PRESIDENT Kennedy improves on Franklin Roosevelt in one respect only: he makes mincemeat of liberal illusions much more quickly.

The amateur world strategists of the New Statesman, busy plotting Kennedy's course for him last November, were convinced that this New Deal idol of all the ageing radical essayists, would come to terms with Castro at once. What an achievement, they pointed out, if Cuba could be snatched from the snapping jaws of Krushchev and Fidelismo be firmly tethered to the "free world's" camp.

As usual, our liberals failed to smell the stench under their noses—in this case, of oil. Wall Street, ready to jettison Batista when his impotence was proved, was quite willing to allow his successors any amount of democratic phrase-mongering. But when the armed workers and peasants of Cuba pressed the new regime to nationalize imperialist property, they put a different complexion on things altogether.

For the past year, America has been surreptitiously training Cuban irregulars for the forthcoming invasion of Cuba. The signs are—and the shrewd Kennedy has said as much—that all the stops will not be pulled out unless or until the Cuban reactionaries can establish some solid base for themselves, however small, on the island. It is clear that they are meeting with no support at all among the Cuban people.

Washington will therefore hold its hand. But the danger persists that, with some sudden worsening of the world situation, it may decide "to make an example" of Cuba. The Labour Movement must be on guard against any such move.

Macmillan on his recent visit may have made secret commitments to send British forces to Cuba. These must not be carried out. It is not necessary to defend everything Castro does (for example, his anti-strike legislation). It is not necessary to call a country ruled neither by workers' councils nor a workers' Party a "workers' state".

But it is necessary to alert the British Labour Movement to any plans directed against Cuba.

Hands off Cuba! Hands off a revolution still unfolding! Not a shilling nor a penny must go to aid Wall Street's plans against the Cuban people.

VERWOERD'S "GOOD NEIGHBOUR" POLICY AT WORK

see articles on page five

by courtesy of the Daily Worker

TO parody the words of the skullie number... "Times are goin' to get hard boys and money is goin' to get scarce". This is the message behind Selwyn Lloyd's first rob the poor to feed the rich budget announced Monday April 19th.

Lloyd, now the darling of the brokers, investors, Tory MPs and the rest who have long been pleading the cause of the down trodden £50,000 a year class, has made it quite clear. To do him justice he has said without equivocation and in a loud, clear voice that the prospects before British capitalism are grim. If not a major slump than a series of deepening economic crises face his class and Mr Lloyd has seen fit to try and take what safeguarding action he can in his budget.

He has done this by making the working class pay... and how. Not only do the recent increased health charges very nicely pay for the surtax relief (Mr Beeching and those like him will now pocket an EXTRA £35 a week) but Mr Lloyd has taken wide powers in the form of the payrol tax. A measure designed to force hesitant employers to sack workers if he thinks the overall interests of capitalism require a large pool of unemployed workers. He thinks this will also help to cut consumption of food, (and other workers' luxuries) and help balance his worsening import-export balance.

If during the next year he thinks that the workers are still buying too much his new, wide range of power will enable him to arbitrarily increase prices; he has publicly admitted that this is behind the increased television advertising tax. His forecast help to the car industry seems to have consisted of making it even more costly for the ordinary worker to run a car.

All in all it is quite evident that the Tories are looking to the future with more than a little anxiety. By budgeting for a high 'above the line' surplus, the capitalist class are preparing to take extraordinary measures to combat what they fear may be an extra ordinary crisis.

The lesson for the Party is quite clear. An immediate campaign at national level is now imperative to explain the causes of the coming crisis... before it is too late. The vacillation of party leaders must be no excuse for not revealing what is in effect a plan for the most severe attack on the living standards of the working class since the war. The meaning of the increased insurance and health charges, the threat of increased prices and high unemployment must all be made clear to the class so that when the wheel begins to grind we will be able to take effective action.
At one time, not so long ago, there were seventy unions catering for building operatives but today, there are only seventeen.

BUREAUCRACY

One of the main reasons for this startling progress is the prevalence of bureaucracy in all the affiliated unions. This bane is not confined to the top brass but in varying degrees can be found at all organisational levels. The local Branch Secretary is as much a victim of this vice as the General Secretary.

The glory and magnified importance of the office held seems to override all other considerations. They prefer being ‘big men’ in small places than to be able to show results numerically and economically more powerful industrial organisms.

Like Gods they thunder in their own little heavens but with all this thunder they are unable to arouse any fear in the minds of the employers who sit snugly in their offices watching with amusement the play performed on the industrial stage.

There are a few who proudly call themselves General Secretaries but they represent at best only a few thousand members whose power and influence is negligible.

A condition of progress in this instance is the break-down of bureaucracy at all levels: a job that must be tackled from the bottom in the Branch and in the presence of the lay-member. In the final reckoning he will be the arbiter and not the EC’s and General Secretaries.

CONSERVATISM

There is no organisation more conservative than the craft union affiliated to the NFBCO. These unions either will or cannot keep pace with the times.

In these days of rapid social and industrial changes they ana-p Austria, they have cut themselves off from the useful and no longer serve the purpose for which they were formed and should therefore be relegated to the museum for antiquities.

In many sections of building machinery and technical progress have destroyed almost every vestige of craft as originally understood. The new forces have brought in their trail operational processes which the old method of labour has displaced. Blended in them are the elements not only of craftsmanship but the skill and aptitudes of the non-craft operatives.

Out of this process of action and reaction a new product: a new operation: a new class of operative in possession of new skills and experience.

Already the question of survival has become a vital issue in many craft unions. Membership is in decline; their power and influence is on the wane.

In an effort of reconciliation some of them have opened their ranks to the craft operatives, but experience has shown that this has added to and not detracted from their difficulties.

On the extent that this policy has been pursued the craft organisation has become a General Union.

Socialist Review

AMERICAN workers are feeling the results of economic recession, in fact five and a half million are unemployed and this army is being added to every day. But recession is not the only worry. Prices are beginning to dwindle. Advanced technology, i.e. automation, is replacing the jobs of many workers.

In the steel industry for example it took 20 man-hours to produce one ton of steel in 1940 — it now requires only 11. Two hundred and thirty major industries more is being produced with fewer workers, resulting in larger profits for the corporations.

About 125,000 steelworkers were laid off last December and 10,000 will not be recalled even if the industry were to operate at full capacity. At present steel production is in the Union only 75 percent. But profits remain high. Recession is not worrying the American steel capitalists. What is true for the steel industry applies to many other industries also.

It would be a mistake to think that only unskilled work can be automated; computers may soon render unnecessary the presence of many of today’s craftsmen. An estimated 160,000 unemployed car workers were canned when employed in the car industry due to automation. One million railway men have been laid off in the past 20 years, partly due to increased mechanisation. And in the coal mines two men do the work that once required twelve.

But not only industrial workers are being replaced by advanced technology. Electronic machines eliminated 25 percent of American office and clerical jobs.

Unemployment benefits last only six months and about 75,000 workers have been out of work for more than this period.

The 30 for 40 (30 hour week for 40 hours pay) is the popular demand which the rank and file of the unions are now putting forward, but this will not solve all the problems, assuming it is achieved, since it will not alter the economic structure of capitalist society.

The British workers have not felt the same amenities, in the extent that their American brothers have, but they surely will. It is the first step towards a solid front for all sections of the movement.

Governor Davis and the Louisiana State Legislature decided to ‘refuse public assistance to poor children and mothers and their 23,000 illegitimate children... thus do what Newport News did’ (The Economist, 10 September).

What brutality on the part of bigoted capitalist rulers!
MAY Day has long since been reduced to a ritual. Everywhere outside Asia and Latin America, a large proportion of the workers' May Days assumed under Stalin a more and more military overture. Parades were dominated by Red Army tanks, motorized cars and massed formations of the Red Navy and Army, while the red Air Force, menacingly equipped, flew overhead. The main speech was delivered by a leading figure (usually Voroshilov) whose turn of phrase produced epigrams such as “let the imperialists bear their bills, no matter how much, we still have our beautiful Soviet garden”. Krushchev has changed the order of things a little, but not much. And we may be sure that this year the emphasis will be, not on the strength of the workers everywhere for bread and freedom, but on the stupendous military feat (for that, of course, it is what it is) of the spacemen and the scientists behind him.

In the West, most workers will not even mention May Day at all. A tiny number will observe the occasion in the leading towns in Britain, more noticeably on a Sunday. No work will stop. Neither heat nor light will be enforced by the tired official speeches. To the leaders whose wretched cowardice merely lost Labour the LCC, May Day is merely an embarrassment, a memory of an overalled past which should be put behind as soon as possible—although the left-wing Labour Group originally refused to give an official declaration on the subject other than its belief that the (admittedly great) achievement of the LCC was that the present situation was ideal.

Politically, the report smells. It boils up in the two largest Labour-controlled authorities (London and Middlesex, with over 5 million people) which submerge them in a Greater London Council covering 8 million people which would, on the basis of the General Election return, have a Tory majority of about 70 to 40. Even if Labour won the elections to this new council (which is probably not impossible in the future) they would still have some of the functions previously administered by the County Councils.

By and large the administration of housing, education, health services and the care of the aged, the disabled and of deprived children will be the responsibility of 52 new boroughs to be formed by the merging of the existing local authorities. In several cases a Labour-held council will be swallowed by a new borough likely to have a Tory majority. Wood Green, Fenge, Feltham, Mitcham and Leyton are cases in point. In other cases a marginally held borough such as St. Pancras is made safe of its council by the addition of a solidly-held Tory one like Hampstead.

The government of all large built-up areas is subject to two contradictory pressures, the demand for a large and efficient and local, but smaller the more remote the government becomes, but the less satisfied is it with the present county authorities and the increasing rail travel itself.
The direction of action

BY PETER SEDGWICK

The anti-nuclear sitdowns have had a bad Press, not least from the Left—which is usually so quick to denounce anything that takes place in other countries. It seems that it is right for the 121 to advocate illegal tactics in France, but wrong for the 100 to undertake much milder forms of mutiny in Britain. If a group of Canon Collins jump to denounce the " lunatic fringe" behind the Easter Monday sitdown in Grosvener Square. The various vanguards of the proletariat and (on the whole) the New Left movement are conspicuous by their absence from the cold pavement outside the Ministry of Defence. Socialism Review permitted itself a cheap gibe at the sitdown in last month's editorial—although most of its contributors seemed to be out there on that pavement.

One may well agree that the post-Aldermaston sitdown was ill-organized and ill-timed. (Socialist Review goes to press too late to be able to comment on the Committee of 100 sitdown in Parliament Square on April 29th.) But on the other hand, anything that tends to increase the disrespect for Indian "law and order" that supports Polaris is to that extent commendable. And above all any criticism of Direct Action, its methods, activities and participants, should be on the grounds of its political effect, and not its "humanitarian", "moral" or "moralistic" effect.

GET MOVING

Our approach to Direct Action (whether organised by the committee bearing that name, or by the more widely-based Committee of 100), should also be emotive: that is, we should refrain from blanket judgments pro or con Direct Action as such, and should examine each proposed form of civil disobedience on its merits as a possible means of waging the anti-nuclear class struggle. Most Militant Socialists seem to be agreed that industrial stoppages against the Bomb are a desideratum, but few months' editorial felt rightly obliged to stress that strikes of this kind will not really be represented as an invidious (unfortunately) only a token fashion.

But we cannot leave our consideration of Direct Action at the stage of proclaiming "No work on the Bomb". This slogan is usually uttered or distributed practically anywhere in Britain, amounts to saying that somebody, anybody else (i.e. workers in rocket bases) has to get moving. But the essence of revolutionary politics is that WE—and anybody else involved in it—are going to get moving.

We should then, think of Direct Action not as a form of militant demonstration undertaken to alert the British people to the threat of the peril, and to show that there are large numbers of people who hate nuclear weapons sufficiently to prove that they mean business. As and when working-class Direct Action follows in the form of strikes against the Bomb, Direct Action will become something far more important: a dangerous challenge to the special system that needs the Bomb.

GANDHIST

The mistake made by many Direct Action enthusiasts is that of supposing that the present forms of Direct Action are sufficient, if expanded on a really huge scale, to overthrow nuclear weapons. After the February sitdown Russell stated that the aim of the Committee of 100 was to carry on organising over ever more disobedient kinds of dis- obedience until the Government was forced to the choice of either imprisoning thousands of people or desisting. Clearly, if the implication is that the Government would then rather abdicate than imprison. (For there is no point in mass protest for its own sake.)

Other Direct Actionists conceive of their task as that of carrying their martyrdom to such an extent that the Tories will be converted by the example of suffering offered them, and give up the Bomb. (This might be called the "prisoners-politics" view of Direct Action; it is no coincidence that the recent CND National Conference both approved the Direct Action as a form of CND activity and rejected a resolution demanding a concentration of forces on the Labour Party struggle.)

Both of these approaches are what may be called "ideologies" of Direct Action: acceptance of them does not depend on a detailed consideration of the or that particular kind of activity, but rather contains a total philosophy of politics, usually that associated with the name of Gandhi. It is worth noting that Gandhi was by no means an absolute foe of violence. He helped in recruiting Indian troops to the Allied imperialist side during World War I, and refused to protest against the imprisonment of the Garwali soldiers (who refused to fight on the Peshawar fronts on the grounds that when independence came Congress would need an obedient army, and this set a bad example).

Besides, Gandhists Direct Actionists have usually voted curiously rosy picture of the struggle for Indian independence, which certainly did not succeed by appealing imperialist hearts by the spectacle of total non-violence.

The struggle included terrorism, sabotage mob-violence and class mutiny among its methods as well as hunger-strikes and passive disobedience. The majority, like any others, had a habit of breaking into distinctly violent forms of Direct Action if they were thwarted or shot at, this causing immeasurable sorrow to

A DMIRAL Rabora, in charge of the Polaris project for the US Navy, who asked the contractors to proceed "on wartime urgency with wartime dedication" gave a pep-talk to one of his officers. Later the officer said: "When I saw that I was ready to die for some one, but I didn't know—or remember—whether it was the Admiral, the President, my mother, the head of the Boy Scouts or who. But, brother, I was ready to die." Cgr. James Butler Osborn, "who looks like a football player, talks like a marine drill sergeant and thinks like a well-trained engineer, seemed almost in love with his elusive command." This ship, he insisted, "is not a problem in physics; it's an art of war."

"Commited $3.5 billions of the national defence budget before a single shot was fired. It was the first instalment on the Polaris fleet that will run up a bill as large as the entire budget for the Strategic Air Command. But it was a cold war bargain." (Time, 1st, August 1960). The same issue showed a map with Britain as a service base for Polaris, in August, three months before the agreement was announced by MacMillan.

The Mahatma on numerous occasions. It is unlikely, moreover, that any more than a very few Direct Action participants will follow the Gandhists in positively seeking imprisonment as a consequence to their protest. (Only one out of nearly thirty anti-Polaris sitdowns at the Grosvener Square sit-down chose to go to jail rather than pay a fine.) The attitude of what may be than sacrifice principle. But this is far cry from the "hard core" Activist's craving for four narrow walls and a blank bed.

To sum up, one can probably do no more than repeat the call made by the anarchist paper Freedom at the time of the first demonstration outside the Defence Ministry: SMALL WITHOUT INLUSIONS!
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PATRICE Lumumba and his colleagues died because they put their faith in the United Nations. Neither the murder of the Congolese leaders nor the treachery of the UN came as any surprise to those who recognize this organization and the role of imperialism for what they are.

The situation is reminiscent of the historical role of Western imperialism, only in this case the rump of imperialism has formed a collective force to carry on its odious task under the "respectable" cloak of UNO. Whatever excuses the Western leaders can use to defend it, one thing is crystal clear: UNO, which Lumumba himself, as Prime Minister, had invited to the Congo to preserve law and order, not only failed to do so but also denied the elected Government of the Congo every available means of self-protection.

In the intervention there is no doubt that UNO was to out the wishes of the State Department, for the Wall St. Journal wrote on September 6th: "A clear defeat for Lumumba would cheer up the US State Department even more than would the liquidation of their other chief head-ache of the moment—Fidel Castro." In discussing the responsibility for this crime against the Congolese people we must ask ourselves whether the leaders of the UN have really acted within the terms of their job, in which to "belong", have British, Belgian, American and French interests.

The financial papers of these countries have openly spoken of interference. In Kinshasa and South Kasaí have broken away from the Congo. The shareholders' interests thus secure, the rest of the Congo can be left to bankruptcy and famine. As can be expected, the former Government played its full part in the whole dirty business. They refused to support UNO's resolution in July calling for the withdrawal of Belgian troops. Meanwhile this Government made no protest when Belgium poured in paratroops to expel the Belgian officers from the Congolese Army. In fact, their whole record runs true to form and they must take their share of the blame for Lumumba's murder, for their most dangerous opponent and has been using the very fact of these murders to confuse people's minds with the anti- Congolese barbarism and their inability to rule themselves.

How can the Congo be saved? Is it too much to hope that at least the scales will fall from the Labour eyes, for it was at Scarborough last October that the Annual Congress passed a resolution congratulating UNO on its handling of the Congo.

The touchstone for socialists on this question is that they stand unequivocally for the restoration of the legally elected Government of the Congo and the removal of all foreign troops, including those of UNO. This will involve use of the anti-imperialist forces to deal with the stooges and puppets. British Labour must be made to take a clear stand against this issue. The rank and file have the responsibility to clear their minds and then to act in a campaign of solidarity against the crimes of imperialism. A campaign which with the support of the British workers and the African peoples against their common enemy.

In our triumphs in Suez, the Labour party wards and GCMS, as well as within the wider anti-imperialist movement we demand the end of imperialism and for the support of those fighting against it.

In 1956 total foreign investment in South Africa amounted to £1,396 million. The British share of this was £536 million or 62 per cent of the total. Nearly seven eighths of the British investment was on a long term basis, £286 million was in mining and £213 million in other manufacturing industries. The interlocking of South African economy with that of Britain went even farther. Of the £411 million worth of assets held by South Africa in foreign countries, £231 million were held in the sterling area, nearly half of it in Britain. Naturally the British do not want to jeopardize the business interests in South Africa by taking up issues with Dr. Verwoerd.

PREFEERENCE

Under the Ottawa Conference agreements, South African goods enjoy a preferential treatment in Britain. So do the British goods in South Africa. But it so happens that while Britain can sell her goods elsewhere without preference, South Africa will be faced with the choice of either giving way or being cut out of the market for South Africa, it would be difficult to find markets where the can sell without being at a disadvantage. Fruit is one such example. In 1958-59, Britain imported about £5,000,000 worth of fresh fruit from outside South Africa. This was 70 per cent of the country's fruit exports and amounted to nearly £2.7 million. In the same period about 56 per cent of citrus fruit exports or 42 per cent of the total crop was sent to Britain. Taken from another angle, in 1958 about 70,000 tons of canned fruit or 90 per cent of the total output was sent to Britain. In such commodities even slight fluctuations in prices make a large difference. Sometimes even if the price realised in Britain is slightly lower, it is made up by the large quantities sold. In the case of currants, raisins and sultanas, for instance, which were valued at 1s. 4d. per lb. in Norway, the price realised in Britain was only 1s. 2d. per lb., but over 6 million pounds of currants were sold. Raisins and sultanas, for instance, which were valued at 1s. 4d. per lb. in Norway, the price realised in Britain was only 1s. 2d. per lb., but over 6 million pounds of currants were sold.

AFRICA

LESSONS OF THE BOYCOTT—BY DEV MURAVKA

THE withdrawal of South Africa from the Commonwealth is not in any way a major breakthrough against Verwoerd's racial policies, despite much optimistic Labour thinking. The reality is that Britain and South Africa is not formally being members of the "governing body" of the capitalist classes of both countries trading in more concrete things than pleasant rhetoric.

Although the British Government has at last voted in "re gestión" of South Africa, the UN, why is it not prepared to support a more militant reaction calling for trade sanctions against SA?

The main reason is that British investment in South Africa is heavy and profitable. The extent of this is not often realised. It is estimated that between 1946-55 foreign direct capital was some of about £700 million flowed into South Africa. Of this £500 million came from South Africa and another £300 million foreign capital provided about 2 per cent and Britain about 17 per cent of the total investment. Even then these figures are not very impressive till it is remembered that £200 million of foreign capital is used to open new gold mines.

Fuller details of the investment pattern, and which jumped up to £1,396, are much more interesting.

The capture of the Santa Maria was not a romantic gesture. Still less was it the result of a plan merely intended to attract world attention to the dramatic situation of Portugal. The capture of a large and magnificent vessel, which lasted for eleven days, and the voyage across the Atlantic pursued by planes and ships of several nations, has a meaning for all of you.

We wanted to protect the dictator Salazar was not invulnerable—and we succeeded. We struck him, and at his height in prosperity, we made them ridiculous in the eyes of the whole free, Christian world.

Tomorrow, wherever and whenever we meet him face to face once more, we shall strike at him again. We would not be what we are, nor would we be your spokesmen, were we to limit ourselves merely to the domain of military action. In fact at war with the Portuguese and Spanish dictatorships. We are not interested simply in overthrowing Salazar by itself. We pursue a revolutionary aim: the reconstruction of Portuguese society on new lines. Owing to various circumstances there has never been before been held out to the Portuguese people a hope and a future corresponding to their aspirations. We intend to take that step, which is decisive for all of us.

We know that no one fights for vague promises and beautiful words. Talk about liberty, equality and fraternity solves nothing. For this reason we do not intend to be guided by the same mistakes made by those who reiterate principles and are fearful or irritating the dictator, and who take refuge behind vague formulas. We want a revolution, protest authentic, the dictatorship on the Portuguese and Spanish dictatorships. We are not interested simply in overthrowing Salazar by itself. We pursue a revolutionary aim: the reconstruction of Portuguese society on new lines. Owing to various circumstances there has never been before been held out to the Portuguese people a hope and a future corresponding to their aspirations. We intend to take that step, which is decisive for all of us.

We know that no one fights for vague promises and beautiful words. Talk about liberty, equality and fraternity solves nothing. For this reason we do not intend to be guided by the same mistakes made by those who reiterate principles and are fearful or irritating the dictator, and who take refuge behind vague formulas. We want a revolution, protest authentic, the dictatorship on the Portuguese and Spanish dictatorships. We are not interested simply in overthrowing Salazar by itself. We pursue a revolutionary aim: the reconstruction of Portuguese society on new lines. Owing to various circumstances there has never been before been held out to the Portuguese people a hope and a future corresponding to their aspirations. We intend to take that step, which is decisive for all of us.

We know that no one fights for vague promises and beautiful words. Talk about liberty, equality and fraternity solves nothing. For this reason we do not intend to be guided by the same mistakes made by those who reiterate principles and are fearful or irritating the dictator, and who take refuge behind vague formulas. We want a revolution, protest authentic, the dictatorship on the Portuguese and Spanish dictatorships. We are not interested simply in overthrowing Salazar by itself. We pursue a revolutionary aim: the reconstruction of Portuguese society on new lines. Owing to various circumstances there has never been before been held out to the Portuguese people a hope and a future corresponding to their aspirations. We intend to take that step, which is decisive for all of us.

We know that no one fights for vague promises and beautiful words. Talk about liberty, equality and fraternity solves nothing. For this reason we do not intend to be guided by the same mistakes made by those who reiterate principles and are fearful or irritating the dictator, and who take refuge behind vague formulas. We want a revolution, protest authentic, the dictatorship on the Portuguese and Spanish dictatorships. We are not interested simply in overthrowing Salazar by itself. We pursue a revolutionary aim: the reconstruction of Portuguese society on new lines. Owing to various circumstances there has never been before been held out to the Portuguese people a hope and a future corresponding to their aspirations. We intend to take that step, which is decisive for all of us.
THE CND’s Conference on March 4 and 5 recorded four major advances. First, the necessity for a joint campaign between the Direct Action Committee (and Committee of 100) and the CND. Second, the CND supporters and leaders was ended, CND is to make another attempt to impose itself on to all unilateralist activities. We need not see again rival bands of pseudo-marchers marching in opposite directions down the same road.

Secondly, the self-appointed National Executive of CND is to be replaced by a completely elected one. Third, the delegates finished the work they started at the last Conference by demanding immediate withdrawal from NATO, rejecting a National Executive proposal that, for tactical reasons, CND should agree to the following measures long enough to try to persuade the Alliance to give up reliance on nuclear weapons.

Finally the delegates showed themselves well aware of the importance of linking socialist and sound industrial workers into the Campaign and of the importance of the last Labour Party Conference and the present fight within the Party. The delegates showed themselves well aware that they need to fight Crossman’s so-called “compromises” statement than the rejection of the rejection of the rejection.

The majority however resolutely refused to call on CND members to support the Labour Party and push for its return to power on a unilateralist policy. Socialists and agitators in the Party who have the of the keystone of Associated supporters; although when it was the Pat, As ex-smoke said of token industrial stoppages against Polaris, she received great applause.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED


This conference of CND rejects the defence policy recently approved by the Parliamentary Labour Party. Although in details this shows some concessions to the rising demands for unilateral nuclear disarmament, it falls far below the qualifications laid down by the last Labour Party conference. Nor can the Campaign support the alternative draft policy of Mr. Crossman. We need to campaign for the continuation of Britain within a nuclear armed NATO or the retention, for no matter how short a time, of US bases in Britain or of tactical nuclear weapons by NATO, all of which are implicit in the Crossman proposal. World events since the last Labour Party Conference have made the individual decisions less necessary; rather they have made it more necessary to continue to campaign strengthened by withdrawal from all alliances armed with nuclear weapons or including members so armed.

Moved by Mrs. Pittock, Crewe CND, and seconded by Ray Challinor Stoko-Trent.

OVER the past year or so contributors to Socialist Review have taken up the problems of many oppressed and underprivileged groups: students, apprentices, sections of industrial workers etc. But you, and those whose articles you publish, papers have failed to mention the largest oppressed class of all: Women.

Women make up over 50 per cent of the adult population. Legally, occupationally, economically and socially oppressed, and subject to the most blatant forms of sex discrimination, they offer an important field for urgent socialist consideration. A few Labour MP’s and councilors have tried by individual effort to tackle very limited problems— reform of abortion laws, provision of creches, nursery schools etc.

Larger numbers have condemned women’s lack of interest in Trade Union activity and their disposition to vote Tory. How many have analysed the reasons for this? How many have talked of equality and freedom for workers and colonial peoples and women? Why do not workers and their wives, mothers and daughters? When will you see us so that we can help in the struggle against capitalism? Don’t retort that nothing can be done until we change society and reach socialism. This is ultimately true for all subject classes, but this does not stop you framing transitional programs and immediate demands. The slavish dependence of women is based on her dependent economic position. Legal, social, moral and cultural inequalities have arisen from this. A whole complex of values and attitudes have grown on this, backed and rationalised by specious psychology and biology to give a stereotype of woman satisfactory to the dominant male sex.

What should and can be done? Engels says, “the first premise for emancipation of women is to change the economic position of the female sex into public industry”. This is the way to make women economically independent and clear the way for emancipation in all spheres. The process has already begun. In England and Wales 35 per cent of women over 15 are gainfully occupied compared with 85 per cent of the men.

Clearly our immediate task is to remove obstacles to the fullest and the equal entry of women into employ in. These are of two kinds— legal, and those connected with traditional attitudes towards women. In many cases the two are intertwined. Therefore, no attempt has been made to separate them here.

Here is a list of places where useful progress could and must be made:—Education (content and opportunities in further education), opportunities in occupations largely closed to women for traditional reasons: apprenticeships; equal pay in all occupations; removal of taxation anomalies, particularly as they affect married women; Paid maternity leave for all occupied women; adequate provision of creche and nursery school facilities; legal abortion and free family planning facilities. By individual and collective action and example to change the opinion which bears down upon those women struggling to be free.

The ideal of woman portrayed by the women’s magazines and newspapers is cherished by male dominated society (often including socialists) causes for the individual woman overwhelming conflicts and struggles in the attempt to become free to herself. In many cases, even when she is a joint or equal breadwinner, she is still expected to take responsibility for the home and children. Help given by the husband is in the nature of a concession, an infringement on his personal leisure time.

Emanicipation is independent of the on the way to becoming a reality for some women and the number is likely to increase, but the weight of tradition and conservative opinion still prevents them entering social and sexual relationships on equal terms with men. Are socialists going to allow women to dissipate their energies waging a struggle against the male oppressors for re cognition?

We know emancipation cannot be completely achieved until all workers, men and women, are freed from capitalism. Let those socialists who are socialists assist women in their struggle for freedom and equal opportunity and aid the freedom of the further the struggle for Socialism.

SPARTACUS

THE ancient legend of Spartac with about 2000 years before the abolition of slavery, a form of political expression which has continued to be the Waterfront”. We were as ensured not only that such dreams are not longer exist, but that their portrayal was a sign of Democracy’s willingness to understand the self-criticism. On the other hand, for political and box-office reasons, too great a degree of historical realism would have been undesirable. As a result the political conflict between slave and master is underplayed, and instead the differences are emphasised between senators of reactionary patriotic origins, typified by dictator poet (Tony Curtis). In contrast,

SOCIALIST REVIEW

The CND’s Conference on March 4 and 5 recorded four major advances. First, the necessity for a joint campaign between the Direct Action Committee (and Committee of 100) and the CND. Second, the CND supporters and leaders was ended, CND is to make another attempt to impose itself on to all unilateralist activities. We need not see again rival bands of pseudo-marchers marching in opposite directions down the same road.

Secondly, the self-appointed National Executive of CND is to be replaced by a completely elected one. Third, the delegates finished the work they started at the last Conference by demanding immediate withdrawal from NATO, rejecting a National Executive proposal that, for tactical reasons, CND should agree to the following measures long enough to try to persuade the Alliance to give up reliance on nuclear weapons.

Finally the delegates showed themselves well aware of the importance of linking socialist and sound industrial workers into the Campaign and of the importance of the last Labour Party Conference and the present fight within the Party. The delegates showed themselves well aware that they need to fight Crossman’s so-called “compromises” statement than the rejection of the rejection of the rejection.

The majority however resolutely refused to call on CND members to support the Labour Party and push for its return to power on a unilateralist policy. Socialists and agitators in the Party who have the of the keystone of Associated supporters; although when it was the Pat, As ex-smoke said of token industrial stoppages against Polaris, she received great applause.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED


This conference of CND rejects the defence policy recently approved by the Parliamentary Labour Party. Although in details this shows some concessions to the rising demands for unilateral nuclear disarmament, it falls far below the qualifications laid down by the last Labour Party conference. Nor can the Campaign support the alternative draft policy of Mr. Crossman. We need to campaign for the continuation of Britain within a nuclear armed NATO or the retention, for no matter how short a time, of US bases in Britain or of tactical nuclear weapons by NATO, all of which are implicit in the Crossman proposal. World events since the last Labour Party Conference have made the individual decisions less necessary; rather they have made it more necessary to continue to campaign strengthened by withdrawal from all alliances armed with nuclear weapons or including members so armed.

Moved by Mrs. Pittock, Crewe CND, and seconded by Ray Challinor Stoko-Trent.
It's Rich

"Children have been trained to duck as soon as they see a brilliant flash of light"—Times report on American Civil Defence, 2 March.

"Stendhal's novel, translated into English under the sinister title, 'The Red and the Black,' was among the books confiscated from one of the white accused"—New Statesman retrospective report on the South African treason trial, 7 April.

"For several years a number of different companies have been investing large sums in devising ways by which programmes can be made visible to those who pay for them and invisible to those who do not"—The Guardian, 10 March.

"A British officer who went out for a training run wearing only a pair of running shorts, with snow still on the ground, was locked in a Norwegian mental hospital"—Times, 8 March.

"But for the fact that it appears that Mr Macmillan felt obliged to insist that there be no change of policy—for fear of embarrassing the campaign—may have achieved a most important victory."—London Region CND circular, Easter.

EXPLORING THE NUCLEAR HUMBUG. Training is now almost exclusively concerned with the use of tactical nuclear weapons to control the battlefield. Increasing responsibility for deciding when to use these weapons is being put on such relatively junior officers as brigade commanders. The other, even more interesting development, is that the soldiers are quite determined not to leave it to the politicians to tell them when to fire their weapons. Political control raises the blood pressure of these professionals. They say that it is humbug to imagine a situation in which the Russians started coming west in strength, and tactical nuclear weapons would still not be used. They add that their Russian opposite numbers must think it humbug also. If a nuclear weapon is to be used, the men on the ground must know that it is used with the approval of the civilians in Paris or an elaborate system of directives locked up in the army commander's brief case, can do this job... The final decision left with your correspondent after his visit to Rhine Army units is that this small force has achieved a new sense of purpose now that it has these powerful weapons."—Economist, 29 Oct. 1960.
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the slaves, probably a tough and insensitive bunch in the first century BC, exhibit all the moral virtues of a clear-cut Westerner: Spartacus will not sleep with the slave girl shud- ed for him despite the jeers of his keepers through the grating; his wife takes a firm psycho- analysis of his character: Crassus, telling him that he is 'afraid'; baby slaves are squirmed with goats' milk by weather- beaten grandmothers; to the background of an over-pink sunset Tony Curtis enraptures the slave army with a poem about 'Home'.

Though it is only a very small part of the film, these are scenes, the transferring of the conflict from the sphere of political rights to that of moral values enables the film to avoid the full implications of the theme.

There are still however scenes in which the iron toughness of Roman life has resisted this modernizing tendency, and they

CRASSUS (Sir Laurence Olivier) and Democrats, typified by Dracchus (Charles Laughton), the Tribune of that favourite American entity 'the People'.

Gracchus, in history a demagogue, is frequently shown exuding a 'Love for humanity'—chatting fondly to an old peasant from whom he has bought a chicken in the forum, helping Spartacus' wife and newborn child to escape with a kindness which belies his explicit reason, spite for Crassus. Such inconsistent bonhomie tends to grate upon the watchful. Gracchus is however also portrayed as a decadent, as are the other 'masters' in the escape from the gladiator school.

Crassus, the owner of the gladiator school (Peter Ustinov) spend most of the scenes allotted for political intrigue, discussing the girths of their women and the succulence of their pigs.

Crassus is shown distributing important posts to incompetent aristocrats and making advances from his bath to a slave-boy are the best. When Spartacus and a Moor are set to fight to the death to 'amuse' Peter Ustinov's lady visitors, the Moor, who refuses to kill Spartacus, that his punishment will be death, is no liberal human- ist: he is a shifty-looking bundle of sinews apparently just wait- ing to slaughter anyone. In the same way the romantic determinism of Crassus to maintain the glory of his mother-city Rome, despite the Freudian implications, for which the director is celebrated, is so compellingly drawn that one cannot deny Kubrick's sensitivity to the real- ities of ideological conflict. The escape from the gladiator school, when in one rhythmical movement the slaves climb over the falling railings and charge forward wielding them as a ram of spearheads, is only paralleled by the 'Spartacus' cinematography. The shots of the flaming logs rolling towards the Roman legions. This modern legend of Spartacus too is an inspiring one.

WITH each successive stage in the development of the Young Socialists' movement it becomes clearer that the failure of the organization is a complete contradiction to all that was promised by Morgan Phillips at the First Conference.

This development was very obvious at the first annual conference of the London and Middlessex Region held at Caxton Hall, 4th March. Of the 19 resolutions only Agenda 14 had been ruled out of order by the NEC, although they were only of an organisational character. Against violent opposition from paid officials the conference elected a Standing Orders Committee, which immediately set about re-organizing the Agenda—ruling back into order most of the 14 resolutions. The Regional Committee had already taken this course of action before the conference meeting, causing the paid officials to declare that the committee was unmanageable and that they dissociated themselves from it.

F. Underhill (the assistant national agent), who in addressing the meeting attacked the Young Socialists for constant fighting at all levels of the movement, and reminded them that it was the Annual Conference of the Labour Party which accepted the constitution of the YS, and called upon delegates to take responsibility for conferences. After a lengthy ovation from the floor he hastened to explain that he meant non-political decisions.

He was asked 'Will the Annual Conference of the YS be able to amend the YS constitution?' to which he replied, 'No but the National Committee elected at the conference can make representation to the NEC of the Labour Party to consider such amendments.'

Resolutions deploring the ban on political discussion in the Federations and Regions and the ban on the YS paper Keep Left were carried by overwhelming majorities. A resolution calling upon the Young Socialists to sink their 'denominational differences' and concentrate on fighting the Tories was heavily defeated.

It was apparent at the conference that there are three major forces at work in the London area—small, rather ineffective right-wing who are mainly concerned with table-tennis competitions, a larger left-wing trying to build a political movement, and the bureaucracy of the London Labour Party, who intensely dislike any but the most lukewarm attack on this left-wing influence.
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A Note on Neutrality

THE word neutrality is used frequently in left circles and expresses the general desire to break down the cold war blocs. Unfortunately all sorts of interpretations can be placed upon the word and at the moment a Left Labour Party with a socialist foreign policy cannot do justice to the reactionary view points can and are being smuggled in under the banner of neutrality.

Major-General Marshal Stubbs, chief chemical officer of the United States Army, told Congress earlier this year that it was technically feasible to launch a biological attack against a large country such as the United States. He said that ten carriers—planes or missile cars—carrying only five tons of dry biological agents could mount such an attack and they would not have to fly at tree-top levels but could fly at high altitudes and drop pods which would open at lower levels and disperse their contents. With ten carriers, employing a line attack, General Stubbs estimated that a potential enemy would obtain at least 50 per cent casualties in the United States. (Guardian, 10th September.)

To some minds it practically becomes neutrality to support the existing status quo. Kennedy and the SEATO team use the language in wanting Laos to be an independent neutral state. But, as Things are, it is apparent that American imperialism has taken a beating in Laos and the imperialists desperately want a breather.

Similarly it is frequently to the purpose of the Soviet bureaucracy to restrain any revolutionary tendency. This is why it is not so easy to go to the top levels and drop pods which will open at lower levels and disperse their contents. With ten carriers, employing a line attack, General Stubbs estimated that a potential enemy would obtain at least 50 per cent casualties in the United States. (Guardian, 10th September.)

WHAT WE WANT FOR

MAY DAY—cont.
conference months. The astonishing victory of Mrs Anne Kerr in Putney, who topped the poll while all the Labour Party candidates went down to defeat, is a small but important portent of what a radicalised Labour Party, courageously led, could accomplish.

The Labour Party remains the leading party in the struggle for Socialism through International. If Gaitskellism can be beaten back at Blackpool, if clear decisions are taken in June in the Movement and its Party, there must be no hesitation this summer. There must be no half measures, no tampering with the great task in our people in public meetings up and down the land, and preparing for the TUC and the Party Conference.

All out on May Day. All out against the Tories, against their agents in our Party. Throughout the social-democratic and Communist movements, a new ferment is arising. Johann Most is dead and buried, but his ideas are moving on.

SOCIALLY REVIEW

AFRICA—cont.
These goods were bought by Britain while only 10,000 lbs of selected qualities were sold to Northern Rhodesia.

Wine is an example where the British market is almost indisputably out. Since 1961 South African wine enjoys an average preference of 10 ba on, per gallon. In 1955, about half of the wine exported was sent to Britain and valued at £1,256,000. South Africa has historical memories of how the Dutch merchants in the town of Gladesville abolished the preference of colonial wines. At that time cordial interest of 700,000 gal.

UNDERMINE

The idea of neutrality being a preservation of the status quo is not socialist and should be combated. The social revolution in Africa, South America and Asia, will not be stopped by "neutralising" it.
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The idea of neutrality being a preservation of the status quo is not socialist and should be combated. The social revolution in Africa, South America and Asia, will not be stopped by "neutralising" it.

Imports of South African goods into the United Kingdom actually rose: to £90.8 million compared with £89.1 million in the preceding twelve months and £91.1 million in 1959. In the first nine months of the year Britain is permitted to sell this to the country. The right of imports of South African goods into the United Kingdom is limited to this. The right of imports of South African goods into the United Kingdom is limited to this. The right of imports of South African goods into the United Kingdom is limited to this. The right of imports of South African goods into the United Kingdom is limited to this.