Labour must force the Tories to take their HANDS OFF AFRICA!

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

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

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

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

INSIDE

Nyasaland pages 4-5
Germans against the Bomb page 7
The Left in the ETU page 2

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

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

Policy for labour

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

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

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

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

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

Labour must use this as a bludgeon to beat the Tories out of office at home and come to power on a fighting Socialist policy which will enable the workers to begin the final battle against British Capitalism.
Industrial S C McHugh continues the discussion on THE LEFT IN THE ETU

As the title of these articles suggests, those members of the ETU who find themselves in the left have problems indeed. Having read the past two articles and as a member of the New Left, I feel that Frank Walters this becomes more apparent, although frankly I find it difficult to see what there is in Bro Nero's article to qualify his claim to be of the left. In fact one may be inclined to sense the CP apologist attitude in many of the points he makes.

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

Smallest Item

Bro Walters speaks of some of these articles as embarrassing, this is also true, who is embarrassed when one makes these criticisms of the Union leadership of course. Their method of combating this embarrassment is to send the appropriate official on to the job to break down militant action, even if the official is going against his or her sympathies the action, he must still undertake this task as he is under a direction of the Executive of the Union. The excuse offered by Bro Walters for the alteration of this rule (Unemployment Benefit) is identical to that of the leadership "guarantine concern over the finances of the Union but there is no way to see that part of the funds allocated for unemployment benefit to the best advantage of the membership as a whole." Any investigation into the financial aspect of this matter will show that unemployment pay is in the Union at the present time and for many years past is one of the smallest of expenditure, consequently the alteration made makes virtually no difference at all to the overall finances of the Union.

Steel Dividends

The "Financial Times" shows that 32 iron and steel companies in 1958 distributed £12 million in ordinary dividends. This compares with £1.05 million in 1957. This takes place at a time when the steel industry is working well below capacity. Many steel works are on shorter time or have unemployment paying. The steelworker is paying to have found some strength to support explanations in the steel industry.

When Bro Walters turns his attention to the aspects of leadership and change of leadership possible pressure on the membership's voting and—to Bro Walters—the terrifying possibilities of the left getting together of the left, he leaves us with no illusions as to his intentions. To pre-suppose any justification for the left's leaving us with no alternative but that of the CP or Catholic Action. The left has and will continue in a way of attempting to nullify or cancel any such activity.

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

Are we to accept the argument that the fundamental right for election is not being achieved by the left. It is not the left or any other which advances is the rank and file do not desire it? which is what Bro Walters suggests. Reasoning then that they are the only one who can achieve these things. If the membership can have this leadership or whatever it is then is he so concerned with who leads, why is he so worried about the possibility of the success of Catholic action? Those who find themselves in a position branches where criticism has been particularly strong and consistant, the treatment meted out by the leaders has been a very simple one: leave them in the cold. The majority regarding them as a small leper colony not to be contacted personally even when requested, very often ignoring correspondence or else leaving it around for so long that the matter is finally lost. It is an obvious fact that all criticism cannot be correct and only the arrogant and stupid could consider it otherwise, but all criticism must be answered and actions explained when requested. This is a sound principle that must be adhered to at all times, it is the failure to conform to this principle that has created so much friction within the organization and needless to say an incorrect approach is very often to industrial problems.

What then is the role of the left in the immediate future? As mentioned earlier "the getting together of the left." I used this wording deliberately for this reason. At the present time there are quite a number of Left wing political groups active within the ETU, many having various political differences with one another. This is a perfectly natural state of affairs within an organization such as ours. Unfortunately the situation as it is now only creates negative results, the political differences will not be solved for a very long time to come, therefore these groups must find common ground on which to get together. This can only be done at a moment in industrial affairs, the forming of a basic industrial policy within the framework of basic political aims, this can be turned into a practical possibility, in fact it has already begun.

This should not develop into an anti CP campaign with the aim of always opposing the CP on the balance of party (or elsewhere) this would merely negate any positive aim). Candidates must and will be put forward for elections, the main purpose at the moment, to create a platform for explaining and developing the program which will be drawn up mainly via liaison activity. In this way groups can maintain their identity and at the same time make a positive contribution towards the socialist development of our organization (ETU).

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

With regard to Bro Walters' concern over press campaigns, it is worth while noting that these campaigns have served a very useful purpose towards protecting the rights of the leadership within the Union. They have forced the press attacks in the way Bro Walters does, over stressing the effect on the membership.

Ballots

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

Solution

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

OUR FIGHT IS YOUR FIGHT

THIS WAS the inscription on a banner held behind the South of the Ring, by women & children, at the big-wings—the Provost, MP Malcolms, the chairman of the Trades Council and others—expressed complete solidarity with the miners, and made fighting speeches in an atmosphere which I have not experienced since the war. Wild en-
thusiasm greeted the more milit-
tant parts of the powerful speech made by Scottish miners’ leader. “The National Coal Board had better beware where it is travelling,” he warned. “If they think they can get away with ignoring this Union there is the threatened closure of 30 Scottish pits, my thoughts winged back to the days of the Humber. Thirty years ago, when public demonstration was the only weapon of that pit-firing army, unemployed miners such as a heartless Tory Government hopes to resuscitate. Stirlingshire is not yet listed as a depressed area; only 5 per cent of the in-
sured population of Falkirk, compared with 10 per cent of Lanarkshire industrial towns, are unemployed. But when that 5 per cent does not include the large number of householders, registered, the short-time workers and the men cast out at 65, then the picture becomes grim indeed. Our thanks, and the thanks of the whole working-class, should go to the miners, for once again they are taking up their tradi-
tional role as the shock troops of our movement.

At the mass meeting which followed, all the local Labour working-class in the orbit of the picketing miners’ action, reached in Britain, accepting cri-
criticism and answering it, associa-
ting itself with other left-wing movements, thereby bringing the British working-class move-
ment to a stage whereby Social-
ism can be achieved. I would suggest that primary moves in this direction would automatically solve some of the problems of the left in the ETU.”

RUDENDANCY, the modern equivalent to the sack, is now a really serious threat to the working class. The Tory Government, the Eco-
nomic League, have put the present figure of unemployed at 600,000 odd. In the future it can be shown that a number of people in the Labour movement have hinted, that at least a million are draw-
ing the dole.

So far as the factory worker is concerned, he knows that such industries as machine tool, heavy engineering, aircraft and shipbuilding, are already in the throes of “laying off” workers and that all the signs are there of a serious slump in the motor car industry. One small hop for the engineering industry is a trade pact with the Eastern bloc. Russia, etc., but this is something for the future and subject always to the conditions under which capitalism is forced to trade with those countries. Compensation for the loss of livelihood, unless it maintains the workless and his family for the entire period he is without work.

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

In other words, the structure governing wages and conditions in each factory is placed on the table as a bargaining force against a certain number of workers being sacked. To my mind the dangers of such a policy are considerable. Once we give such a policy the oppor-
tunity to cut one established rate, to downgrade one worker, then I know, from past experience, the whole structure goes in the melting pot. The price we would pay if we adopted this policy would be the death of the trade union organisation. Finally we come down to an old principle which was adopted many years before I was born, namely, “first in last out.”

I have had some experience of this principle and being faced with a reduction in our work-
shop, I moved, “first in last out.” It may have been that as I was the last in that in the motion was carried. I don’t know. All I do know is that this is the only way I can see to resolve the problem of sackings on a local factory basis. At least this ensures that the boss is the first to have the decision made by him. The trade unions Whilst we are facing redund-
ancy in our particular factories, we should not altogether forget the future and the need to obtain a really national policy against sackings. Whilst it may seem fruitless to send resolutions to the EC, we should still keep up the pressure. Also, we can call upon local branches of the unions to meet collectively and discuss local problems of redund-
ancy on a wider scale.

BEAT REDUNDANCY NOW!

says Karl Dunbar,

Rileson AEU

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

It is well known that some unions in the Confederation are pursuing a policy of compensation for discharged workers.

There has been quite a consider-
able amount of controversy over exactly how large this compensa-
tion should be. Personally no amount of money can compen-
sate for the loss of livelihood, unless it maintains the workless and his family for the entire period he is without work.

We must of necessity be con-
cerned with the present state of affairs, facing as we are an ever-

growing army of unemployed and a boss class becoming ever more and more reductionist, a towards an organised labour, ever more ready to attack the rates and conditions won by the organized workers, as many years of bitter, relentless struggle. It is with this in mind that I bluntly condemn the attitude taken by the engin-
eering employers on the issue of “work or full maintenance.”

Socialist Review expresses its sorrow and consolation to all those who know and worked with Wally Jones, the Dock’s leader, whose tragic death recent weeks.

Wally Jones was a workers’ leader who knew how to talk and bargain hard with the bosses, and his loss will be a hard blow for the workers.

As a man who devoted his life to principles and to bet-
tering the conditions of his comrades, his death deserves the fullest obituary of the Labour Movement.
I SOME FACTS and Figures

- Companies and MEN

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

The mineral rights are largely owned by the giant British South Africa Company — known as "Chartered" to the initiated — it was set up by royal charter and once governed the whole of Southern and Northern Rhodesia. In the early 20th it relinquished the administration of both these territories; in 1933 the Southern Rhodesian Government bought the company's mineral rights in its territory for £2 million; the company’s assets now consist of (a) mining rights throughout Southern Rhodesia, subject to payment to the Northern Rhodesian Government of 20 percent of any revenue derived from exercise of their rights in the territory; (b) mineral in the river 16,000 square miles in Nyasaland, (c) half interest until April 1st, 1964, in net proceeds from any coal exploration carried out by Government in North-West Rhodesia, (d) 134,000 acres of citrus and other estates in the State of New South Wales, Australia, (e) 99 per cent of shares of Rhodesia Railways Trust. Royalties in the year ending Sept. 30th, 1958, totalled £6,120,829; consolidated profit £7,719,197; dividends paid out £2,266,780.

Classes

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

President of the British South Africa Co. is Lord Robins (formerly Col. Robins, but elevated to the Lords only last year). In a letter to The Times on March 5, 1959, he said:

"The predominance of the white man—everyone who represents the interests of the white race, from the settler to the settler's wife, from the miner to the miner's wife, from the farmer to the farmer's wife—is concentrated at least for another generation. Different classes and different interests in this White African are not forced to meet socially or to frequent the same clubs, etc., or even other houses; why should it be so in mining?" (Botha, African, just because he washes, speaks English, and wears European dress, must necessarily be accepted in the society of white men of the top grade)

Lord Robins is also on Africa Explosive and Chemical Industries, De Beers Consolidated Mines, etc. Seventy-five years old, he was Literary Secretary of the Anti-Socialist Union of Great Britain 1909-14.

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

- Wages

WAGES IN NYASALAND

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

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

- Town and Country

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

1. Blantyre/Limbe township, 2s. 6d. per day; (2) Zomba and Lilongwe townships, 1s. 9d. per day; (3) Salima township, 1s. 4d. per day. (Colonial Office Report, Nyasaland, 1957).

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

- SOCIAL OCCASION

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

Lord Twining's full title is "Baron Twining of Tanganyika and of Godalming in the County of Surrey." Governor and Com- mander in Chief of Tanganyika, 1949-58. Viscount Malvern (the Godfrey Huggins) is "of Rhodes- sia and of Bexley." Born in 1958; Prime Minister S. Rhodes- sia 1933-53, of South Africa Co. In a non-executive capacity. He is also on the local board of the Standard Bank of South Africa and on the Merchant Bank of Central Africa.

Lord Malvern, in a speech to the Institute of Mining and Metallurgy at Exeter on May 11, 1957, referred to outside trouble- makers who increased the diffi- culties of the Federation by their interference. People in Britain seemed to have given up their sense of spiritual values, he said. "They have become idolators worshipping the idol of a universal vote." He gave warning of the danger of paying too high a price for dominion status, for in- stance by designing the franchise law to please the United King- dom. "It would be a complete sell-out because you know the sort of thing that would satisfy them."

- IN THE PAST

A LOOK BACK. "The admis- sion even to the inner financial circle of a few members of the British aristocracy, attracted by the sheer spirit of adventure, was valuable, not only for the vulgar purpose of prospectuses, but for the slower and more deli- cate work of constructing political and 'social' supports for the Rhodesian buds. But this was 30 and more years ago — John A. Hobson's The Evolution of Modern Capitalist Agriculture. (1887)." A text, is illustrated from South Africa. The great propped up "enterprise in South and Central Africa are the de Beers combine (Oppenheimer), the copper companies (with Mr Prain) and Tangany- ika Congestion—Union Miniere (Belgian Congo) tie-up. This has Charles Waterhouse, ex-Tory MP in the Tanganyika government. Reprinted by kind permission of LRD Publications Ltd. from LRD Fact Service, March 7, 1959.
2 WELENSKY'S RACIAL DICTATORSHIP by John Rex

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

The revolution began in 1950 when Huggins persuaded Jim Griffiths to accept a "basis foolish enough to believe that before criticising the young men who have taken up arms against John Bull, I should, first of all, examine the political sins which gave rise to their movement.

To begin with, England invaded Ireland, butchered anybody who opposed the Anglo-Irish Papal Treaty in ways which caused the next forty years to be followed by a relentless process of repression designed deliberately tostamp out the remnants of Irish life and culture peculiar to the Irish people. Not a single decade went by in which Irishmen asserted in blood their ancient, inalienable right to independence and self determination. This struggle, beclouded by the character of the leaders, was in the end conveyed to the Irish population who were nowhere in the founding of the great British Chartist movement, and won the worthy support of the great Socialist James Connolly, who thought the idea and ideal worth giving his life for in 1916.

After Connolly, no less a person than the Socialist Liam Mellows elected to face the firing squad, nor was he the last Socialist to swear allegiance to "The petty bourgeois terrorist IRA." National Independence

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

For discussion "that the notion of "partnership" should replace the notion of "trusteeship" as the basis of British policy in the African territories. Perhaps "trusteeship" never meant much in practice, but its meaning was clear in the Devonshire declaration of 1923 which spoke of "encouraging the developing..." the role of the British Government was "unable to delegate or share this trust the object of which might be defined as the protection and occupation. Neither British nor American! I'd sooner accept their word than that of the Northern Irish Socialist" like Mr Barr who don't even think the partition of Ireland worthy of mention. (See Mr Barr's election manifesto for the last General election! Now Mr Harris, I am not a member of the IRA and indeed I have never been a member of any Irish organisation, but I have in my mind followed the developments in Ireland." Now Mr Harris has a "fancy franchise" scheme to ensure that an even greater proportion of the African representatives would be chosen by the Europeans. At the last election there were less than 750 African voters in the Federation.

Organising

A concentration of power like this in the hands of the White minority (about 250,000) with a population of 7,000,000 in the Nyasaland Protectorate reflects the sort of economic class structure of Rhodesia where all the best lands, the industry and marketing facilities are in the hands of Europeans. And they proposed to use their political position in every possible way to exploit the African proletariat. The majority of the Irish people Mr Harris believes (I wonder, does he?) that the passing of resolutions which get good press in the North of Ireland is a bad thing. What rubbish! What utter stuff and nonsense! And you an Oxfordian! This was really surprised at you Noel. Isn't it quite obvious to a man with even half a head that British Imperialism would have ridden roughshod (completely) without the watchful "resolutions" of the Labour movement in Cyprus, Malaya, Kenya, Nyasaland, . . . Or maybe an Oxfordian is good for them and bad for Ireland? More power to the workers who will put forward resolutions in defence of the oppressed, and more fool the capitalist who will publicise their passing—he'll be well advised to read Charlie Marx, or even listen to the frothing of Roy (Rogers) Welensky.

The partition of Ireland is wrong! The occupation of any part of Ireland by a foreign army is wrong! The idea of "Socialism" is a false, dangerous argument and one only designed by the Trotskyist to support the White Workers' Republic. The only truly progressivist for us can be Unity AND Socialism, not to hell out of here John Bull and let us clear up the mess ourselves.

withdraw

Finally the arrogance of the federal government has been shown by its action in deporting John Stonehouse who was investigating the situation of the miners. To use a piece of effrontery the Tory Government simply capitulated. Everyone now understands that a Parliamentary Commission should visit Nyasaland. This demand must be backed in every possible way. But there are even more important things...
A Merseyside Amendment urging that more work be undertaken to win Trade Unionists, and unorganized workers, to the cause of TGU was accepted by both Conference and GC. Eric Heffer, speaking for Merseyside, made the valid point that if the Labour Party was to be won then the TGU had got to be strengthened sufficiently. What 75 per cent of the Labour Party Constituency Parties were already supporting the basic aim of the Campaign. It was felt by the Conference that the Labour Advisory Committee had been too reticent in its work and by 126 votes to 121 a resolution by Oxford University group was carried that the committee should be strengthened by the inclusion in it of two delegates to be either TGU or LJP members. It was after this that the debate took place on the

question of the “Voters’ veto.” Pat Arrowsmith, who so splendidly told the campaign is un queuesioned, made a speech of high emotional quality, stating that this is the overriding issue of all time. Speakers were so numerous that at one time they lined the walls, and had to be urged to resume their seats. The EC speaker, AJP

JOHN REX — end

do. Labour must demand the withdrawal of Southern Rhodesian troops immediately, even if it means sending in British troops to ensure compliance. It must demand the immediate release of the Congress leaders from jail in Natal, and the transfer to the UN. The Congress is the fundamental change in the various territories so that the overwhelming desire of the people of South Africa may be officially and publicized.

The Labour Conference should say quite unequivocally that it is on the same side as the African Congress in its struggle for freedom. It is possible to envisage the relationship of the MIP’s still table nonsense about “partnership” as the policy of the government. The industry and agrarian changes is against a vicious racial revolution, which if it is successful will lead to the destruction of slavery as makes no difference. They will have no protection in this fight from the Tory ruling class in Britain. Everything depends on how the British Labour Movement acts.

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

Details

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

Labour’s task

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

THE USES OF THE TV

by Chris Barker

“New Fields for Television” was the heading of a feature article in The Times of February 27, and the writer used it to set out various arguments in which television could be used to assist widespread imperial domination of under-developed territories. Of course he didn’t say this in so many words, but here are one or two suggested uses which he found:

a. “The prospect of a set is an incentive to work hard and save.”

b. “A government can use its time for propaganda... or it can rely on the commercial peak hours to dump down the fires of unwelcome agitation, and encourage the traditional unit of family life.”

c. “It can be regarded as a means of spreading western values, as well as a conquest for the brush enterprise of commercial television.”

For sheer contemptuous arrogance it would be hard to beat.
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SINCE 1945 all anti-war organizations of outstanding pacifists have warned of the dangers of an atomic war, pointing to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In Western Germany, however, the hope and the fear of war, the hope of achieving the resulting consequences of the Atomic bombs on Japan, and of the Bikini tests, but they have alloyed their fears of the war by thinking of the differences between them and these places, and have devoted themselves to the pursuit of the "economic miracle." The US Information Agency has organized large-scale exhibitions in many German towns, which demonstrate the peaceful developments of nuclear physics. The US Subcomission on the Dangers of the Atomic Age reported: "...the present and potential effects of the slow increase of radioactivity in the atmosphere are without precedents in history." A highly subsidized press in America went so far as to point out that the dial of luminous watches represent a greater danger than all the German tests which have taken place to date. The world was also allowed to hear the self-satisfied claims of the American press. Every country has succeeded in inventing a "clean" bomb. And everywhere the propaganda went on for the creation of a Clean Bomb in the Service against nuclear war. The German Federal Post even applied a date-stamp to frank envelopes with the inscription "Air Defence in the Nuclear Age." The well-fed German citizen may enjoy the well-tended and restful sleep—did not the government give him all the necessary safety of assurance? Were not his slogans for the 1957 election campaign "No Experience with Nuclear Dangers"? And so the American weapons were given the full support of the Federal Republic of Germany. They were passionate discussions in Parliament. On March 25, 1958, however, the government obtained a majority of 72, and atomic re-armament became an accomplished fact. The German Social Democratic Party declared that the government had "betrayed" the cause of disarmament and that the authorization to make a decision of such fateful consequence. They declared they would continue their struggle against atomic re-armament outside Parliament. It seemed as if West Germany had become an ally of the United States, and long and sharp debates were broadcast, causing a sudden awakening from the "economic miracle." This propaganda was broadcast, and the public was informed that 83 cent per the population disagreed with atomic re-armament. Hiroshima, Nagasaki and the Bikini atoll struck suddenly very near: anybody with a modicum of imagination realized what the consequences of nuclear war on the territories of the Federal Republic and the DDR would be. In every town there was the threat of varying political colours demonstrated against the atomic danger. The Social Democratic Party started committees of "Campaign Against Nuclear Death." New organizations sprung up everywhere. The appeal issued in March, 1958, by the Christian Democrats, calling on nuclear scientists to demand a voluntary renunciation of atomic weapons, found a ready response among the people, who had at last become aware of the danger. A few days later, in Hamburg, more than 150,000 men and women staged a demonstration in front of the Town Hall in protest against nuclear re-armament. The demonstrators called upon the Social Democratic Party and the Trade Unions to organize a general boycott against the atomic plans of the Government. No one seemed more surprised at the response to their slogan "Campaign Against Nuclear Death," than the Social Democratic Party and Trade Union leaders themselves. The Trades Union Congress was just at that time convening in Hamburg, and both they and the SPD leadership dissociated themselves from this clamour, which lacked respectability, and, instead, suggested that a plebiscite be demanded which would show the Government that the majority of the German people opposed nuclear re-armament. "Counter — offensive" Thus they abandoned their unique chance to force Adenauer's resignation through a campaign of civil disobedience, but many people, aware of the individual's responsibility for the developments did not know what to think of the ambiguous attitude of the Social Democratic Party and Trades Union Congress and began to organize isolated sections, such as the "wild" protest strikes in several large industrial concerns. In many towns, such as Hamburg, Berlin, Cologne and Munich, they organized "Nuclear Warning Committees." Day and night, students and others guarded huge posters "Against Nuclear Death," giving the people the example of civil resistance. Nationwide, appeals of Dr. Schweitzer, broadcast by Oslo radio and transmitted by the German stations, also made a strong impact everywhere. The Social Democratic Party was unable to make better use of the opportunity to place a Bill for the disarmament of the federal states, aiming at a plebiscite. This Bill became law in those states where the SPD has a majority—In Bremen, Hamburg and Hesse. In the meantime, however, the Federal Government had already taken the first step of the war, and went into counter-offensive. They published giant posters calling for a "Campaign Against Atomic Death in the Whole World." This phase of impudence served to direct the unpopularity of nuclear war into a channel more convenient for the Government. To prevent the plebiscite in preparation in the three states already mentioned, the Government obtained an injunction from the Supreme Constitutional Court. In Munich and Berlin organized attacks took place against the "Warning Pickets." A counter-picket was planned, but did not materialize since the pro-atom fighters could not man even this last try. The Bavarian police made a search of the HQ of the organization against nuclear re-armament, and arrested several of their most active sympathizers. Finally, the Government proceeded against the Warning Pickets in many towns for "obstruction of traffic" and forbade the erection of posters, since "there was no verifiable need or interest in such posters." Before the plebiscite was prohibited altogether, the irritation of the populace was vented once more. On 1st May, 1958, the slogans of the Trade Unions for "Social Justice and a 48-hour Week"—was completely ignored and the May Day demonstrators carried almost exclusively signs denouncing the government and demanding a complete boycott against nuclear re-armament. Popular participation was stronger than ever before but, in the meantime, the anti-war song was already time for the being of a vigorous movement. The plebiscite was prohibited following Dr. Adenauer's announcement that the "West German democracy was "representative" and not "plebsistic." The ruling of the Supreme Court was accepted by the opposition and the majority of the population. The General Strike did not take place, since it appears that in Germany an efficient civic council exists except with the explicit permission of the Government. In the 1958 elections in Schleswig-Holstein and Nordrhein-Westfalen the Social Democratic Party tried to make capital of the popular rejection of nuclear re-armament. It seems that the well-nourished Federal citizen is more concerned with the full shop-windows than with radioactive health of his children. When confronted with the alternatives "Fight Against Nuclear Death" or "Wealth for All," he chose wealth, in accordance with the ancient concept: "After me, the deluge." The Social Democratic Party drew their conclusions of the elections, and with the new laws allowed the slow disintegration of their anti-nuclear re-armament committees. More than that, they issued an appeal to their members asking them to volunteer for the new Federal Army! What are we to think of the Social Democratic position? It seems that their purpose is to appear as if the ability to turn somersaults is unlimited, as we can well see from the obscure history of that Party. What happens in the mind of a party member who, having just carried an anti-nuclear war poster at the May Day demonstration, then voluntarily joins the Army, to receive instruction in the use of atomic weapons? Are they all disillusioned who once dreamed that they would win the war, and especially nuclear war, by painstaking work in the Party? The promising Campaign Against Nuclear Death ended in defeat because the mass of the population, abandoned by its political and trades union leaders, was not ready to face the consequences. All that remain now in West Germany are small groups and single individuals (together with a small section of the political party and the permanent Anti-Nuclear Congress in Gelsenkirchen) to continue the struggle with their resources reduced. It must be the conscience of the people, who continue the campaign against nuclear pollution of the globe, and who try to frustrate those who, in their powerlessness, may one day press the button that would seal the doom of humanity.
A YEAR has passed, and for a second time many of us are expressing our protest against the Government H-bomb policy by the Aldermaston march. We may not only as opponents against H-bomb war, but also as opponents who see reason to carry on the protest this way for a second time. The march itself signifies the continuance of the struggle, a repetition of the previous year.

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

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

Towards the mass movement

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

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

Peace means socialism

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

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

Report of the first annual conference of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament by a delegate

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

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

Develop resistance

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

See page 6