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

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

Only twice before—in 1926 and 1937—has there been a complete shut down of the capital city's bus services. Should this happen again a small section of the working class takes on the combined staffs will refuse to operate the trains—and some 10 million people will lose all their means of public transport.

Pressing close behind the busmen in the wage fight are half a million main line railwaymen whose claim for a living wage has been contemptuously and utterly rejected by a Tory sponsored and inspired "Tribunal."
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Should the railwaymen become involved in strike action, an immediate refusal on the part of dockers and road-haulage drivers to handle goods will be forthcoming. In fact, as the cards are now stacked, something approaching a miniature general strike, is clearly on the agenda of the day. In this fight the enemy stands clearly identified—it is not merely the two "Knights of the Round Table" (Sirs Brian Robertson and John Elliot) who are the figureheads of nationalized British Transport—but the Tory Government, standing four-square at the head of British capitalism.

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

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

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

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

H BOMB FRONT
NOW BLACK THE BOMB!
writes Raymond Challinor

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

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

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

Another encouraging sign was that four-fifths of the marchers were under 30, just the age group politicians accuse of being politically apathetic. But surely this march proves that apathy is manufactured by the politicians themselves. Youth are not prepared to take an active part in political parties because, being without microscopes, they find it difficult to detect the differences between the two major parties. They regard the parliamentary pageant game, where heat is generated over trivialities, as of little consequence to themselves or anybody else. But when an issue of life-and-death importance arises, it is youth that gives the lead. Their infectious enthusiasm, confidence and boisterous energy was in evidence throughout the march.

Public support

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

MAY DAY—MARCH FOR PEACE
BLACK THE BOMB! BLACK THE BASES!
The busmen go down, the railway fight is lost before it starts. If the workers in the nationalized transport services are beaten, then the moment of truth for their government is their lashing as surely as day follows night. The greatest service that the Liberal Government, which the London busman can render to the British people today is not to keep the buses running, but to bring the government down. This is the irrefutable truth that must penetrate every factory and office, every local organization, every working class area. Every single one of us has a personal and urgent responsibility to do:

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

IT IS NO ACCIDENT that the first working class section to take the brunt of the Tory offensive are the staffs of the nationalized transport services. The bus industry was held up to us as the shining beacon of socialist progress, as the harbingers of the socialist society, the first magnificent fruit of the first Labour Government. Nationalization was to put the capitalist in "Carey Street," instead it turned ex-owners into guarantors of boundholders and put them on "Easy Street" for the rest of their lives, the vainglorious perspective of the industry propped or founded. As for the employees, the "privatized land" opened up for them has proved the graveyard of their hopes: ten years of nationalization has made their long heirloom the worst paid section of industry—bar none—while the very men they toiled to save have witnessed their status descend from 1st to 4th position in the national wages scale. What precisely were these assets that were nationalized in 1948? What is the point of that "golden age" which was over at the same rate of exchange a dozen to one hundred million pounds—for the benefit of humanity and the greater glory of the Transport House board of "socialism."

The Daily Herald—then the official organ and mouthpiece of the Labour Party ponders—the British Railway Industry. It said:

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

There you have it. Here is the underlying reason and cause of the present plight of our railway system. And here also is the classic indication that we are in the hands of the Transport House "experts" who saddled this millennium around the necks of the British people—and called it "socialism."

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

In 1948 the British Railways were decrepit, decaying, and obsolete—and, as the "Herald" admits, couldn't be given away.

The last year before nationalization the British railways incurred a working loss of 150 million. Railway stock was worth as much as Hitler's "marks."

Yet, this was the precise moment chosen by the master minds of Transport House to mortgage the future of the British people for 90 years to the fate of the 5,000,000 "owners" of this gigantic scrap-heap. Since 1948 something in the region of £500 million has already been doled out as interest to bondholders. Loan upon loan, the railway had to be raided more or less each year of it's existence to keep even this clanking skeleton wheezing its decrepit way around the country. And, ten years after this master stroke—the nationalized industry now runs a private enterprise skyrockets hundreds of millions of pounds MORE than on the day the industry was nationalized.

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

It is no coincidence, the story is by no means ended. Having paid the colossal sum of £500 million to them, the Transport House "experts" are now known that a like sum must be spent to bring it to a reasonable state of efficiency—and once again the money must be borrowed—at interest.

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

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

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

AT THE TIME OF WRITING, industrial struggles are looming larger than ever on the horizon. While the London Transport busmen are due to strike (see page 1), the 'tubemen' will not remain silent on that day.

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

(For the first time for many years the three railway unions are united in common endeavour: to be free of the "new-found unity," a new basis will be established for the future, leading to the eventual trans-union Transport and General Labor Union for all railwaymen.)

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

(1) Control of overtime.
(2) A rise in the guaranteed “back-fall” pay to £8 4s. 6d.

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

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

AFTER THE SHAMEFUL treatment of the Levine dispute by the AEU Executive (reported throughout in SIR) we hear of another strike, this time amongst the ship workers. Three hundred and twenty
men employed at the Yorkshire Engine Company struck work in support of Brother Bucklow the Convenor who was sacked for alleged abusive language. (Be threatened to "sort them out" after a junior progress clerk had allegedly accused him of "sloppiness"). Once again the AEU Executive refused to give official backing. Resolution No. 16, which had been sent back to work leaving the Convenor outside. Another one of the many who have been sold.

THE MARGARET CONFERENCE

of the Union of Shop, Dis-

dtributive and Allied Workers, con-

sidered the problem of Wage Restraint. labour restraint was opposed by the Execu-

tive and defeated by a single vote. However, one resolution, stating that the take-over of the economic and efficiency industries is not for those who are unemployable and incapable of participation in the success of the next Labour Govern-

ment was carried despite the platform.

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

should buy shares in leading air-

craft companies to "give them a voice in the firm's affairs." The resolution, from Brockworth branch, was carried.

By investing £750 or £1,000 the union could have a voice in the affairs of the five leading companies in the aircraft industry con-
trolling 50 percent of the indus-

try. By sending a nominee to annual general meetings they would have a say in the price and wage and incompetence in it. Surely, by the honey pot combat waste and incompetence is for the next Labour Govern-

ment to nationalize the aircraft industry under workers' control.

GROWING PROBLEM

affecting workers in many indus-

tries is that of colour and for-

eign workers. 'The April 12 issue of The Newsletter featured an article dealing with the subject. It was an account of a discussion at a Labour Party Ward meet-

ing, at the end of which a charter for immigrant workers was drawn up. Here is part of it.

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

2) Immigrant workers shall be on the same fringe list as British born workers, on the same system of payment. Rents of flats, hotels, etc. shall be strictly controlled by a Labour Govern-

ment. The public ownership of these premises an early target. No guarantees of preference for foreign workers to be formed.

Such a charter can go a long way to solving our "problems" and creating the unity needed to fight against common enemy, the em-

ployers, their agents and their Tory Government.

DIRECT ACTION MARCH

on SR Industrial report

The struggle against the Bomb, the Bases and war is sort-...

out. After the Labour Party de-

monstration at Trafalgar Square on Sunday, April 13, had fizzle-

out with Bevan asking for "three cheers for a Labour victory" and getting just one. From the 12,000 people assem-

bled, a column formed to march to Hurlford Road, calling for industrial action against the Bomb, the Bases and war. For the very first time London heard a demonstration—some 400 strong—chanting "Stop work on rocket bases. Stop work on H-Bomb. Or 'Black the Bombs! Black the Bases!' Beyond Aldermaston Something had happened between Aldermaston and Trafal-

gar Square, between the "leaders" speaking from the platform, who continue to drone about the war, and the banner lines—
as if the safest thing in the world is to mortgage our future with a dollar-ocracy and the Russian bureaucrats—but to the audience. The audience had learned that Aldermanst was not enough, that we have to go beyond—into the factories and building sites. No more "the leaders" and the Socialist Review and the News-

letter attracted attention. No workers, no leaders willing to march under these banners, to shout their slogans, to gather in Hyde Park and listen to suppor-

ters of these two socialist jour-

nals explain how war and its ular

should be forestalled to lend an industrial campaign against the Bomb and war. This was the way to show who stood where, to show who could be re-

lied on in the struggle against war and capitalism, in the fight for a new society-socialism.

ASSET: A new plan for what?

asks Eric S. Heffer

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

swers.

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

His main contention is that the wage structure should be related to the annual wage increases in a green industry. He suggests that in the "growth sec-

tors of the national industries" we might all try the ASSET plan. This envisages an agreement between the BEA and BEA for 3 to 5 years for annual wage increases of 5 percent or the in-

crease in productivity, whichever is the least.

Little to say

What are the objections to a scheme which, on the surface, ap-

pears to put more into the poc-

kets of the workers?

My primary reservation is this. The proposals are purely section-

al; they must lead to certain key unions getting all the plums, thereby creating a labour elite, whilst the mass of the workers may not share the benefits gained.

Secondly, such a scheme could only apply to a small number of industries. It will aim at an actual amount of a definite annual increase in productivity. Can anyone point to such an increase under capitalism with any surety? What about recessions (and how can these be avoided under capital-

ism?) when the productivity of an entire industry may well drop notwithstanding an increase in individual productivity due to the added spur of unemployment? Will those who are the production workers receive the benefits from, say, automation, and those who are not still scram-

ble in the dust?

Clive Jenkins' plan results from the need, on the part of some offi-

cials, for a quiet life. The rank and file have very little to say in such agreements, and are very much relegated to the back-

ground. In any case the idea of a net increase of 5 percent or less (supposing productivity rose by 20 percent) is an dangerous one.

A bureaucratic fashion

The cost of living could rocket (what then of the 5 percent) and production could remain static or actually decrease. Is it then sugges-

ted that because production did not increase, the industry would not be able to afford a wage rise to meet the increased cost of living?

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

RON LEWIS

• Labour and the Bomb

AT LAST the movement against the Bomb and for socialism is realistically underway. The success of the movement may be best assessed in terms of the Party-leadership's re-acceptance of Trafalgar Square and resorting to traditional socialist agita-
tional activity is a real measure of the suc-
cess of some element of the campaign.

Of course, the stand taking by the Lea-
dership in the Square cannot be regarded as sanction for the idea of a deal of opportunism motivated them and their allies to give up the trol the 'official movement' in the streets was reflected in the speech of Nye Bevan when he said 'the Labour Party was returning to traditional methods that the ranks should be closed, meaning that we should now cease our agitation to ban the bomb.'

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

We have come a long way since 1954 when the Party leaders foisted the obscenity of German re-armament upon us. We shall go a lot further if we are sensible in our criti-
cisms and if we establish an intelligent list of priorities in the matter of demands. We are not in a position that not a big organization monopoly in the shape of the Right-wing lead-
ership. Divisions and cracks are appear-
ing all over the place and providing that we are not too ultra in our demands and de-
monstrations we should be able to deal a death blow to reaction within the Labour Movement.

• Strachey's Scrap

JUST HOW FAR REMOVED the inner cases are not in my opinion and even suggests that because Gallup Polle have shown the British people to be in favour of the retention of the Hydrogen Bomb, the Movement must stand for its retention. If what the people 'think' at any one time is to be taken as what a Socialist Party should advocate we might as well spend all our evenings worshiping at the shrine of the idiot's eye and wait for the future.

But in addition to this, Strachey attempts to convince his readers that there is a differ-
ence between the Labour and Conservative Parties on nuclear arms policy. This he does by selective and tendentious quotations from the Daily Mail.

The significance of this work however, is that the fact has not received official bless-
ing from the NEC, a striking illustration of the changes which have taken place in the movement since Lord Leverhulme was King.

• County elections

AS I PROPOSED in the Review a month ago, the Party made important gains in the County Council Elections. No doubt many of the labour members is at an all time high level, and several important coun-
ties have been captured by Labour.

Without any effort to minimize the significance of this achievement (I have a strong personal reason for not wishing to go through that, which is not publicly held by us) it would be a mistake to assume that these results necessarily have any per-
manent significance for the future. Sir 1952, our

Secondly the Tory voter himself was very apathetic. A more lively Tory-party organization would have got more of the Tories to the polls.

It should be faced however, that there was a large degree of general apathy, and in the in which two thirds of the people did not vote, in spite of the fact that ever non-voting Labour voter was called on eight times during the day. Because we had, I think, a very much better than average Party organization, we got a 2% poll; almost a record in these parts (Surrey) for a County election, where the average this time was 3177.

The seat which I fought in 1952 and won, was not won this time, although there has been no change in the relative strength of the area. Indeed, the Labour vote was down 1300 (1700 constituency) on 1952, where the area not much worse than in 1952.

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

A councillor's job

But we managed to win power, in some places, and a substantial minority elsewhere and we must make the best use of it. Where we have power we should demonstrate to the workers that they have a strong personal stake in the control of the County, and we must take measures that have a real bearing on their lives. Where we are a minority, we must use the powers which we have (none of this sanctimonious rubbish about doing good work in committee!) A minority colour power, we must use it; if we don't, we must be seen to be doing good. And he must always bear in mind that his duty is to make everything secondry to that aim.

ELECTION NOTEBOOK

by Stan Reeves

IN THE TRIENNIAL County Council Elections which took place last month, Lab-
our gained control in four counties previously Conservative. In Whitley Wood—Car-
enshire, Essex, Lancashire and Middlesex. This brings the total number of County Councils controlled by Labour to ten and represents an important victory. In Mid-
dex in particular, where the Tories have been supreme since 1949, Labour has done well.

None of the less in many areas Party mem-
bers are disappointed with the results. In Staffordshire and the West Riding of York-
shire Labour hopes have not been realized to the full and in many individual seats re-
results have been disappointing.

The factors which determine Labour's suc-
cess in elections are of course manifold, but the three most important are Labour's re-
putation nationally, locally, and the state of the electoral organization.

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

It is noteworthy that only in areas where a genuine left wing in the Party exists nor-
ally is it possible to call upon a really keen band of workers. Where the ideas of compromise and capitalist reformism could sway there might as well spend all our evenings worshiping at the shrine of the idiot's eye and wait for the future.

The weakness and compromise of the national labour movement and Labour Party on the Hydrogen Bomb and nationalism have helped to destroy the enthusiasm of many Party members which the Brightons Con-
ference last October.

Further than this it is, of course, reflected in the lack of any party shown the working class at large. All too often can-
vassers are told that both sides are as bad. Nationally Labour has failed to win any sig-
ificant percentage of the floating voters or to make inroads on the all too large section
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POLICY FOR APPRENTICES

by Roger Coxen & John Phillips

Shoreditch and Finsbury YS

THE OPINION of any employer on the function of an apprentice is a measure of the value of his training. The time that young workers and apprentices are thoroughly and properly trained is not necessarily in any particular trade—that should come later—but to obtain confidence in choosing an occupation fitting to their character, and therefore enabling them to give the maximum benefit to society.

These two different basic attitudes show clearly, though that the young workers today have serious responsibilities. "It's no good," the approach of the present day employer has not changed since the Victorian era or beyond.

The problems

To put this in simple terms, let us put forward some criticisms of existing school-to-work and employer training practices.

Briefly and generally they are these:

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

Problem I cannot be solved under the present Education System. What we must have is compulsory state education up to the age of 16 years, which would allow for the young prospective worker to decide at a reasonable age (17 or 18) what type of industry he wants to enter.

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

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

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

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

First steps

Some advances have been made towards this, but only as far as the "shop floor" is concerned. To quote from the "Agreement between the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Union and the Engineering and Allied Employers’ National Confederation," September 1949:

Preliminary training should be arranged to give the boy an insight into engineering work as soon as is possible out in Engineering works and the reasons why the processes are carried out.

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

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

False security

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

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

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

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

The socialist program

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

Although rare, some Indentures, which are drawn up by employers only, prevent an apprentice from being sacked. If through some minor offence an apprentice should be sacked, as the mobile nature of the Union, no good legal advice offered by Unions is not available to him, thus giving him less security than that which the ordinary worker enjoys through not having such an agreement.

Higher wages can be obtained by Unions pressing for proper organization amongst young workers, or even more strongly to apprentices that low wages are not necessarily a part of being young.

What can be done now?

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

Many of these things will not be accomplished in our present system, and will only come to fight as for the Socialist Society, in all one day hope to live in.

Letterbox

We have a space problem. Unless readers get a move on and push up sales in Youth Sections, Apprentices Clubs, Colleges and Universities so that YS can cut loose from SR, we’ll continue to have a small output. Anyway, this issue can only find room for one-quarter of the material we received. We’ll keep our fingers crossed to publish it in the future. In the meantime, a short summary is in order.

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

Barry Mask, Secretary of the Leeds University Labour Society, has sent an article demanding that socialist youth unite for political action against the "bright blue peril of the 1950’s." A fitting response came with the news that a Combined Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament had been formed, and had already sent out its first Newsletter. Our correspondent in this case, Tony David Smith, editor of the NALSO Newsletter, also sent an article on a policy for youth, which fits neatly into our present series on the subject.

From Birmingham comes the news that a national conference open to student organizations and others is planned for May 10 under the heading of Nuclear Campaign Conference. We hear too that NALSO is planning a summer camp for September to which working, school and student youth are invited. The subjects will be of interest to all young people.

There is no space to deal with any of the many letters we have received, except to quote very briefly from Martin Carter, of Swindon.

Young people are rebels without a cause, so many people say. But there are no causes, but that there seems to little they can do about anything. Most young people are dissatisfied with "The Establishment," and this, unfortunately, includes the Labour Party at the moment.

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

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

Today, however, we have the survival of the human race to worry about. And if not enough to break the apathy and feeling of irrelevance, than without our education system is misleading youth more than we realized (and it certainly is prejudiced against the human race is not worth saving...
The way an organization fights is determined by its political and social nature. Its methods, politics, ideology and program are determined by the class interests it represents.

Ideologically, the FLN has relied on the chantist mystique of bourgeois nationalism, lumping together French workers and French colonialists as landlords and Arab landowners. The policy of the FLN is precisely the opposite of the common struggle of the French and Algerian working-class. It is the realisation of the "messalist" USTA who have left nothing untried to connect the Algerian revolution to the struggles of the French workers, and who have been assassinated for that reason (see SR, December, 1957).

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

Land to the peasants?
What about the absolutely necessary radical agrarian policy of dividing the land among the peasants? It is impossible for the FLN to seriously commit itself to such a policy since its supporters are the landlords and the large landowners who would be the hardest hit by a radical agrarian reform. It is the MNA that has always advocated such a reform, thereby earning the support of the peasants. It is the Stalinist-bred of the whole North African bourgeoisie. For lack of a political answer, the FLN has had to fall back on terror: the assassinations of the USTA leaders is only one of the better known instances.

In Algeria the contempt for the people and political poverty of the FLN has revealed itself in its arrogance of ambition which exposed the population to the full force of repression without the slightest benefit to the nationalist cause: thus the school and university strike, thus the FLN's attempt to smash the FLN city organization. In the partisan fighting, certain FLN units have ruthlessly used the civilian population for military purposes, without regard for consequences. Whenever such units have met with a population that was supporting the FLN, they have attacked them and tried to smash them.

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

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

THE BELLOUNIS CASE

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

Supporters of the FLN say that Bellounis is a traitor. If it were that simple, his case would not be as significant as it is. When Si Cherif, former FLN partisan commander, rallied to the French army with a small group of men a few months before Bellounis made his agreement, when Adjoul-Adjoul, another military leader of the FLN, surrendered to the French in early 1957 and called for the surrender of the partisans over radio-Algeria, they hardly paid any attention. They are ordinary traitors, and they raise no problems.

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

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

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

MASSACRE IN MELOUZA

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

It should not be forgotten that Melouza is in Bellounis' zone, and that there were not one but many massacres of that type. The inevitable result of this policy is to force large masses of people into an attitude of weariness and discouragement with the national movement, and to certain forms of collaboration with the French authorities - the position of Bellounis.

The lesson of Bellounis is one that concerns first and foremost the FLN and its friends: it means that their policy creates the danger of mass-collaboration with the French as a "lesser evil." What is the relation of Bellounis with the MNA? Bellounis' position is incompatible with that of the MNA, and he therefore had to leave the party when he made his agreement with the French. At the same time, the MNA has not publicly condemned Bellounis. Yet, the reason for the MNA's reluctance to condemn, is no doubt the recognition of the fact that the people of these zones have no resentment against and that, for them, collaboration with the FLN could be a worse fate than collaboration with the French. One can condemn an individual who tries to save his skin by deserting; when a whole region does it to avoid genocide, it becomes a different problem and must be approached in a different way.

MOULAY MERBAH

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

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

When the Asturian miners went on strike for the seven-hour day it was already obvious that impending events would mark a real break in the letargic comrade. When the Asturian comrades arrived with partial news about the situation, it was evident that an extraordinary force, we realized that these strikes were taking a definite political turn.

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

On the other hand, the number of arrests by the police estimated at about 500 and, according to one witness, shootings have also started. This order of march wants, is the slow deterioration of the present situation, not the end, and皮革 to all the end of the war through an active intervention of the working-class.

The position of the Stalinist leadership has determined that of its party comrades, factory politicians and intellectuals, the syndicalist and Trotskyist, the MNA: the workers, and the CNT-UC, the asturian campaign to infiltrate it. In short, the CP has betrayed the Asturian people in their struggle with their political foreign policy, while the so-called "Fourth International" is betraying the Asturian people in the international by its own small operarions in the French CP.

POWER FOR WHAT?

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

When a hydrogen bomb explodes, as it does, its potential radiation—nuclear energy contained in the nucleus of the atoms from which hydrogen is constructed—creates a tremendous explosion. Very high temperatures are generated.

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

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

But in Zeta, the newly designed apparatus at Harwell, the necessary high energy is supplied from a very large electric voltage. Because of the way it is constructed, there is no explosion. Exceedingly high temperatures—as high as the sun's—are reached, and they could be used to generate electric power.

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

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

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

DEREK HART
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Black the Bomb — ctd

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

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

But, by themselves, these demonstrations will not be enough. It is necessary to weld the movement of nuclear immigrants with the organized Labour Movement and the struggle for Socialism. The campaign will flounder to defeat.

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

The Socialist view

The socialist view, on the other hand is this: The prevention of capitalism and inexcusably bound up with that system. How to fight against war, you must fight against capitalism. An analysis of the economy of this country or the United States shows the most profitable sectors are those producing arms. With the growing danger of an American attack, the props that are keeping their wobbly economies standing is likely to be a Brixton, Enfield, Hass and other brewers to lead a campaign for temperance. It's just not in their interest.

Being opposed to socialist ideas, the Nuclear Disarmament Committee sought to confuse the protest, march to purely non-political and non-political limits. Speakers advocating trade union action were not allowed to express their views. The Socialist Review's and the Newsletter's "BLACK THE BOMB! But what do they say?" were discouraged. Indeed, an attempt was even made, at the behest of the Chief Marshal, to take our banner down by force. So much for pacifist consistency!

While the Socialist Review considers the decisive factor will be workers' action, we can see nothing against—in fact, everything in favour of—a broad movement, embracing many differing views, but all agreed on the urgent necessity of opposing the public to the danger, and need to oppose, nuclear warfare. As such, movement can only exist if there is respect and tolerance for the other person's point of view.

H BOMB • MASS LOBBY

Tuesday, 20th May 5—10 p.m
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PARLIAMENT Colour-bar

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

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

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

But the West Indians who pass through Victoria Station by the way to Brixton and the Harrow where the heirs of a tradition as old as capitalism itself. In time of expansion, industry always need to draw in more workers than those available around the factories, and so the vacuum is created into which such economic invalids as the people of depressed rural areas are sucked.

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

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

Most of us probably have some sturdy beggar in our ancestry. As time passed, the supply of other sources. The collapse of the Highland clans after Culloden and the 45's and the failure of the rural industries of Wessex and East Anglia, industries that had quite probably absorbed some of the vagrants of earlier years. Then there was the Irish potato famine and the decline of British farming when cheap American wheat flooded in after the 1880's.

Socialist attitude

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

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

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

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

MICHAEL MILLETT
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WHAT WE STAND FOR

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW stands for International Socialist Democracy. Only the mass mobilization of the workers' and farmers' mass political arena can lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

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

• The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the large and medium scale industries, with compensation payments based on a means test. Re-nationalisation of all nationalised industries without compensation.—The nationalised industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.

• Workers' control in all nationalised industries, i.e., a majority of workers' representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and receiving the average skilled wage or more.

• The inclusion of workers' representatives on the boards of all private firms employing more than 20 people and the right of workers' representatives to have free access to all documents.

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

• The establishment of a principle of work or full maintenance.

• The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, linked to a realistic cost-of-living index, the abolition of all personal taxes for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.

• The abolition of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities and the right to requisition private property.

• 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 for all irrespective of their country of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.

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

• The unification of an independent Ireland.

• The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas. The abrogation of all weapons of mass destruction.

• A Socialist foreign policy independent of both Washington and Moscow.