long last, provided some comment on the issue of the AEU, the TUC and Labour Party Conferences:

"JOURNAL" AND THE BOMB

by J. BENNET

The AEU monthly "Journal" has, at long last, provided some comment on the issue of the AEU, the TUC and Labour Party Conferences: We are invited to submit comments direct to Executive Council on the article in the November issue of the "Journal" dealing with the behaviour of the AEU in the "November" issue of the TUC and Labour Party Conferences this year. Excellent—let us hope that somewhere in this broadsheet, the leadership of the AEU will find what to say.

THE terms 'line-off' and 'line-
on' in the printing industry mean the stopping and start-
ing of work. The recent line-off in the News Chronicle is a case in point. Although the print issues will continue, the apparent lack of political principle in the "Liberal" proprietor, the popular editor, the engineer of the TUC and the Labour Party, is hypocritical in the extreme, if examined in the light of the past behaviour of the paper and the dubious manoeuv-

FLIGHT STREET JUNGLE

"LINE- OFF" 

by George Jerome

The following article by a printing worker, Bro. Jerome, deals with the closure of the News Chronicle and its effect on printing workers. It suggests one reason for the closure. Whether this is a tenable reason we have not enough information to judge—Editor.

The second Herald offer 4 weeks before the line-off could have been considered. The Australian combines offer could have been considered. The Roy Oliver and his "Labour" offer could have been considered. The Liberal party offer could have been considered.

All were offers that would have kept the papers alive and printing under their own names. But one AEU member named Bill sell-out had already been com-

cond page 3

AID: Since we have heard a great deal about the aid capitalist countries grant to the underdeveloped areas, we might also hear about the aid made of the USA's grant of 600 million dollars to Latin American countries. Alas, much more than 600 million has been taken out of these countries by the worsening of their terms of trade and the United States caused by the decline in prices of the major exports. This deterioration led to a drop of $5.0 billion in the value of the dollar of the past 10 years." (The Times, 7th September)
CRISIS IN THE CAR INDUSTRY

ONE of the obvious facts of the motor industry over the post-war years has been the centre of concentration of production in the hands of five major firms. These (BMC, Ford, Vauxhall, Rootes, Standard-Triumph) are now responsible for over 90% of the national motor output. At the same time, the industry has depended to a large extent on rapid introduction of new and technological changes which, coupled with the demand for cars and lorries that has marked the last ten years, has caused a radical re-organization of the industrial machinery. Between 1948 and 1958 the net output of motor firms increased from a value of £179 million to £432 million, an increase in value from £498,000 to £1,336,000. Meanwhile the capital expenditure per employee has increased from £50 in 1948 to £138 in 1958. In short, in comparing real earnings with productivity, the figure has dropped by 15% in the five years since 1950.

OPTIMISM

These figures point to the growth of automation and the consequent increase in the number of employees in contrast with the increase in output and profits. Nevertheless, the increase in the number of employees has been as drastic as the industry's own organization. As the firms have attempted to gain quick returns on the world or home market, they have neglected the employment conditions and have either increased automation or taken on increased numbers of workers. Thus the work has been geared entirely to the demands of the market. The terms of labour in the different firms have therefore been completely independent on local conditions and have consequently resulted in a crippling series of wage-rate decisions. Wage rates have been decided to fit the number of workers, and not the number of cars. As firms have restricted output or introduced new machinery or automation, the workers have had to make their own agreements and the management has attempted to curtail demands by reducing wages and lowering series of wage differentials, bonus payments, overtime rates, etc. Thus it is impossible to talk about averages in wages over areas, for the conditions vary to such an extent that the organization becomes arbitrary. But it is useful to mention the general trend by indicating the difference in Midlands as compared with Ford. Though the rates for skilled workers in Coventry and Birmingham vary round 10/- and 9/- an hour, in Fords they stand at 7/2; production workers are round 5/- to 10/-, with 6/6 at Ford, and unskilled workers range between 5/6 and 6/-, but are fixed at 5/6 at Ford.

It is therefore essential that the negotiations be conducted from the shop floor. The shop representatives, buried in the bureaucratic world, have been unable to enter into the struggle and rather than come to terms with the necessity of shop steward negotiation, have raised the issue of strike, of "insubordination" and "wildcat". The shop stewards are in a sterile situation in much clearer light and have been able to perform the function of spokesmen. Thus the very effect of the present disorganization of the motor industry has been the increasing conflict between the rank and file of the union and the hierarchy. It has been brought out in the tours of the workers and the union to Birmingham. It has been shown that the lack of direct contact with the workers and the transparency of the bureaucracy of the union. When the right of the ordinary worker to disorganization continues the stewards alone can be the direct representatives of the industry.

POLICY

The 'Economist' of September 24th showed that the output of cars fell in August by 8,000, and the weekly rate for the month was over a sixth below that of May and June. Production is being cut by 15% and Vauxhall is down by 20%. The prices by a reduction of 7% from the European Common Market countries together will upset the US depends on the production of the American "compact cars", and, so long as the dollar was strong, the hire-purchase scheme is certain to make for increased contraction. Workers are already being cut down. Thousands of workers are on short-time, and thousands have got the sack.

A militant policy is needed to face this crisis.

Car workers cannot afford to face another defeat as in 1956. Then the trade union officials, hand in glove with the employer, agreed to the miserably pitiful assistance of "compensation" to sacked workers.

STRUGGLE

Reduction of the purchase tax on cars and a general easing of hire-purchase restrictions can give some help to the industry. Again a cut in car taxes, squeezing out some of the fat profits of the industry could help somewhat to enlarge the market for cars. Reductions in the crippling fuel tax could also help.

Trade with the underdeveloped countries—assisted by generous credit from Britain (a much more useful exercise than waste "defence" expenditure)—and car trade with the countries behind the "Iron Curtain", could also help.

Above all, and immediately, what is needed is a struggle against sacking with a pitance for compensation. This struggle should be combined with a demand for the 40-hour week with a 7½-week annual holiday, followed by a progressive reduction of working hours.

PLANNING

The car industry urgently needs planning. Notwithstanding Gaitskell and Co. the instability of the car industry shows that capitalism continues to be a system of insecurity. Capitalist takeover bids are still the order of the day. Ford, who pays something like 2s. an hour less on the average than wages paid in Midland firms, are set on their bid. Clause 4—defending the public ownership of the industry—should now be translated into action.

A campaign of the whole labour movement should be launched for the nationalization of the motor industry under workers' control. Socialist planning should be the answer to capitalist failures.

"Redundancies" and dismissals: in spite of the fact that the motor industry is never going to regain its highest ever profits, working conditions and guarantees have never been worse. The widespread clamours by the manufacturers for easier hire-purchase terms, the fall in prices and wages, is due to more basic causes.

"LINE-OF—contd

surely the workers on the papers could have been given far longer notice than in fact they were given.

The reasons become clearer when it is remembered that the print Unions are well organized and exercise complete control over the flow of skilled and unskilled labour. It is claimed that this situation has never been acceptable to the employers. This was a major factor in the 1953 strike and is now being exposed to a take-over and continuous printing.

By selling out, 3,000 workers were thrown on the London print market. The unions have to find work for their members on the unsatisfactory day to day basis, and those for whom this is not possible have to depend on a fund, with the moral and financial weakening of members and unions if the situation is prolonged.

On the shop floor the management, with a saturated labour market, are able to hold the threat of unemployment over the heads of militant print workers. Fortunately, the situation from the point of view of the workers is not as bad as the unions and the employers had hoped. It may be asked what prompts my assertion that an attack on the redundancy is the first step.

I can answer that best by pointing to the political implications of this exercise.

It was not surprising that the closure of the papers brought forth the usual volley of abuse against the unions in order to shift the blame on to a section of the TU movement which has been in the forefront of the fight for a more Socialist Labour Party and for rationalization in the industry. This highly conscious section of the working class, so to say, the 'managers', are a product . . . the fact that the employers took this at first sight contradictory view is to be explained by the News Chronicle. The lessons of this should be clear to all trade unionists who are fighting to fight the retention of conditions won in the past and to push forward to a socialist society. We are still with us, with as much force as in any time in the past. Capitalism is just as dangerous when it can afford to be rational.
Will Gaiskell ban the Labour Party?

HUGH Gaiskell’s slander of Labour Party members during the H-bomb debate at Scarborough has been followed by a new slandering — but is it any worse than the usual? A Labour leader, who should be seeking to build a bridge to the rank-and-file, to unite the Party, and especially to fan the flames of internal discord. Moreover, it is an example of the kind of which the Tory Tory tactic. In the past, and at the present time, some of the more unscrupulous Tories strive to misrepresent the socialist case and identify it with communism. For example, in 1924 the Daily Herald-Press so-called "Zinoviev letter", which purported to show that the Labour leaders were close associates of the Communist International. Since then, it has been frequently tried again to scare people into voting Tory. Lies, falsifications, smears: we expect them from the Tories. But we don’t expect—and should not tolerate—it from the leader of our own Party.

Unfortunately, Hugh Gaiskell has the knack of smearing his opponents. Speaking at Daily Herald Hall in October, 1952, he attacked party workers as communists. He said: "I was told by somebody in my party that one-sixth of the constituency party delegates appear to be communists of some importance." He asked that "the National Executive should give immediate attention" to weeding out the supposed communists.

Two years later Gaiskell gave tacit support to a sensation- al Sunday Pictorial campaign headed "DANGEROUS VOTES", the Pictorial was commonly assured by readers that, at the 1954 Scarborough conference, "at least twenty speeches will be made which have been deliberately written by Communist Party members... sympathetic and supporters."

"Writing the following week in the Pictorial, Gaiskell did not feel under any compunction to deny charges that had so unjustly been made against fellow party members. Nor did any feeling of loyalty to the Labour Party lead him to defend Aneurin Bevan, who had been subjected to a vitriolic attack by the Pictorial. Instead, he added fuel to the fire, by making his own personal attack on the Labour Left."

1954

While Gaiskell made his defiance with the Bevanites perfectly plain, he also made it obvious that there was something in what he felt was a certain similarity of view: "I doubt if foreign policy is going to play a big part in the next election—because it is not an important subject."

In 1954, Gaiskell came out with some other strange opinions which, in the light of the current Labour Party conference, deserves more carefull consideration. Inter- viewed by the Daily Herald (12. 3. 54), he was asked what he thought should be done, if, in any country, the Communist Party looked like coming to power through the ballot box. Gaiskell replied, "The democratic parties are entitled to stop it by suppressing the Communist Party. Democracy can only work if parties observe what are called the 'rules of the game.'"

The Gaiskell's sincerity — this is why there has been no reason for thinking he doesn’t— his views on the bomb. He thinks, as he told the Scarborough conference, unilateral renunciation of the bomb is not enough. He does not think that could easily lead, he argues, to the breakup of NATO and the World. He also supported other words in support of the campaign for Nuclear Disarmament who are not communists, and, how long time to follow the communist domination of Western Europe.

Under these circumstances it would not be proper, if Gaiskell still accepts the principles he enunciated in the Ceylon Daily News, to stop the unilateralists by taking undemocratic methods. It would be better to flow the Party’s membership, disregarding conference decisions.

And, let’s assume for the sake of the new Gaiskell campaign that the Party is convinced of a policy Gaiskell has described as "neutralist, pacifist, and fellow travelling."

Two resolutions have come our way. Readers should fill in the space provided, attach it to the resolution they wish and use it where they can—Editor.

CONFERENCE MUST DECIDE

We, the undersigned members of the Labour Party, declare that unity in the Party can only be achieved through wholehearted acceptance of the authority of the Party Conference. By all sections of the movement, including the Parliamentary Labour Party and the implementation of Conference decisions by the National Executive Committee and the Party’s standing machinery and paid officials.

We believe that unless the authority of Conference is maintained in this way, the prospect before the movement is one in which Party policy will be arbitrarily determined by the Parliamentary Leadership.

We refuse to allow the Party Conference, and affiliated Trade Unions and Constituency Parties, to be reduced to the impotent position of debating resolutions without deciding policy.

NAME POSITION ADDRESS

BLANK (Letters please) IN PARTY

WE SUPPORT ANNUAL CONFERENCE DECISIONS

LABOUR, CO-OPERATIVE AND TRADE UNION MEMBERS

We wish to place on record our belief in the democracy of our movement. In the past, when such decisions as for German re-armament have been taken by Conference, we have not attempted to overthrow the democratic process simply because we didn’t agree with the decision.

We have always reserved the right, as democrats, to continue to put the minority case before the Party membership and by such means influence the Party to change the existing policy at the next Annual Conference.

Never, at any time or on any issue, have we sought to deny the right of the movement to take decisions, no matter how wrong we may consider these decisions to be. But it becomes increasingly clear that the avowed Right Wing of the Party and their supporters in the Trade Union leadership, have determined to violate the democratic process and impose their will upon the movement. This is not a situation which cannot be allowed. We reject the argument that anybody in the Parliamentary Labour Party has the right to ignore the Conference when it suits them.

It is the duty of the rank and file members of the Party and the Unions to now make their position crystal clear. It is a duty to defend the democratic process. To support every Labour M.P. who stands against the overthrow of Conference decisions. To demand from all our elected representatives, at every level, their unqualified support for the conference resolutions.

WE SUPPORT ANNUAL CONFERENCE DECISIONS LAC crystals OPERATIVE AND ORGANISATION TRADE UNION MEMBERS

NAME ORGANISATION

WE SUPPORT ANNUAL CONFERENCE DECISIONS LAC CRYSTALS OPERATIVE AND ORGANISATION TRADE UNION MEMBERS

NAME ORGANISATION

London S.W.15
SCOTTISH WORKERS FIGHT POLARIS

It is true to say that many of the Scottish people are dissapointed by the outcome of the General Election. The Liberal leader, Mr William Mackay who was sent to prison for his part in a bank robbery. But a larger and more intelligent section of the Scottish people have turned their attention to Holy Loch where it is proposed to do away with the base.

The fight against the base, sparked off by Glasgow Trades Council on 2nd November, is involving a rapidly growing number of people. There seems little the slightest of reasons. One man said it would prove an additional attraction to Dunoon. Another said it would be a waste. It is now said, on good authority, that it will bring about 30 jobs. No statement like that was attempted when the base was discussed by the Trades Council. The size of these two Council meeting was on a higher level than usual. There was nothing like the same enthusiasm on the last occasion. Out of 247 delegates present, only two voted against the resolution condemning the base. The meeting was attended by the Chair and the Co-Chair. The main attack was directed against the present Labour Government with nothing being said about Russia or America.

SPREADING OUT

The various bodies interested in nuclear disarmament in Glasgow have had an informal meeting at the Trades Council. After the Executive Committee of Glasgow Trades Council. The joint Committee comprising representatives from the Glasgow City Labour Party, the Co-operative Movement and the Trades Council have met to discuss future plans. Already several processes and public meetings have been held. Meetings on a wider scale are being planned.

The Scottish TUC and the Scottish Labour Party have made it known that they are opposed to the base. Various trades councils, including Edinburgh, have joined the struggle.

The well-known Scottish daily paper, "The Freeman's Journal" made its column open for discussion on the matter. The Christian at

ary of Glasgow Trades Council, has made up his mind that the base of THere will be a new slip into the background during the struggle. The Trades Council will make every effort to draw other bodies opposing the base. It will, in addition, take other steps to increase the pressure against the base being established at Holy Loch.

SIGNS

This is not only a Scottish question. Protest made outside completely show that not the question is fully appreciated. It seems however, that Scotland is getting more of its share of the base. It is only right and proper that the strongest possible resistance should be shown from Scotland. That is what is happening.

The signs are that it will lead to a general struggle against the presence of nuclear bases. This would be expected but it will not be allowed to hinder the campaign. Mr John Johnston, the Secretar

GAITSKELL AND THE LABOUR PARTY—contd

Gaitskell has, throughout the fifties, been the architect of the Cold War. Inevitably it leads him to advocate a policy that is directly contrary to the best interests of the Labour Party. In 1950, he proposed cuts in the National Health Service to pay for a greatly expanded arms programme. As Chancellor of the Exchequer, he was able to win the Atlee Government over; Bevan, who regarded the NHS as the Labour Government's supreme achievement, sought to prevent this onslaught on the social services. He re- gressed from the Government, the great dispute began. In other words, Gaitskell's zealously in the fight against the Cold War caused the great divide, provoked disension with the Party, and contributed to the downfall of the Labour Government. According to Gaitskell, the Labour Party now recognises that the NHS charges were a retrograde step and that the next Labour Government should abolish them. However, much H-bombs cost, and however much Gaitskell may want to amass more of them, he cannot suggest paying for them by continuing NHS charges without going against the declared policy not of the annual conference but also the Parliamentary Labour Party.

The second great issue of the fifties—German re-armament—followed the same pattern. Although no Labour candidate had advocated voting against the Nazi generals with arms at the 1951 General Election, Gaitskell made no qualms in the conference that the election policy, like those he has over nuclear disarmament. Gaitskell's views are, of course, evidently does now, that dissenting MPs should be allowed to follow the dictates of their consciences. Six MPs were expelled from the Parliamentary Labour

for actually having the audacity to vote against German re-armament. In general, the Labour Party is united in regarding German re-armament as a dangerous step towards the development of West friction and international incidents. The Labour Party has made an effort to keep the public informed of the danger in Central Europe, the emergence of a non-militarized zone. This policy is directly at variance with the position Hugh Gaitskell held throughout the German re-armament debate. During the past ten years, Hugh Gaitskell's political behaviour has fallen into a deep and falsified manner. He has raised issues that divide the Labour Party. For a time he has won the support of the party by ignoring rigid conformity from dissenters, but later, faced with the turn of events and the weight of public opinion, he has had to beat a quick withdrawal.

But his latest escapade—trying to hold back with Canute- like fortitude—the rearing tide of support for nuclear disarmament. has led him into a difficult, untenable position. A consistent warrior in the Cold War, he grows more and more similar to the late Foster Dulles, who thought he saw communists under every bed, table, and lavatory seat. Gaitskell even sees them among his fellow members of the Labour Party, while, at the same time, he feigns delight with the Communists of democratic rights.

For democratic socialists Gaitskell has reached the end of the road. The Labour Party has for a long time been at the altar of the American alliance. What is needed is a clear lead for national independence and nationa l independence, a foreign policy independent of both Washington and Moscow. And Gaitskell is coming across incapable of giving such a lead.

STATEMENT

FRIGIDAIARE WORKERS' STRIKE

We are glad to reprint the statement which appeared in the Daily Worker on 3rd July. It reads "Frigidairer Workers' Strike" leaflet published by the Frigidairer Strike Committee, North London, 9th August. On November 9th one of our members, while being timet on a job on an assembly line, was considered by the foreman not to be working fast enough. Before the man was able to change the rate of his job, he was shifted by the foreman, and transferred to the store. The store gang was then called in, and tried to settle the matter on the spot, but without success. It should be stated here, that in Frigidairer's Strike Committee does not provide for mutual agreement on the job times. It is the foreman who takes the time for the job.

TURNDOWN

After protracted negotiations the management failed to make an agreement with the management that the Divisonal Organiser be called in, our member put back on the assembly line, and the dispute negotiated without pressure from either side. This proposal was turned down by the management. After further negotiations, the management dictated that the member put back on the assembly line but that they would take away one third money (20 per hour). When this was reported by the stewards to his Section, our members (13) in all stopped work. On Monday 7 November, two other assembly lines decided to stop in sympathy, involving 150 men. At our request, the Divisional

organiser came to a meeting of the members involved in the stoppage. At the meeting it was again decided that the stewards make an attempt to reach a settlement with the management, and again propose that our member be put back on the assembly line without penalty, and the Organiser called in. The stewards saw the clear lack of support, the management rejected both the matter of the member being put back on the job, and the Organiser. On Tuesday 8 November, an All Factory meeting voted to stop work at 8am on Wednesday. This was supported by an overwhelming majority. The Organisers of the AFU, TGWU, GMU, ASW, ETO met the management on Thursday 10 November, at 2.30 pm. During the course of these discussions, the management made it quite plain that the issue is now the growth of Trade Unionism within Frigidairer.

SUPPORT

We have built up a solid organization and will fight to the bitter end to defend it. We are confident that with your assistance we shall bring this strike to a successful conclusion.

Please send all financial support possible to the Organisers, 5A, Holmstall Avenue, Edgbaston, Midland. ... and ORGANIZERS have backed Frigidair products and donations have come in from Harrow, Hendon and Willenden Labour Parties—ed.
SATURDAY NIGHT AND SUNDAY MORNING

SATURDAY Night and Sunday morning", from the book by Alan Sillitoe, is the first British feature film since the war to show Britain as it is really lived by millions of people. The smoke, the noise, the congestion and the gut-tear of the British factory-town in the north of England can provide only one escape for an energetic young factory-worker. He sets out to get the maximum out of a selfish enjoyment with the minimum of effort: and yet, despite the high wages, the wardrobe full of suits, the files and the beer, he is aware that all this is not enough. His amoral approach to human relationships and to Brenda, the married woman he makes pregnant, is one of take much and give little, a philosophy he has learnt from 'the bastards' who run the factory, take his taxes, put him in the army, and drop the bombs which would burn up the land for one hundred miles around Notting- ham.

Unlike the book, the film is unwilling to go into such details, and the young worker's hatred of the television, but enough remains of his protest and his passionate half-sympathetic character despite his behaviour.

Throughout the film one is made strongly aware of the prosperity of the working-class, not just in the south, but in the north, and in their prospect for the future, the workers of 1960 are little better off than their parents, dead from the neck up, with tele-visional hypnosis. A film which states this as clearly as Saturday Night and Sunday Morning, and puts the blame on 'them bastard bosses' is a rare event in the British cinema.

RTP AT UNITY

Unity Theatre has a long and illustrious tradition in the Labour Movement—it celebrates this month its twenty-fifth anni- versary. It is quite clear that the new Left of the youth movement has not suffered from this complaint since they have not been able to get tickets for some of the major films. Of the shows we did manage to see, the British Saturday Night and Sunday Morning (now at the Warner, reviewed elsewhere on this page) and the American Shadows, with the performance of the impromptu film, Shadows, like its contemporary The Savage Eye, shows the decline of American life—a world which embraces buckster and beat, the imagery of Greenwhich Village and the Bowery. The main character spends his life with two friends, hunting for change because he is too lazy to pro- vate his boredom. Ostensi- bly race-conflict is the main issue of the film, but in fact the problem is subordinate to the harsh portrait of lives with out a meaning. Something similar was attempted in Notte Brava (and Les Cousins) in the Italian film, and in the French-Style of French Cinema. A group of French tarts and hood- lums joins up with a gang of idle-upper-class boys for a night of disconnected incidents, violence punctuated by listlessness and boredom.

YOUTH

The problem of Youth is be- coming fashionable without its full implications ever being clear, as attests the film and novel can the full violence and amorality of a generation that has a stake in nothing. The two films were screened at the Festival of Hungarian peasant life in the 1920's. Zhdanov has been pushed.

SOCIALIST REVIEW is published by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd. Periodical rate $2.00. Reprints may be purchased. Copy may be reproduced provided the views of Socialist Review which are given in editorial statement.

9 March 1963

DOG FROM RUSSIA

Some of the more notable of the Russian contributions which are missed, but which should certainly be interesting, are Ray's Jahaguaa Bumla's The Young Avantgardists, Antonioni's L'Avventura, and Lady with the Little Dog from the USSR.
Algerian War

from page 1

thing' against them that they have a year now a certain number of them (two to three hundred) will not demand satisfaction for this desire except in individual protestations to which they are generally incomprehensible (that is to say, refuse to leave for Algeria or desertion). These, however, can lead to nothing. Fighting is a mania and desertion, organised by a network of warrened with police, and directed by the bourgeois, can only achieve the exile, abroad or in prison, of young men who ought, in the normal course of events, to form the vanguard of the struggle against the war, not vegetate, cut off from everything, incapable of action, in some foreign country, without hope of return. It was this situation that led the National Union of Students (UNETP) to propose the last national demonstration against the War in the Place de la Bastille on October 21. Immediately the CGT (the Stalinist TUC) replied that this proposition was a sign of mistrust and fusion, and criticised the call for a national demonstration violently, giving as suggested alternatives, local demonstrations and delegations to local authorities. The Paris region departmental union and the Federation were upheld the appeal, while the national level federal bureau of the same union endorsed it; the CFTC (Christian TUC) adopted a waiving position. Only the National Federation of Education (FEN, an autonomous union of students and professors) unanimously supported the UNETP and its action.

One of the tasks of the FEN is to pressurise the regime to force it to make peace on the lines of its two previous peace offerings (application of self-determination). The FEN did not try to mobilise the latent opposition to the War among a large section of the population on the basis of a policy different to that of General de Gaulle, the clique in the CP and the CGT. However these last two did all that they could to prevent the national demonstration from taking place. Their tactics consisted of a constant substitution of one or two hour token strikes and local demonstrations for the project of the students. The militaries were told: these children's tantrums do not concern you. At the Central Committee of the CP, Thorez said: 'We have no right to show any lack of confidence in the tendencies of the UNETP'. In the course of the daily meetings of the various unions, the statement of the unions, the CGT became more obvious everyday that the Stalinists wished to sabotage the project now it was begun. Thus 'Humanité' (the CP paper) on the 20th October, noted that the 21st demonstration of the CGT which called on workers to organise one hour token strikes and demonstrations outside firms in their towns...

On the morning of Thursday, 20th October, the prefecture of the Seine Police announced that the national demonstration at the Bastille was prohibited. The regime refused to risk the clash of forces between the police and the fifty or sixty thousand demonstrators who would doubtless gather in the Place de la Bastille. The students decided to hold a demonstration despite the prohibition. The Stalinists opposed them more than ever opposed to it. From that moment, both sides planned tactics: which side would be first to capitulate to the regime, the Stalinists or the others? The students' ambition to mobilise 500,000 in the Place de la Bastille, whatever may, and thus, since the demonstration was prohibited, whether or not the regime would stop the everyone back against the wall. The Stalinists 'capitalised' the first. In fact, they were the real capitulators. They were afraid that by continuing their dodging manoeuvres they might allow their militants to be swept into a real struggle against the War, then against the regime; and this finally what they deeply desire? want! It does not want to risk a remotely revolutionary situation escalating. It closed all links, smashed all links, all hopes of unity, in the direct action of their grand charterage demagogically claims to be. The Seine Departmental bureau of the UNETP announced on the 21st October that 'it was not associated and would not associate with an appeal to assemble on the 27 October for this prohibited demonstration'. The political bureau of the CP declared on the same day that conditions were not ripe for a national demonstration in Paris which was proportionate, to mobilise the masses of the partisans of negotiation'. At the same time, the CP and the CGT sent out orders for the 27 October: token strikes of one hour within the plant (sic!) and local demonstrations... really a second sabotage of the planned national demonstration—workers could not demonstrate simultaneously at their place of work and in the centre of Paris! Thence on the same compromise was inevitable: the UNETP, the FEN, the CFTC, and the FC extracted permission to hold a march on the 27th October in Multiplas Assembly Hall; but the CP and the CGT, determined to turn last to last the unity of action against the War, accused the organisers of the meeting of having plotted this with the police in order, naturally, to 'divide the working-class...' and demanded, finally, that they associate with the meeting and to participate in the selection of speakers as a condition of their attendance... The FEN and the UNETP asked them, as a first step, to retract their slanders. The Stalinists refused.

The meeting was held without them. 15-18,000 people assembled, mainly students and intellectuals. Workers mobilised elsewhere or 'demobilised' by the CGT were seated. Despite the attendance of the CFTC and the FO. The CP had shown its power but only negatively, not in a positive context in its division of labour. The developments in the meeting had proved that the need for struggle was not lacking: they showed that it was perfectly possible to hold a prohibited street demonstration with the participation of workers who were largely under the control of the Stalinists. The regime would not necessarily have resulted in the victory of the regime...

Unfortunately, though the holding of the meeting was in vain, the Stalinists' conclusion was much more disappointing. The organisers were forced to appeal to the regime. De Gaulle must be forced to do what he had said he would do. They allowed an impassioned demonstration of 20,000 people to the west of Paris. The Stalinists were the straightest direction for action in the near or distant future. The police actually divided the stream of people. Some hundred metres down the road squadrons of police charged without warning on scattered groups of students, and on those who, dissatisfied with the regime's conclusions, were shouting 'Peace in Algeria' and 'Negotiations in Algeria'. These demonstrations, or those inspired by the PSU, were condemned in advance to brutal repression—they were dispersed in our first emotion. Every small practicable organisation had been prepared. The barbarity of the regime needed all the argument... More than a hundred were injured—some of them severely—five were taken to hospital and thirty were arrested, one student was charged with assaulting a policeman while two others were crushed... such was the balance of peace vengeance against the pacific peace...

But now?

Since 22nd October, the agitation has calmed down, the fever abated. The students know that they cannot fight the regime alone, to be the vanguard does not mean isolation. They are waiting for a new initiative from some other quarter. Meanwhile De Gaulle's policy, one day to the left, one day to the right. After the trial of the fascist insurgents of 24th October, the situation against the intellectuals who composed the manifesto of the 121, supporting inseberordination, the dissident of the ultra, Jacomet. De Gaulle is once again the unconquered master. Everyone is waiting for him to decide. Too many thousands of students who refused to join this game risk even more, risk the subordination and desertion— and this can only increase their dependence on him. De Gaulle is likely to be able to profit from the general resignation of the country to plot his policies in unity, no matter what his opponents slowly but surely, but the gradual deterioration of his régime, therefore, is the day one day turn against him. It is not definitive that each day makes a difference. De Gaulle needs that policy which only relies behind it the unity of a facade. De Gaulle is about to make a difference. If he proposes another policy, Algeria? or not? He is the master of history so long as he is alone in wishing to control it.


PETER CADOGAN DISCUSSES

**Freedom of Speech**

SINCE, as Rutherford observed, "all great truths are simply great and beautiful ones that are most easily overlooked. Thus we all cheerfully acknowledge, and may well admit, the freedom of speech—and in practice deny it. Of all the unsolved problems in front of us, access to the people being the most urgent, since without the correct political method we shall be incapable of any progress as a nation.

It was not until a few months ago that what seems to be a legal right was actually dawned upon me. I owe the discovery to the students of Cambridge.

During the last academic year the University Conservative Club asked Oswald Mosley to come to Cambridge and speak in the Union, and I decided to go along and take part in the discussion. The extreme Club (with Brian Pollitt and a handful of CP types) made much of the opportunity to blacken Mosley's name. When Mosley entered the Chamber he was given the full "Siege Hell" treatment, and I was told that he was somehow invited to establish himself and he got up to speak a student walked straight up to him and flung an egg in his face. (All this did in effect was to make him seem the injured party and be duly capitalised on.)

**BARRAGE**

Mosley then spoke at some length and amongst other things (after assuring us that he was not a Fascist) expounded his incredible case for total apartheid in South Africa—two wholly separate states, one black and the other white. He then faced a fierce barrage of uninhibited questions and the meeting ended with a minor masterpiece of irony uttered by a young Tory and a formal vote of thanks.

This experience was for me a final lesson in the significance of the freedom of speech. Eibhitha had I seen the CP view that the freedom of speech did not extend to fascists. Now I clearly and fully appreciated for the first time, that provided one believed in the intelligence and humanity of people then freedom of speech for a character like Mosley was the best political weapon we had.

In Cambridge now Mosley has no mystique. He has been seen, heard and found wanting. Even as I write, a Right, would I think, agree with that.

Does freedom of speech for fascists mean giving them in to them? Of course not. Free speech means exactly what it says. It does not grant free speech for the rough house. If fascists, or anyone else, turn to violence then socialism should be ready with overwhelming force (and I mean force) to stop them in their tracks, but not to stop them speaking.

Untruth is self-exposing. Reaction is self-confidence.

One must understand that our socialism is nothing if not an increasingly valid reading of the truth, then it is possible for us to deliberately create the combination of circumstances in which the worthless witless of its own worthlessness. This is in the nature of freedom.

Now take an example from the other end of the political spectrum... One of the left-wing leaders (or won't say which) recently came out with this proposition: "The consolidation of working class power will require the violent crushing of all political tendencies aiming at the preservation or re-stitution of exploitation."

What does this mean? Simply that the people who put it forward have a complete lack of confidence in the intelligence of the common people. The socialist revolution in this country will not take place until the overwhelming majority of the people support it. In that case the only possible reason for subsequent police-state action must derive from the mistaken policies of the revolutionary leaders who are required to take coercive action to maintain measures on which they know they cannot carry conviction. Where is mass conviction and mass movement "violent crushing" utterly redundant. Yet people who do not understand this premise to think they can build the revolutionary party! No wonder it doesn't get built.

The Labour Movement today is stultified and hag-ridden by an infamous regiment of dogmatic blind faith in the bureaucratic machine (the Right); the infallibility of the Soviet Union (stalinist); Parliament can solve all our problems (VPS); the Labour Party is death (LIP); that the Russian leaders are not beyond hope and persuasion and Russia still a 'workers state' (trotskyists); all power to Healy (SLL); UNO is the answer (NBL); belief in a vanguard elite (various); industrial action is the answer (Workers Party); the slump is inevitable (various); capitalism can go on 'buying time' almost indefinitely (Cliff).

There is a characteristic common to all of these. The mere mention of these leaders (or particularly the leaders) of each group will regard their own particular dogma not only not oppose discussion in the pages of their own press. They will simply vibly anyone who dares to say that. Dogma and criticism cannot co-exist.

Thus today real criticism on the Left is suppressed by the Left itself. The idea that capitalism is to blame for everything is not true and is in itself a common and dangerous dogma. There is a fundamental source of error within ourselves. It lies in our mistaken method.

This is what Lenin was getting at when he said that "criticism and self-criticism is the law of development of the party". And it follows from it that any group on the Left today that fails to grow in the present sterile political atmosphere is failing not from objective but because of its refusal to re-recognise the very law of its own development.

May I, in conclusion, put a question to my fellow socialists? Between us there are profound differences of opinion. Between ourselves in conversations and "meetings" we have the horticultural arguments. Are the things we disagree about only petty incidental questions or matters of great moment? Since they are clearly of the second order how is it that we do not have them out in print in all the journals and papers to which we have access? Have we so little confidence in ourselves and socialism?
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**WHAT WE STAND FOR**

The Socialist Review stands for international Socialist democracy. Only the mass mobilisation of the working people in the industrial and political areas can lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism. The Socialist Review believes that all administrations of any kind must be brought to power on the basis of the following:

- 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.
- Workers' control in all nationalised industries in a majority of workers' representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequeent recall and receiving the average skilled wage rate in each industry.
- The establishment of workers' council in all enterprises within the framework of a planned economy. In all nationalised industries subject to frequent election-immediate recall and receive the average skilled wage in the industry.
- The establishment of workers' control over the conditions of production; 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. The establishment of an adequate industrial health service.
- The expansion of the housing programme by granting free loans to local authorities and the right to requisition private houses.
- 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 social 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 abolition of conscription and 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 a moral renunciation of the H-bomb.
- A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington nor Moscow.