

# The Week

- WORKERS' CONTROL
- VIETNAM CAMPAIGN
- PRICES AND INCOMES
- COAL INDUSTRIES' CUTS
- TORIES LIKE LABOUR'S  
HOUSING POLICY

## CASTRO ON ALGIERS

4108  
6D W



Subscription rates: 13 weeks 10/-  
26 weeks £1  
1 year £2

Vol. 4. No. 1. July 8th, 1965

Students 25% discount.

CONTENTS

Page	1	Editorial.
"	2	T.G.W.U. conference.
"	3	Coal cuts.
"	4	Vietnam campaign.
"	5	Housing debate.
"	6	South African trade.
"	7	Big business concentration.
"	8	End of the Commonwealth.
"	9	U.S. investments in Malaya.
"	10	The Algerian coup d'etat.
"	11	Castro on Algeria.
"	12	The Scarborough Labour Party.

UNIONS VERSUS THE GOVERNMENT

Three major union conferences are taking place this week. At each of the conferences the Government is under fire: Mr. Brown's incomes policy was mercilessly thrown out at the T.G.W.U. conference; and at the N.U.M and N.U.R. conferences the failure of Mr. Wilson's team to carry out their promises was forcibly pointed out. Thus we see very soon and very clearly, the fruits of the non-socialist policy being pursued by the Government: inevitably and independent of the will of all concerned the stage is set for large-scale conflict between the Labour Party administration and the unions. The lesson which the left wing has tried to point out over the years: that there is no middle way between a bold socialist policy directed against and eating into capitalist interests, and a right-wing, Tory-like policy has again been vindicated.

The job of the left wing, however, remains to translate their understanding of this problem into a policy which will win the majority of Labour supporters. Clearly, a principal component of this fight must be the creation of a national left wing of some dimension. In the constituencies we have the political understanding of such questions as Vietnam, in the unions we have the possible mass base for a national left wing. The wedding of these two forces, around a policy which will in the eyes of the mass of labour supporters be a real alternative to Mr. Wilson's, is the job of the day. The left in the C.L.P.s must take up every industrial issue as it comes up; the trade unionists must go into the C.L.P.s and provide the existing left with valuable reinforcement. Let the T.G.W.U. (and other unions) form itself into a national fraction fighting politically for its objectives and the whole balance of forces within the Labour Party would be changed.

"THE WEEK'S" SUMMER SCHEDULE: During the summer months of July and August it is extremely difficult to bring <sup>out</sup> a weekly journal which depends upon voluntary labour and news of the movement. We therefore intend to appear fortnightly during these two months, and replace the missing issues with four pamphlets of lasting value. However, should some urgent political question arise during the period we will produce action issues.



T.G.W.U. TO CAMPAIGN FOR STATE-RUN TRANSPORT from an industrial correspondent

Speaking at the biennial conference of the Transport and General Workers Union, Mr. Harry Nicholas, the union's acting general secretary, announced that the union is to pursue a campaign for an extension of public ownership or control of various transport industries - with Government co-ordination of them all. He said the T.G.W.U. would put forward a "major resolution" at the T.U.C. and Labour Party conferences outlining its plan for a "properly administered and co-ordinated" transport industry. He hinted at the contents of this resolution when he said the country must have a new authority, broader in scale than the former British Transport Commission, which would co-ordinate transport in general. This would be coupled with regional administration "to deal with the complex problems that exist in the various geographical regions."

He called for an extension of public ownership in the company-owned section of the bus industry, and criticised the "crazy-paving" of publicly owned rail and bus undertakings alongside partially-owned and private bus concerns. This led, he added, to a low level of service with low wages for far too many busmen. In co-ordinating road and rail services, the executive body would take road haulage into account. Mr. Nicholas said: "Since 80% of the freight of this country goes by road, it has got to be understood that we cannot approach the future problems we have got to face with a rail complex. We believe that rail can be adapted to the situation, providing there is an extension of public ownership in the field of road haulage as well. He said that British Road Services should be not merely permitted to buy up private road haulage concerns, but that it should be instructed by the Government to pursue a vigorous programme of expansion, with enabling legislation where this was necessary.

GOVERNMENT MUST CARRY OUT PROMISES - N.U.R CHIEF by a special correspondent

In his presidential address to the National Union of Railwaymen's annual meeting on July 5th, Mr. Frank Donlon, the union's president, warned the Government that the union was looking for "early action on the transport situation" as pledged at the General Election. He claimed that the Government was not proceeding towards the implementation of its promise for a state-owned, fully integrated transport system.

He also gave some figures on the extent of redundancy in the industry: since last year many thousands of members had been sacked (Mr. Donlon is one of the latest), making a total of 100,000 in the past three years and 225,000 since 1949. If the present policies continued, ten of thousands more railwaymen would lose their jobs in the next five years.

Among the other questions dealt with by Mr. Donlon was the failure of British Railways Board to consult the unions over new schemes. Despite pay increases, the introduction of the latest technological equipment under the modernisation plans had adversely affected members' earnings and conditions of work. "This deplorable state of affairs arises because the management are now tending to introduce schemes before negotiations with the union on wages and conditions have been completed," he added.

The right wing scored two voting victories: attempts to get the union to support unilateralism, and to criticise the appointment of Mr. Sidney Greene to the Southern Electricity Board were both beaten.



Both sides of industry welcomed last week's announcement by the Minister of Power that the Government is to write-off £400million of the National Coal Board's debt to the Exchequer. In practical terms, this is estimated to save the Board some £32millions a year in debt charges. The figure was much higher than that which had been predicted, and M.P.s were clearly surprised when Mr. Lee made the announcement. However, the move is not so "generous" as it may appear at first sight. The N.C.B. incurred its huge £927million debt to the Exchequer largely as a result of capital expenditure to meet an estimated annual production of 240,000,000 tons of coal a year. This latter figure was arrived at under Government influence. Nor was the figure purely a "mistake"; the Tories wanted to lessen Britain's dependence on oil in the protracted conflict with Egypt which led to the Suez crisis. Since then the miners and the general public have been paying for this policy.

However, the unexpectedly high figure has led to suspicions that the Government hopes to induce the N.C.B. and the workers to drop the idea of a 200,000,000 tons a year target. Indeed, Mr. Lee's statement in the Commons spoke of some further contraction in the demand for coal. When interviewed by the B.B.C., just after the announcement, he spoke of the need to more rapidly concentrate the industry in the more profitable areas such as Yorkshire and the East Midlands. A Financial Times article written the next day speculated that the Government was adopting a new fuel policy. It said that in all probability less and less will be heard of the 200,000,000 tons target, and that the pace of closing down of unprofitable pits can be expected to accelerate.

All of this amounts to a severe danger that the Government is going to adopt, in its entirety, the Tory policy in relation to the coal industry. Nothing in Mr. Lee's statement indicated that there was any criterion in judging the industry other than profitability. Whilst the Government was ready, in the interests of taking the pressure off the N.C.B., to write off <sup>not</sup> taxpayers' money, the more important question of compensation payments was even mentioned. Even the argument about the relative cost of coal and oil for generating electricity is predetermined by these compensation payments. It is to be hoped that this week's conference of the National Union of Mineworkers will make it unmistakably clear that the miners will not accept Tory policies in their industry no matter who tries to introduce them.

#### NET LOSS OF 30,000 MINERS IN ONE YEAR

The Ministry of Labour Gazette gives each month details of manpower in the coal mining industry. The latest issue shows a net loss of 30,000 in past year: (comparing April this year with April last year)

Division	average number of workers	loss since March	loss since 1964
Northumberland & Durham	93,500	1,000	6,600
Yorks	105,900	600	5,100
North Western	37,200	300	1,800
East Midlands	82,800	500	3,800
West Midlands	34,400	500	3,300
South Western	70,100	100	200
Scotland	50,100	300	3,200
<u>Total (including small pits)</u>	<u>478,900</u>	<u>4,000</u>	<u>30,100</u>



Fenner Brockway asked me to pass these following plans on to you - they comprise all the information available at the moment about future activities:

### July

1. Delegations to report back to local organisations and arrange local press conferences.
2. Deputations to local authorities and every type of local organisation.
3. Broaden and expand local "Peace in Vietnam" Committees (now over 60)
4. Intensive local propaganda: meetings, marches, film shows, literature distribution, letters to press, etc.
5. Vietnam Sunday - Sunday, July 25. Public demonstrations in all large centres, including Trafalgar Square. Christian Action to arrange services in churches, including St. Paul's Cathedral.
6. The campaign will arrange discussions with representatives of Britain, the Commonwealth, America, North Vietnam, the National Liberation Front, Saigon, China, Russia and non-aligned nations.

### August

1. Preparations for the autumn campaign.
2. Vietnam Bank Holiday. Seaside demonstrations at Blackpool, Scarborough, Brighton, Great Yarmouth, Torquay, Porthcawl, Llandudno, Dunoon, etc.

### September

1. Intensify work on July pattern.
2. International Forum with representatives of American and European movements.
3. Regional delegate conferences representing every type of organisation, to be followed by a large national conference (Provisional date, 18th September).
4. Activity at political conferences, T.U.C. and church assemblies.

### October

1. Still further intensify work. October is likely to be the critical month.
2. Renew University activity.
3. Town and Gown teach-ins, extending the university teach-ins to general public.
4. Co-operation with Christian Action in a Preach-in, with leaders of all churches participating.
5. Another and bigger lobby if necessary.

### November

1. Mount pressure on an international level.
2. Exert influence for effective intervention by the Afro-Asian conference on November 5th.

N.B. The Week will publish details of these activities as when they become available. In the meantime we would urge all readers to ensure that local Labour Parties, trade union branches, etc., take action.



It is scarcely necessary to comment upon the new clause in the Rent Bill; one merely has to repeat what was said in the House of Commons to see why Frank Allaun was so disturbed when the details were announced. The following extracts make clear the general lines of the clause:

In moving, Mr. MacColl, Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Housing and Local Government, (Widnes, Labour) said: "... The new clause provided for a limit on the amount of increase of rent that could be charged by the landlord of 15% in any one year...At the first stage an order would be made affecting any area and rents would be frozen at the existing old controlled levels. At the second stage the landlord could apply to the rent officer and from the rent officer either he or the tenant could go to the rent assessment committee and the machinery would fix a fair rent within the meaning of Clause 22...Having got his fair rent, the landlord was limited by the clause in the amount he could claim from the tenant. He could not claim more than the fair rent. He could claim up to the fair rent provided that his claim did not provide an increase of more than 15% a year, and the next year he could charge another 15%....and go on until such time as he reached the fair rent...."

Mr. Julius Silverman (Birmingham, Aston, Labour) said the second of these clauses re-enacted most of the provisions of Section 11 of the 1957 Rent Act. Labour members had fought Section 11 at the time; he was alarmed that it should be restored....He did not like the idea of either de-control or recontrol by order or regulation. It would be administered humanely and at the proper time by the present Minister, but the legislation would leave an instrument in the hands of Mr. Crossmen's successors who might not be so humane. Mr. Frank Allaun (Salford, East, Labour) said this clause was a disastrous mistake. He feared that loopholes would be found in Clause 22... No one knew exactly what rents the tribunals would fix. In Tottenham there was a row of houses - of two up and two down - for which tenants were paying 28s. a week plus rates. One house had been affected by creeping de-control and the landlord charged 80s. a week plus rates. Suppose the tribunal reduced that figure to 60s. When it dealt with the controlled rents would it raise them from 28s. to 60s?

The most significant speech, however, was made by Mr. Brooke (Hampstead, Conservative) - scarcely a progressive on housing matters, one would think. He said that in general he welcomed the new clause and the Minister's approach. He had long thought in the light of experience that the original 1956 Rent Bill was slanted too much in the direction of complete de-control and not sufficiently in favour of raising controlled rents to a sensible level. This praise, coming from a leading Tory, is both disturbing and tends to confirm Messrs Silverman's and Allaun's worst fears. If a man like Henry Brooke is saying, in effect, that the present clause is better than the Tory Rent Act there must be something wrong somewhere!

#### NOTTINGHAM CITY LABOUR PARTY ADVOCATES BOYCOTT

At its last meeting the Executive Committee of the Nottingham City Labour Party decided to recommend all Labour supporters to boycott the forthcoming test match between the South Africans and a British cricket team, which is to be played at Trent Bridge, the local cricket ground. The Executive is also organising picketing of the match.



The latest issue of South Africa Report, a handout from the South African Embassy, is entirely devoted to British/South African trade. The facts and figures given are a powerful condemnation of the hypocrisy of British big business. To quote the preamble:

"...United Kingdom exports to South Africa have increased by 52% in the past two years. In 1964 the trade, in both directions, was worth £372.3 million (South West Africa included), with British exports showing a credit balance over imports of £82.2 million, her highest with any trading partner. Today only the United States and Australia import more from Britain than does South Africa..."

This journal contains so much material that it is difficult to decide what to reproduce. However, of immediate interest to the ordinary man in the street is its centre-piece, which gives details of Britain's import of South African food. The following table is based on the journal's figures:

		Proportion of Britain's total imports	
Commodity	Rank	%1964	%1964
Corned Beef	Third place after Argentina and Paraguay	7.5	11.0
Other tinned meats	Third place after Australia and Ireland	6.5	7.0
Eggs	Third place after Poland and Sweden	9.0	17.0
Tinned Pilchards	Virtually the sole supplier	99.0	99.0
Maize	Second place after the U.S.A.	22.0	24.0
Oranges	Second place after Israel	28.0	25.0
Grapefruit	First place	35.0	35.0
Lemons	Second place after Italy	19.0	21.0
Pineapples	The only major supplier	77.0	82.0
Apples	Second place after Australia	23.0	23.0
Grapes	First place	51.0	47.0
Pears	First place	41.0	32.0
Tinned Peaches	First place	62.0	59.0
Tinned Pears	Second place after Australia	25.0	27.0
Tinned Apricots	First place	72.0	62.0
Tinned Pineapples	First place	37.0	36.0
Pineapple & grape juice	First place	40.0	52.0
Tinned Green Beans	the only major supplier	72.0	80.0
Wine	Third place after Spain and France	12.0	11.0

Such massive imports of foodstuffs from South Africa raise many questions. It is inevitable that the Co-operatives must be handling a huge proportion. Last year moves to initiate a national boycott were defeated, this year, a proposal from the Nottingham Co-op Party that South African produce should be separately displayed was also defeated. The left must find the means to pursue this question locally and nationally.



## FANTASTIC CONCENTRATION OF BIG BUSINESS CONTROL by an economics correspondent

Nearly every capitalist country has legislation to prevent or limit monopoly. Just how unsuccessful (or perhaps, half-hearted?) these endeavours are is shown by the first complete survey of ownership and control of manufacturing industry made on a world scale. The study, carried out by the research department of the McGraw-Hill magazine, International Management, took 30 months to complete and covers 152 countries. The facts it reveals on a global scale are truly staggering: some 60 to 70 of all business activity is controlled by less than 2% of all the companies in the world. The major share of manufacturing and distribution is in the hands of only 20,637 companies.

The survey finds that in the United States, only 3,500 companies, representing 1% of the incorporated concerns, handle between 70 and 80% of the country's turnover. In all other countries apart from the United States and Canada, the survey shows that 1½% of the companies - some 17,137 - control a similar amount of business. Even within the top 2% of companies, there is tremendous concentration. The extent of centralised control by manufacturing corporations and their subsidiaries is emphasised by the fact that only 1,600 companies - outside of the U.S. and Canada - control 30% of the world's business. In the United States a mere 100 companies control 60% of the net capital assets of all the nation's manufacturing corporations.

There is a surprisingly similar degree of concentration in most of the advanced capitalist countries, with 1 to 2% of the companies controlling 60, 70 and even 80% of all business. In the United Kingdom 1,322 firms account for 75% of business, the figures for other countries are: Germany, 1,353; Japan, 1,125; France, 936; Italy, 693; Sweden, 281; Holland, 236 and Belgium 231 (in all cases controlling about 75%)

## SEPARATION OF OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL IN INDUSTRY by Tom Nicholls

If anyone still has any doubts on the question of separation of ownership and control under modern capitalism, the report of a recent Production Engineering Research Association conference on "Financial Management and Cost Control" (Engineering News, 17th June, 1965) should put them wise. Clearly, in the view of the main contributors to this conference for professional managers, the basic interest of the manager is still identical with the owner and the shareholder, no matter how remote they may be from the actual day-to-day running of industry.

"The measure of profitability of a business is the rate of interest on the capital employed in the business" said J.P. Wilson, President of the Institute of Cost and Works Accountants. If this statement seems too much of a truism, the aims of industry were put even more clearly by Professor A.J. Merrett, of Sheffield University's department of Applied Economics. "A company should compare what it has made for its investors over the last ten years with what rival companies have made for their investors," he said. "Often, this would show that the company had not been doing as well as its yearly reports had indicated." Could the aim of maximising profits be put more bluntly?



Just as Korea and the Congo marked the beginning of the end of the United Nations as an effective force in world politics, so Vietnam and Rhodesia spell the final break up of what was once the British Empire.

Since the end of World War II, British capitalism has tried desperately to save what it can from its imperialist investments. Forced to make political concessions to the tide of nationalism which swept the colonies, it attempted to bind the newly independent states with economic strings. The Commonwealth was presented to the world as an association of 'free and equal sovereign states,' but there is in fact little real equality. So far the largest proportion of British investments go to the older 'white' dominions, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. Rhodesia and even the expelled Republic of South Africa figure higher in the British capital investment list than Ghana, Kenya and Tanzania. Investments in the more highly developed dominions mean higher profits and quicker returns and that is all that capitalism is fundamentally interested in. Britain, Australia, Canada and New Zealand belong to the world of 'haves'; the rest of the Commonwealth very much to the world of 'have nots'.

British Imperialism, when it gave up the political rule over the ex colonies, however, had one last trump to play. The economies of these colonies were geared to Britain and her 'allies'. With their dependence on the markets of the West, it was confidently expected that the new states would humbly follow British policy in the international arena.

But, imperialism is no longer the overwhelmingly dominating force it once was. The Russian Revolution and, above all since the war, the Chinese and Cuban revolutions have provided a most effective counter weight. The new nations of Asia, Africa, and the Carribbean, who once placed their faith in the United Nations or the Commonwealth and came to realise they were being used by Imperialism, soon appreciated the fact that they could stand up to the imperialist bullies whose powers of retaliation were curbed by the knowledge that they had to keep a wary eye on the growing Socialist sector of the world.

The United Nations as a force for peace was discredited when it was used by the United States as a cover for its aggression in Korea and in the Congo and by its utter incapacity to halt the Americans in Vietnam or Dominican Republic. Just as the old League of Nations was revealed as the instrument of Anglo-French imperialism so the United Nations stands exposed as an extension of the State Department.

Within the Commonwellth, there has been a growing realisation that Britain takes a different line in 'native' ruled countries like British Guiana and white settler dominated countries like Rhodesia. To British Guiana it despatched troops to 'keep law and order' and to frustrate the will of the people, it imposed on it a constitution deliberately designed to keep Cheddi Jagan and the P.P.P. out of office. In Rhodesia, it helped the settler regime of Ian Smith to

continued over/



build the most formidable military force in Africa outside Verwoerd's Republic.

With Labour in power, the African people had the right to expect a speedy end to the semi-fascist regime in Rhodesia and immediate independence on the basis of one man one vote. All they've had from Wilson are high sounding platitudes, the promise of action in some indefinite future, while Smith strengthens his forces and consolidates his police state. Despite the apparent compromise of the final communique, there can be little doubt that the African leaders, responding to the pressure of the people are getting ready for a show down over Rhodesia and when it comes, the whole hollow farce of Commonwealth solidarity will be exposed finally.

The so called 'peace mission' was a non starter from the day it was launched. Wilson, committed wholeheartedly to support of American action in Vietnam should have been the last person to lead such a mission if it were to be at all effective. The Prime Minister of Britain, however, could not stand down in favour of one of his colleagues - that would be rather undignified for the old country, old boy.

It is not only the leaders of the former colonial world who are learning the lessons of contemporary history. Imperialist internationalism means the subjugation of the whole world to economic exploitation by the great capitalist powers. The instruments they create, whether called League of Nations, United Nations, or Commonwealth are designed to this end. Everything else, peace, prosperity for the under - developed areas and so on, are secondary considerations. Genuine internationalism can only come from the exploited, who have nothing to lose and a world to gain, from combining their forces against a common enemy.

MALAYAN PARTY WORRIED BY U.S. INVESTMENTS from a special correspondent

U.S. investment would strangle Malaya's national economy, said the Malayan People's Party (Party Ra'ayat) in a statement on June 25th. The party expressed its opposition to the signing of a revised "investment guarantee" agreement on June 24th between the Malaysian Government and the U.S. Ambassador in Kuala Lumpur to facilitate the expansion of U.S. monopoly capital's economic influence in the country.

The statement said that in addition to exploiting the cheap labour of Malaysia, U.S. investments would enjoy a seven-year tax-free term under the agreement. Through economic expansion, U.S. monopoly capital would also exert its influence in the political and military fields of the country. The Malaysian economy was already under the monopoly control of British big business. The inflow of U.S. capital would make the national economy suffer under a heavier neo-colonialist pressure, and accelerate the outflow of the country's wealth, the statement concluded.

It would appear that Mr. Wilson's "East of Suez" policy has the role of protecting U.S. investment as well as that of British big business. The next time the question of solidarity with Malaysia is debated in the House of Commons it would be good if this was pointed out.



## WHO IS BEHIND THE COUP D' ETAT IN ALGERIA\*

The reactionary coup in Algeria which ousted President Ben Bella from power shocked people all over the world. It is no longer a mystery who is behind it. Without question those who benefit from it. The powers who feared the Afro-Asian Conference....those who detested the World Youth Festival which was to have been held in Algiers...those who feared to hear the verdict about the dirty war against Vietnam....those who feared to stand condemned for plotting against the Arab Liberation movement by arming Israel: Washington, Bonn, the oil companies - they all fear the united voice of the emergent Afro-Asian powers.

Ben Bella had just returned from successful negotiations about better terms for his country with French oil companies and President de Gaulle. Two years ago at a similar juncture in the negotiations the Algerian Foreign Minister, M. Khemisti, was shot dead by an unknown assassin and he was immediately replaced by Colonel Boumedienne's protege Bouteflika, who is now in power..it smells of oil. The Anglo-American oil companies are deep in Algeria; and West Germany even more. Bonn sent 36,000 soldiers to fight for the French against Algeria, some of them were the best torture teams. Bonn also supplied arms. In exchange, and within the Common Market, West Germany has free access to Algeria's raw materials. Krupp, Deutsche Erdoel AG, Haniel Steel and others are busy in exploiting North Africa. They are in Libya, Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria, Mauretania, Gabon and the Congo. ....

Contrary to her neighbours, Tunisia, Morocco and Libya, Algeria took an uncompromising stand against West German militarism and neo-colonialism. Ben Bella gave, therefore, his support to the foreign policy of President Nasser versus Bonn. We know that Bonn is the heir of Nazi Germany and her close military alliance with Israel - under the cover of "reparations" is a menace to peace in the Middle East. Behind the present junta lurks Bonn and Washington. One of the first acts of the new Government was to order the demolition of a war-memorial which commemorates the Algerian and French soldiers who gave their lives in the war against Nazi Germany (Monde 25/6/65) Bonn wanted to buy Ben Bella with a loan of 115million francs which he refused (Monde 27/6/65) Algeria's junta wants to isolate her - under the smokescreen of Islam - from her progressive allies in Africa and Europe, in particular, from the socialist camp, the United Arab Republic and Ghana.

Ben Bella is a great Algerian patriot, but at the same time a good socialist and internationalist, because he knows that Algeria's security is linked to the liberation from imperialism of other nations. This is the reason why Ben Bella gave a home to the Angolan freedom fighters, to the Ethiopian People's Movement and to Republican Spain. The imperialists did not like him for that. And the present junta: Messrs Boumedienne and Bouteflika who smear Ben Bella "a traitor" are doing the dirty work for the imperialists.....

President Ben Bella, above everything, took a leading part in the struggle for African unity and freedom. During the historic conference in Addis Abeba he advocated the militant struggle against colonialism, imperialism and racial barbarism, in particular against South Africa.....

\* N.B. this is a statement issued by the Friends of Algeria Committee, c/o Iraqi Students Society, 3, Shavers Place, London S.W. 1. For space reasons we have had to considerably shorten it and delete material not relevant to the main line of argument, e.g., <sup>on</sup> the question of Israel.



The Prime Minister of Cuba, Dr. Fidel Castro, was quick to publicly attack the leaders of the new regime in Algeria. On June 27th he described the overthrow of Ben Bella as "an inglorious coup." The overthrow could not be termed a revolutionary process, he said, in a nation-wide broadcast. Comparing it with the 1952 overthrow of King Farouk in Egypt, Castro said: "The Algerian coup was not against a king, a feudalism enemy of the people, but against a representative of the Algerian revolution." He praised Ben Bella and sharply criticised the new leader, Colonel Houari Boumedienne, and the foreign Minister, Abdel Aziz Bouteflika.

"Who could deny that Ben Bella was a leader of the Algerian people" he asked. "Who could deny his historic position in Algerian independence and the Algerian Revolution?" Of the new regime, he said: "If they decide to break off relations with us they would not be the first military putschists to do so." The Cuban Prime Minister said that to side with the new regime would be the worst form of opportunism (this appears to have been a criticism of the Chinese attitude and the speed with which they recognised the new regime).

"Who could say Ben Bella was not a revolutionary," Castro continued, "was not interpreting the sentiments of Algeria, that Ben Bella was a traitor to the revolution or was an imperialist, that Ben Bella was a reactionary or a despot?" Referring to Colonel Boumedienne, the Cuban Prime Minister said: "I am not judging Boumedienne as to what he has done. Let history judge him." He added: "Military despotism, political reactionism and repression cannot last in a country whose people rose to independence through hundreds of thousands of dead and fought against an army much better armed than that of Boumedienne." Of Mr. Bouteflika, he said: "Bouteflika is not a revolutionary but a man of the right, an enemy of socialism, an enemy of revolution, Bouteflika is reactionary."

Castro concluded by declaring: "If Ben Bella had been more ruthless, he would still be in power. Alas he too kind... Should the men who had made the coup repent and continue carrying out the Algerian Revolution, we shall not refuse them our support."

SAVE BEN BELLA, SAVE HENRI ALLEG AND OTHERS

by Pat Jordan

One of the most pressing tasks of the socialists in Britain will be to do what they can to prevent the new regime in Algeria either killing or imprisoning socialists in Algeria. First and foremost, we must campaign for the release of Ben Bella: this is not merely a humanitarian move or the saving of a great revolutionary; Ben Bella can act as the focal point for a revival of the left in the Algerian Revolution. Then we must remember the heroes of Algerian war like Henri Alleg and Michael Raptis who kept alive the tradition of solidarity between the workers' movement in the West and the Algerian Revolution when the major parties (Socialist and Communist alike) acted disgracefully. These men are, according to what little information has seeped through, either in hiding or under arrest. Boumedienne's contemptuous references to "foreign advisors" bodes ill for their welfare. There are, moreover, figures like Mohammed Harbi, who incurred the wrath of the bureaucrats and Islamic traditionalists because of their fight for genuine internationalist and socialist policies within the F.L.N. The next stage of the Algerian Revolution - a higher one because it will assimilate the lessons of the mistakes of Ben Bella and his team - will need men like these. Let us act quickly and decisively; I would welcome ideas for a campaign.



As a comparative stranger to Scarborough, I was reluctant to believe that the Scarborough Labour Party had developed pseudo-fascist characteristics. How wrong I was! To my horror, I have actually heard Executive Committee members condemn a party member on the grounds that his council house rent was in arrears. I have heard another "leader" of the party, a man who brandishes his former military rank at every possible opportunity, say to another party member: "Do you know who I am?" - in the manner of the butler speaking to the second footman.

I have heard others boast of their friendship for and co-operation with a former Conservative M.P., who is a noted for his spluttering, frenzied hatred of the left. I have heard a Labour councillor say that the corporation should set up the equivalent of "penal colonies" for unsatisfactory tenants. I have heard the same man take up the old, tired stories of "coal in the bath" and "burning the doors in winter." This man went on to 'distinguish' himself by accepting the mayoralty of the town at the invitation of the Tory majority.

Another member of the Executive stated that the local police should be called in to "deal with" the Young Socialists. Does he want the youngsters to be manhandled simply because they have dared to oppose the opportunistic tactics of the Tory fellow-travellers who "lead" and disgrace the Scarborough Party?

Transport House must act now!

Judy Cameron.

FIRE AT LABOUR'S NORTHERN VOICE OFFICE

from Alan Rooney

Fire broke out at North West C.N.D. Regional headquarters, 14, Tib Lane, Manchester, last weekend. It started on the stairs and was spotted by two 16-year-old boys who were entering the building to join C.N.D. They gave the alarm and the fire was dealt with before any major damage was caused. Labour's Voice moved into the building only last week. Their offices have been broken into previously and a typewriter stolen.

ADVERTISEMENTS

THE ALGERIAN

COUP D'ETAT

A brief analysis published by  
Arab Revolution.

This 7-page pamphlet gives a brief outline of the balance of forces in the Algerian Revolution and the events which led up to the coup. It suggests a programme of action for all those, inside and outside of Algeria, who wish to reverse the recent defeat and carry the Revolution forward. It is available from: Arab Revolution, c/o International Bookshop, 4, Dane Street, Nottingham, price 6d p.p.

WORKERS'

CONTROL

A report of the second national seminar on Industrial Democracy, held in London on May 8th, 1965.

Contains papers on Co-operative Democracy, Steel Nationalisation, A Plan for Docks, Incomes Policy Facts, and other original material.

Other important articles cover the T.G.W.U., Yugoslavia, the C.W.S., Planning and Industrial Democracy. Available from: The Week, 54, Park Rd., Lenton, Nottingham: 1/3d p.p.