

10 ✓

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor : R. Palme Dutt

1963 : BRITAIN AND THE WORLD

The Editor

★

BATTLE FOR JOBS

Leo McGree

★

WEST GERMAN SCANDAL TRIAL

D. N. Pritt, Q.C.

★

Also: articles on Shipbuilding—Liberal Party—The Vatican
Council—Greece and the Common Market

JANUARY 1963

One Shilling and Sixpence

CONTENTS

<p>Notes of the Month: 1963—Britain and the World. <i>From the Shame of 1938 to the Shame of 1963—Kipling! Thou Shouldst Be Living at this Hour—Mirage of the New Colonialism—Mirage of the 'New Capitalism'—Preach the New Gospel in Merseyside—Muddle of the 'Mixed-up Economy'—Prisons and 'Juvenile Delinquency'—New Future for Britain.....</i>R.P.D.</p>	3
<p>Battle for Jobs. Merseyside's campaign described by the Woodworkers' District Secretary.....Leo McGree</p>	16
<p>Shipbuilding and British Economy. An Executive member of the Boilermakers on the industry's run-down.....Ted Williams</p>	19
<p>West German Scandal Trial. How Nazi influences try to ban the Union of Victims of Nazi Persecution.....D. N. Pritt, Q.C.</p>	27
<p>Liberal Party Policy. Where the Liberals stand on the crucial issues</p>	Katherine Hood 33
<p>Greece and the Common Market. What 'Associate Membership' means in practice.....</p>	Costas Koliyannis 38
<p>The Vatican Council. The Chancellor of Southwark Cathedral describes the far-reaching social and political effects of the Ecumenical Council.....</p>	The Rev. Canon S. Evans 41
<p>Readers' Outlook: <i>Secret of Britain's Greatness</i>...</p>	Angela Tuckett 1
<p>Illustration: A Great Anti-Slavery Demonstration, 1863</p>	24-5
<p>Forty Years Ago: <i>When Nazism Began.</i> First exposure in the British Press appeared in Labour Monthly</p>	48
<p>Book Reviews. 'Journey into the Past', by Ivan Maisky: <i>William Gallacher.</i> 'Factors in Economic Development', by A. K. Cairncross; 'Theories of Economic Growth and Development', by Irma Adelman: <i>John Eaton.</i> 'The Weapons Acquisition Process', by M. J. Peck and F. M. Scherer: <i>Judith Todd</i></p>	44

READERS' OUTLOOK

The Secret of Britain's Greatness

IN THE COTTON TOWNS of Lancashire, 'England's dark, satanic mills', a vast misery of unemployment. In Blackburn, 15,862 unemployed or on short-time; in Stockport, 12,000—some 31·8 per cent on relief; in Glossop, 35·9 per cent of the population living on charity: that was the record in November, 1862. For one hundred years ago, the American Civil War was at its peak; and the blockade by the North—the 'united states'—of the cotton-exporting slave-owners led to a cotton famine which brought the textile industry of Britain's industrial North to a standstill. The misery 'is incredible', wrote Karl Marx at the time: whether the British government would intervene in favour of the slave-owners to break the blockade 'has accordingly become a bread-and-butter question for the working class.' Every effort was made to inflame them by their 'natural superiors' into a clamour for intervention. 'Reynolds Weekly Newspaper has been purchased expressly in order . . . that it might reiterate weekly in raging diatribes' that demand, writes Marx and the government was 'only waiting for the intervention cry from below'. Then, in a famous passage, he continues: 'Under these circumstances, the obstinacy with which the working class keeps silent, or breaks its silence only to raise its voice against intervention and for the "united states", is admirable. This is a new and brilliant proof of the indestructible excellence of the English popular masses, of that excellence which is

the secret of England's greatness.' A wonderful tribute, and a tradition which we should teach every child to treasure and to deserve anew in each generation—not least today. Ten months after Marx wrote this, the working class broke its courageous silence in a big way. As soon as Abraham Lincoln at last came out for the emancipation of the slaves as a war aim—the turning point of the war—immense working class demonstrations were held in Britain *against* breaking the blockade which was causing them such misery, against the slave-owners, sending messages of support to Lincoln. Six thousand in Manchester, 4,000 in Bradford; meetings in Sheffield, Stroud and finally in London. Then even sections of the middle class began joining in, and an Emancipation Society held meetings a hundred years ago this month such as that pictured on our middle pages: there are no drawings extant of the far greater workers' demonstrations.

A hundred years later it is the turn of Cuba to show what the struggle for emancipation means today; and the efforts of the gallant Cuban people strike hatred and terror in all reactionaries, just as sympathy goes out to them from 'the popular masses' everywhere, like the great-hearted people of Lancashire. A *Blackburn* reader is full of praise for the articles in December about Cuba, remarking: 'Anyone in the British Isles in the Socialist movement needs those articles. But soon *L.M.* will be giving further help about the unemployment menace.'

(Here you are, Les; unemployment in Lancashire in 1862 on this page and in 1962 on page 16.) He continues: 'Many who thought Socialism was not a necessity are having second thoughts. I'm taking your tip of looking at *L.M.*'s index, and each of our new recruits shall have a back number with an article that fits his or her needs.' A *South Coast* reader: 'R.P.D. has excelled himself—a Leninist analysis with the typical Leninist conclusion for action. On the Indo-China clash it was superb. It throws the blame just where it belongs and then proposes reasonable settlement, which the Chinese are ready to make.' A *Scottish* friend writes: 'R.P.D. and Pritt on Cuba are dealing with topics I was discussing recently with a new friend. I had done my best with him, but of course *L.M.* covers the ground more fully and effectively. Now I shall send it to him as a follow-up of our talk.' More examples of readers winning new friends for *L.M.* and therefore influencing people. Another *Scot*: 'Here are two new half-yearly subscriptions. Send them the Cuba-and-Border number; and if I can have a specimen copy of it for a Labour councillor, I hope to get yet another new reader.' A *rail shop worker* sold 20 of a recent number: 'It was appreciated by the lads, and three

have become regular readers already.' An enthusiast writes from *Ireland*: 'It's a much respected journal here, having the great virtue of being wonderfully consistent. It certainly goes the rounds in the workshops'. Here's what two older readers have done: one in *Surrey* bought an extra copy at a meeting he attended 'to pass to a friend whom I hope to win as a new reader.' A *Dorset* man sends us the price of a December copy to forward to a friend in New Zealand: 'What a masterly account of Cuba and the Border by R.P.D.—wish I could order 50 to distribute, but being a pensioner I can't afford it. Long live the *L.M.*!' These are examples of what almost every reader could do, using *L.M.* to 'continue the argument'.

On the money side, I wish we could mention everyone who sent a bit extra in this season of gifts and 'mellow fruitfulness'. But I want especially to thank our honoured friend, the Dean, whose letter we print below, also that *South London* Communist Party Branch for the £2 10s. ('part proceeds of a jumble sale'); and the *Channel Islander*, who adds: 'Here's greetings to you all—and a bigger circulation in the New Year!' And the same to you, and to all, from us all.

ANGELA TUCKETT

*The Deanery,
Canterbury.*

I am sending you £5 for the splendid line and skilled journalism of the 'Labour Monthly'.

Hewlett Johnson.

NOTES OF THE MONTH

1963—*Britain and the World*

From Base Camp the British-Russian party can see Communism Peak, the mountain they will climb together.

(*Daily Herald*, July 25, 1962.)

AND they did. However, that is a parable of the future. At the present moment Britain is at a low point—far lower than Base Camp. Economically. Politically. In the international scale. John Bull has become everybody's target. Every ass brays over the stricken lion who once lorded it over the imperialist world. The economy creaks and groans. The strategy is in ruins. The Commonwealth is mocked by those who planned it. The dream of Full Employment and the New Capitalism has faded. The grim dole queues lengthen. Each ally in turn gives a kick. The supplicant at the Gate of Joyous Entry, headquarters of the Common Market, finds the entry neither joyous nor easy. Uncle Sam turns a cold shoulder on the spurned and no longer indispensable retainer. Even the once beloved Commonwealth has been sacrificed for nothing. No wonder all sections of the people, high and low, have begun to ask: What has gone wrong? Is Britain played out? What is the future for Britain? The question is worth asking. Nor can the answer be sought in isolation from the rest of the world. The problem of Britain today is a crucial expression of the problem of the new world situation. The coming Communist Party Congress at Easter will be devoted to this problem of Britain's Future. It will be worth while to attempt some preliminary examination of some aspects of this problem.

Why?

What went wrong? In 1945 Britain emerged from the war seemingly at the height of strength and influence in the world. It is true that the main battles of victory to destroy the enemy armies had had to be waged by the Soviet armies, with the Anglo-American forces only participating on any large scale in a late auxiliary role, chiefly to prevent the extension of the popular revolution over so much of Europe as they could grasp into their control. It is true that the main profits of the war went to the United States, which suffered no wounds of war on its territory and amassed fortunes,

while the Soviet Union was devastated as no country before in history, and Britain also suffered some war destruction and economic losses. But the Triple Pact of the Crimea opened the way for Britain to participate as an equal with the United States and the Soviet Union in leading the new United Nations and the world along the path of peace and reconstruction, with fascism and German militarism destroyed for ever, and collective security ensured so long as the three powers maintained co-operation.

Opportunity Squandered

The British-Soviet Treaty of Alliance (whose twenty years, if it had been fulfilled, would have reached completion in 1962) provided for Britain and the Soviet Union at the two ends of Europe to co-operate in maintaining peace in Europe after the war, prevent the revival of German militarism and aggression, and 'undertake not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other'. Shades of Nato, which was a flagrant violation of Britain's binding treaty obligation. The masses of the people in Britain, as in all the countries of Europe, showed their enthusiasm in the election of 1945 for the new perspective of peace and anti-fascism and friendship with the Soviet Union and the disarmament of Germany, and their eagerness to enter on a radical programme of economic and social reconstruction, ending Toryism and monopoly rule for ever, and advancing towards socialism. All this has been squandered during these eighteen years to bring Britain down to the present nadir of weakness, degradation and humiliation. Why? And how?

Price of Fulton

What is now revealed in the sight of all, in the present weakened position of Britain, is something more than the momentary outcome of the collapse of Skybolt, the toughness of Acheson and Macnamara, or the merciless terms of the Six. It is more than the sharpened temporary downturn of the economic trade cycle, which may worsen further before the customary pre-election shot in the arm administered to the now confirmed Keynesian addict. The continuous descent needs to be seen over these eighteen years. We are paying now the price of Fulton; of Churchill and Bevin and Attlee, no less than of Eden and Macmillan; of Nato and German rearmament; of nuclear mania and the sell-out to the United States; of eighteen years of treason to the British people and to peace.

From the Shame of 1938 to the Shame of 1963

Fulton reproduced Munich. Earl Attlee, offering a spirited answer to Acheson in *The Times*, recalls that also in 1938 'an American well-wisher', observing Britain under Neville Chamberlain and Halifax 'humiliating themselves' before Mussolini and Hitler, might have regarded Britain as 'down and out', but that '1940 came'. He forgets that the essence of the humiliation of Munich (which only the sole Communist M.P. opposed at the time and not after the event), of the Government of Neville Chamberlain and Butler and Lord Home, was that their blind anti-Soviet hostility led them to sacrifice Britain's national interests in order to foster German militarism and rearm Germany (in violation of their previous pledges to keep Germany disarmed) as the valiant champion against the Soviet Union, and thereby made the second world war inevitable. But this is the very definition of the policy carried to even more shameful lengths by Fulton, by Nato, by the rearmament of German militarism and neo-Nazism and the grovelling appeasement of the rulers of the United States, and carried out equally by the Attlee Labour Government and the Tory Governments during these eighteen years. Earl Attlee forgets that it was his chosen Foreign Minister, Ernest Bevin (or should we rather say, the chosen of Churchill and King George?) who first publicly proclaimed the anti-Soviet crusade amid the plaudits of the fascist press, even before Fulton and before Truman and the United States had grasped the new alignment and change of partners; just as it was the Labour Government of Attlee and Bevin which broke every pledge of Potsdam and the war by inaugurating the rearmament of German militarism. All that has followed is the sequel and disastrous working out of this suicidal policy of Toryism and Tory-Labourism. And if Father Kennedy as Ambassador at the Court of St. James observed the humiliation of Munich and its sequel and recorded his adverse verdict of the fall of Britain, it is a fitting irony of history that Son Kennedy as President should observe the deeper humiliation of Britain through the repetition of the same policy today, and should record an even harsher adverse verdict through the cold words of an Acheson and a Macnamara. The Father, the Son—and Macmillan as the Holy Ghost to breathe the expiring sigh.

Philosophic Pessimists

Why did they do it? Today the Tory press and 'enlightened' organs of opinion and the B.B.C., not very hidden persuaders are full

of 'profound' philosophic analyses demonstrating that the decline of Britain from former grandeur to lower rank is an inevitable predestined historic necessity. Empires come and empires go. So it has always been and so it always will be. Nevertheless, for consolation a little niche will be found for Britain inside the new West European Axis under the aegis of the German Eagle. The Navy League has been urgently pleading for an extension of British naval building in order that Britain may not lose third place as a naval power. Within the lifetime of some of those who read these words the same Navy League used to demand imperatively, as the indispensable condition for the survival of Britain, that the British Navy must equal the combined strength of the two next strongest naval powers—the 'Two Power Standard'. Now it has become the 'Third Power Standard'. Ichabod and all that.

Kipling! Thou Shouldst Be Living At This Hour!

What a pity that Kipling could not have lived to see this day. He died just two years before Munich, but had lived long enough to see the Anglo-German Naval Agreement of 1935 which gave Germany 100 per cent equality in submarines for the more efficient destruction of British merchant shipping and sailors. He would have understood this final outcome of his saga and relished it with his customary grim realism. For there has been no more striking demonstration since Balzac of the familiar Marxist truth than in the case of this most gifted poet of the modern imperialist era in Britain, who has been too long casually dismissed by some on the left as a jingo, that his power of artistic creative insight outweighed and cancelled out his superficial political tenets with a deeper truth of life to which he bore witness almost in spite of himself. Revolutionary writers could do worse than study Kipling as a model, not necessary of metrical form (out-dated), but for vividness of imagination and relentless social insight beneath the jingo trappings.

Ring Out the Old! Ring In the New!

However, all this philosophic maundering about dying empires and nostalgic self-pity over lost glories or noble resignation to a diminished role is beside the point. Only one question matters: What is being done to advance into the new world. Certainly it is true that the decline and fall of British imperialism, as of all imperialism, is in the long range an inevitable historical reality of the age in which we live, and is not caused by the vagaries of policy of

this or that statesman or politician of the past eighteen years. The disintegration, not yet complete, but approaching completion, of Britain's old colonial empire is as inevitable a phenomenon of the present era as was the loss of the former world industrial monopoly of Britain in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Britain's traditional capitalist prosperity in the nineteenth century had been built up on the basis of that world industrial monopoly, which had itself been created on foundations of colonial blood and plunder, and whose noisily proclaimed prosperity masked extreme class divisions and exploitation and mass poverty also in Britain. Marx and Engels had predicted the downfall of that monopoly in face of the growth of younger capitalist rivals, the United States and Germany. From this they deduced the necessity for Britain to advance to a new social and economic order, to socialism. That lesson is underlined with new urgency today.

False Sunset Glow

The socialist movement did arise anew in Britain, as Marx and Engels had predicted, in the moment of the downfall of Britain's world industrial monopoly eight decades ago. But it was not yet strong enough or experienced enough to prevail against its powerful antagonist. Therefore the agony has been prolonged. The rapid extension of the world colonial monopoly was seen as the substitute for the lost world manufacturing and trading monopoly. A false sunset glow of prosperity—most glaring in all its ostentatious hideousness in the Edwardian era—has been maintained during the first half of the twentieth century on the basis of the continued world colonial monopoly and overseas exploitation sustaining an increasingly sick and parasitic capitalism. But the onset of the general crisis of capitalism, with the first world war and the first victorious socialist revolution, and still more the disintegration of the colonial system during the two decades since the second world war is bringing this basis to an end and sounding the death knell for the old order in Britain. The manifest bankruptcy of the policies of Toryism and Tory-Labourism to provide an answer is becoming more and more widely felt in the present situation. The need to advance to a new programme for the new conditions is universally recognised.

Mirage of the New Colonialism

'End of Empire' and 'Empire And After' has become the current theme-song of Tory and Labour imperialists alike (even while they

dispatch the troops to Brunei to maintain their non-existent empire). Their picture is premature. We are still living through a further transitional stage of attempted adaptation of imperialism. In the face of the universal national liberation revolt of all the colonial peoples the imperialists have had to concede independence in nearly all cases, sometimes after defeat in heavy colonial wars, and will soon have to do so in the few remaining cases, even though they try to hobble independence at first with all kinds of conditions of transfer, partitions, constitution-mongering, bases and the like. But political independence has not yet meant the end of imperialist economic exploitation. Economic exploitation, on the basis of the old colonial economy has been maintained and even extended, sometimes in new forms (disguised as 'aid'). The strategy of neo-colonialism has become the key strategy of modern imperialism.

Deepening Gulf between Rich and Poor

The increase of colonial super-profits during the past decade (the supposed decade of the Strachey-Hinden 'End of Empire') has found striking expression in the terms of trade between the advanced imperialist and 'under-developed' (colonial and ex-colonial) countries. The United Nations Bulletin of Statistics for June 1962 has reported that between 1953 and the first quarter of 1962 the price of manufactures from the advanced industrial countries has risen by 9 per cent, while the price of primary commodities from the under-developed countries has fallen by 12 per cent—of food by 22 per cent. This has given rise to the conspicuously increasing gulf between the advanced imperialist countries and the colonial or ex-colonial countries. The rich grow richer, and the poor poorer—the characteristic general law of capitalist development. Faced with this horrifying world picture, sincere and well-meaning philanthropists, ignorant of the workings of imperialism, proclaim the fact of this growing gulf in order to beg for crumbs of charity for the poor starving populations of the 'backward' 'under-developed' countries, as an alternative to fighting to end imperialist economic exploitation, which keeps these peoples backward and poor.

Colonial Basis of British 'Affluence'

This increase of colonial super-profits during the most recent years has partially concealed the real bankruptcy of the imperialist system, and has been one of the key factors which has helped to cushion the shocks of the depressions of the post-war trade cycle.

It is this increase of colonial super-profits which has given rise to the current false reformist theories of a new crisis-free capitalism with a perspective of infinite prosperity. Nowhere has this applied more conspicuously than in the case of Britain, the most sick and parasitic modern capitalism.

Taking the period from 1956 as a whole, the change in the relationship of export prices to import prices has seemingly contributed something like £600 million per annum to the strengthening of the United Kingdom's balance of payments position.

(*Financial Times*, August 28, 1962.)

£3,000 million in the five years 1956-61. Without this the recorded net surplus of £628 million on the balance of payments during these five years would have shown a net deficit of £2,372 million or an average annual deficit of £493 million! Such is the colonialist basis of Tory 'economic success' (with stagnating production) during the fifties. And this is leaving out of account the direct colonial super-profits.

It has been estimated that more than half Britain's income from overseas investment comes from her two oil companies, Shell and B.P. The loss of the Middle East oil wells would make a visible hole in the British standard of living.

(*Observer*, January 29, 1961.)

The filthy Tory 'never had it so good' propaganda is based on colonial hunger. Here we come to the real taproot of British foreign policy, the cold war, the inflated arms expenditure, the servility to the more powerful United States imperialists. Here equally is the taproot of British opportunism, reformism, the 'new socialism' and all the lying propaganda of the 'new capitalism'. But the mirage will not last.

Pricking the Bubble

We have now entered the era when the further advance of the national liberation movement has begun to challenge imperialist economic exploitation and demand restoration of the economic resources of their countries. The advent of this new era was heralded by the fall of the Attlee Labour Government over the Abadan crisis, with the dispatch of warships and the vain attempt to initiate military action (only frustrated, as Lord Morrison has now told us in his Memoirs, because the professional service chiefs informed him that the military operations he desired were technically impossible of fulfilment without a delay of time for preparation and mobilisation which would render them ineffective) against—

sweet irony for a Labour Government—Iranian oil nationalisation. The advent of the new era was heralded once again by the fall of the Eden Tory Government over the Suez crisis, with the fiasco of the Anglo-French war against Egyptian nationalisation of the Suez Canal (now working better than ever without the Canal Company). The two key transitions of Government in Britain during the eighteen years since 1945. Each time over the Middle East. Each time over the colonial question. Each time against nationalisation in a colonial 'sphere of influence'. It may be recalled how Lloyd George fell over the Chanak crisis in the Middle East. Once again colonialism is revealed as the taproot of domestic politics in Britain. But this time this final offensive of national liberation, this offensive for economic liberation from the stranglehold of imperialism, this offensive which is still only beginning and is visibly gathering force in all the newly independent countries (compare the Cuba crisis and its significance for the international situation), will finally end the privileged basis of the economy of all the imperialist countries, and especially of Britain. This will open a new political situation in Britain.

Mirage of the 'New Capitalism'

Already the mirage of the miraculous crisis-free 'New Capitalism' and permanent Full Employment and the 'Disappearance of Class Divisions' and the 'New Middle-Class Working Class' has begun to fade, just as the West German 'Economic Miracle' has become tarnished. Toryism is burying its old posters as deep as it can. The 'New Thinkers' of the now tattered and dog-eared, once so glossy, revised version of 'socialism' or 'contemporary capitalism' have now switched their record, and found other hares (nuclear bees in the bonnet supplied straight from the Pentagon, or Common Market delusions of prosperity) to pursue. The indignant repudiations to denounce the obsession of 'old-fashioned socialists' with 'obsolete' memories from the thirties are now less vociferous. Capitalism, it is being discovered, through all its varying successive phases (perhaps this may be offered as the 'newest thought' of all for young people) is still capitalism.

Preach the New Gospel in Merseyside

Let Strachey, Jay and Crosland go out to preach their gospel of the oh-so-shiny prosperous managed capitalism to the grim queues outside the Labour Exchanges on the North-East Coast and the

Merseyside. Let them describe the beauties of the mixed economy (better, perhaps, 'mixed-up economy', like the jargon phrase 'mixed-up kids') to the young school-leavers who come out fresh and eager to find their place in the world, and instead find no work, but only rebuffs and the dole and their parents' charity, while they can regale themselves with reading in the press about 'teen-agers' huge spending power'. Let them descant on the joys of the 'new working class', which is 'no longer a working class', to the railway shopmen and the railwaymen and the miners and the steelmen and the foundry workers and the shipbuilders who find the gates closed and the cranes silent and the works abandoned; and in consequence their household crashes down from a relatively higher wage to an unemployment rate which is even a lower proportion of earnings than pre-war, while their only chance of finding a job is to abandon their dream home, won after twelve years waiting on the list; and the H.P. payments on the wonderful 'luxuries' of fridge, telly and washing machine of the 'new working class' have become a nightmare. Capitalism is still capitalism, and the decorations on the chains only make the chains more galling. It is even possible that our honoured contributor and front-line fighter, Leo McGree (read his article on p. 16) is not such an 'obsolete shellback', but is closer to the workers and the realities of capitalism than all the 'New Thinkers' in their cosy Penguin coteries.

Muddle of the 'Mixed-Up Economy'

Of course it is a libel to suggest that capitalism is not advancing, merely because the old basic productive industries are going down. 'Planning' is now the watchword even of Toryism. Maudling has rushed to the rescue by cutting purchase tax on motor cars in the hope of flooding still more cars on the chock-full overcrowded roads so as to provide more headaches for his colleague Marples. Capitalist 'planning'. Pour out anything that is easy to multiply on mass-production lines; then employ a vast apparatus to sell it and fabricate a demand by slick publicity; but do not, repeat, do not produce what people need. Raise up the towering speculative luxury office blocks to reach the sky; but leave the people homeless, since it is not clear which authority is really responsible for the homeless; and let the young married couples abandon hope of a home, squeeze in with their parents, or pig it in overcrowded costly digs. Plan to build 90 new hospitals in the next ten years, but close down 1,250, and leave the provision worse than ever.

'New slums are being formed faster than existing slums are being cleared' (*Observer*, August 5, 1962). But the construction of private luxury swimming pools at an average price of £5,000 apiece to add to the mansions of the rich is booming at a record rate of expansion. After all, it all goes to swell the Gross National Product and demonstrate the 'upward turn' in productivity and prove Tory capitalist 'prosperity'.

New 'Growth Industries'

Certainly there are new 'growth industries' breeding and burgeoning in the fruitful soil of the 'new capitalism'. Take, for example, one of the most important. Betting Shops—that great social reform of the Tory Government—whose luxurious premises now decorate every street in the island. No lack of capital and incentive and enterprise and expansion here.

BRITAIN'S NEWEST INDUSTRY—THE BETTING SHOP

Created by the Betting and Gaming Act of 1960, betting shops have become big business on a scale that has outstripped all expectations. . . . With new shops opening at the rate of over 100 a week, the present total is reckoned to be between 15,000 and 20,000. Betting shops are the outstanding growth industry in the British economy at the present time.

(*Sunday Telegraph*, September 9, 1962.)

Between the wars the *Economist* (November 20, 1937) could describe 'foreign investment' as 'the nation's greatest single industry'. Today we have reached new heights in the triumphant productive upsurge of Britain's ultra-modern 'contemporary capitalism' (how well Strachey caught the current fashion-jargon in naming his book). Betting shops have become 'the outstanding growth industry in the British economy'. Not to mention the luxury casinos for the rich and the lavish redecoration of 44, Grosvenor Square by the Aspinalls. The Tory Government, who have simultaneously in their tireless reforming zeal cleared the streets, thereby ensuring the maximum profitability of the call-girl racket, carried special legislation to facilitate the proliferation of obscene literature (always in the name of the highest 'enlightenment' amid the delighted yelps of the highbrows) and sought to extend drinking hours until the publicans themselves rebelled, have never lacked loving care to provide for the lighter requirements of the people in a period of danger of social unrest, just as their predecessors sought to drown the anxieties of the first onset of the Industrial Revolution in a flood of cheap gin.

Prisons and 'Juvenile Delinquency'

Of course there are other expanding 'industries'. On December 14 the B.B.C. in its customary weekly 'Careers' announcements proclaimed: 'Why not join the Prison Service? Excellent prospects. A rapidly expanding service. Security guaranteed. Big programme of new prisons planned'. In the Soviet Union they are closing down prisons for lack of inmates. Here the press has announced 'the biggest prison building programme since the eighteen-forties'. The Royal Commission on the Police reported in 1960: 'The country has never in its history had so many policemen as there are now'. The proportion now is 1 per 700 of the population, as against 1 per 800 in the stormy year 1849. The apostles of Hiroshima turn up the whites of their eyes to complain of the growth of violence and crime and 'juvenile delinquency'. Let the Tory rulers of society rejoice in their own handiwork. The wonder is not that some youngsters should ape their elders in violence and promiscuity. The wonder is that the overwhelming majority of young people, blocked at every turn by the conditions of existing society, confronted by a society of high-placed crime and violence and egoism and cut-throat do-the-other-fellow-down and all the rest of the bestial Tory ruling class ethic, should yet be so undaunted and freshly eager and resolute to struggle against tough odds to make something of their lives; often also to help their mates, and sometimes even, forgive us all, with such means as are in their power, if only with badges and marches and sit-downs at first, to try to make the world a better place. In that spirit is the hope of the future, of a better Britain.

Two Paths for the World

In this year 1963 we are indeed at a moment of choice equally for Britain and for the world. Can the negotiated compromise on Cuba be followed by extending negotiated compromises on other issues and danger-points, until the nightmare of a new world war with nuclear weapons, which still hangs so heavy on the consciousness of mankind and throttles progress, could begin to recede and give place to a new framework of international relations such as could make nuclear disarmament a practical possibility? Dare we hope that the present Kennedy-Khrushchov exchanges may pave the way to fruitful negotiations? Or will the type of policy expressed in the recent public utterances of Acheson, the policy of 'strength' to seek to impose by military threats the Adenauer objective for the expansion of the frontiers of Neo-Nazi Western Germany as part of

the Atlantic Bloc, prevail in the counsels of the West? That path means war. The whole socialist world seeks peace. The Soviet Union has proved it over Cuba. China has proved it with the voluntary unilateral cease-fire and withdrawal of troops to make possible negotiations. The Afro-Asian countries have shown their desire for peace by their messages imploring India to enter on the path of negotiations. Peace and peaceful co-existence is the universal desire of the peoples all over the world. 1963 will see the most fateful decisions to govern the path towards these aims.

New Future for Britain

Equally for Britain 1963 will prove a year of decision. The choice on the Common Market will have to be made. This choice is no limited economic decision or experiment of a temporary regional alliance. It will involve the whole present international alignment of Britain, and ultimately the survival of Britain as an independent State. The alternative to the Common Market (and the chances of defeating it have grown) is not and cannot be the *status quo*. It will require a new international orientation of Britain, breaking the bonds of subjection to the United States and West Germany and the ignominious role of a nuclear target for destruction, and stepping forward to lead the fight for peaceful co-existence and international economic co-operation. It will mean to link the economy of Britain in fruitful equal interchange through long-term contracts, not only with the Commonwealth countries, but with all the expanding economies of the new world that is sweeping forward, the socialist countries and the newly independent countries. This will restore the independence of Britain and defeat all the Achesons.

'Planning'—For Whom?

Such aims can only be won by the political fight within Britain. But the fulfilment of these aims is also the indispensable condition for progressive social advance inside Britain. The manifest bankruptcy of present policies and of the present economic situation has led even the Tories to make a hasty switch from their previous glorification of 'Free Enterprise' (that is, jungle freedom for the monopolies) and 'Conservative Freedom Works' to the noisy proclamation of their new gospel of 'Planning'. But what do they mean by 'Planning'? Not for the needs of the people. Look back to the paragraph 'Muddle of the Mixed-Up Economy' to see some illustration of the cruel mockery of Tory 'planning' from the standpoint

of the people. They want 'planning', not for the needs of the people, but for greater profits of the monopolies at the expense of the needs of the people—to attack standards and lower labour costs in the name of 'planning' (Neddy and Nick).

Towards the Victory of the People

The economic-political battles of the coming year on the domestic front in Britain will turn on the two associated questions of (1) the Common Market, and (2) the menace of the economic situation, with unemployment, redundancy dismissals, the Government's economic offensive and the smooth-tongued Tory trick to cover this offensive with talk of 'planning'. The strength of resistance to this offensive by the trade union and labour movement will be essential for victory in the political field. It is not enough to meet the Tory talk of 'planning' with parallel demands for 'planning' within capitalism. What is true of Tory capitalist 'planning' is in the end true of all so-called smooth-tongued thimblery three-card-trick 'planning' of capitalism by capitalism for capitalism, whether it wears a Tory or a professed 'Labour' label (in practice the same bureaucrats, commuting between their top seats in the Civil Service and on the Boards of the big monopolies, would operate it), so long as the key big monopolies are left in possession. Hence the necessity to advance to a new programme, which does not merely speak of 'planning', but sets the aim to take directly into public ownership the big monopolies as the indispensable foundation for any serious planning. Such a programme, alongside the essential aims in the international field, is set out in the Draft Political Resolution submitted for discussion for the coming Communist Congress. The questions are of common concern to the whole labour movement. 1963 sets the task for the whole labour movement to unite, together with all the growing numbers of people among all sections who recognise the necessity for a change in the direction of affairs, in order to speed a general election, ensure the defeat of the Tory Government and advance to the fight for the fulfilment of the new programme which the present situation so urgently requires.

December 17, 1962

R.P.D.

Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties

BATTLE FOR JOBS

Leo McGree*

ON Guy Fawkes Day, November 5, 1962, seven hundred workers travelled on the midnight 'Scousers' Special', to march through the streets of London and lobby the Members of Parliament, demanding work for Merseyside. It was the most appropriate date for visiting the House of Commons; but this time it was to expose the plight of some 40,000 workless.

Liverpool is the gateway to Lancashire and the barometer of each economic crisis. The closures of the cotton mills, the pits, and the railways are all reflected by unemployment amongst the dockers and seamen, engineers and shipbuilders. Figures are used to prove that the unemployment crisis is only a temporary, difficult phase which will soon pass. But these figures have been steadily rising over the past two years; and the workers have also risen, to demand more work be brought to Merseyside.

What are the true figures? Dockers and seamen who are unemployed are not counted in the grand total of workless; they come under the Dock Labour scheme, or are established seamen. Official figures are counted as 37,000 on the dole, or 5.6 per cent of the population. One-third of this number have to also apply for National Assistance. Over 3,000 are under 18 years of age; 68 out of every 1,000 men unemployed; 36 out of every 1,000 women unemployed; and 40 men for every vacant job. One-third of the jobless of the whole of the North-West is on Merseyside. There are 80,000 officially designated slums—and over 4,000 building workers on the dole. Some 6,000 shipyard workers are without a job. These figures give a brief picture of the position, but no one can give the correct figure of those who 'got out', migrated south.

This was the reason we marched to London, accompanied by police and the TV cameras, so that in every part of Britain people could hear the slogan: 'We want work'.

Take shipbuilding. We have a great shipbuilding yard at Cammell Lairds, Birkenhead, and some of the most modern docks for ship repair. Five years ago, this yard had an order book of 7 million tons. Today, apart from twelve months' work for the Admiralty, no orders have been placed. Having spent £15 million on modern-

*Mr. Leo McGree, as many of our readers will know, is the Liverpool District Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers.

isations, they are now, for the first time in history, building ships without a customer, and are selling ships 'off the peg'. The firm have issued a brochure of the ships they have for sale, advertising standardised vessels at 15 per cent to 20 per cent reduction for cash. We are selling our ships like soap powder: 'Buy your tanker this week, 4d. a ton off'. In their desperation for orders, Cammell Lairds have decided that 'the Russians are important people to be well in with' (*Observer*, December 2, 1962) and if the trade delegation decided not to visit Merseyside the firm would go to London to meet them. Well, well, the sky is black with birds coming home to roost. In 1954 the Russian Government requested the ship-builders of this country to build them 95 ships, but because of the Yankee Battle Act this order was refused. Today more ships are built in foreign yards for British shipowners than are built in this country. So much for the patriotic British shipowner.

Then, the building industry. Four thousand building workers living on 57s. 6d. per week dole—and thousands living in condemned houses. We are building two great Cathedrals in which we can worship the Almighty; great commercial buildings to house the football pool promoters (Littlewoods and Vernons); our dance halls and cinemas are being turned into bingo shrines; we have even got ten-pin bowling alleys. But not sufficient homes, hospitals and schools. What an indictment of this Government! They think: if it is profitable, then we can build; but if it is in the interest and welfare of the people, then we cannot build.

The City Council leaders went over to Paris to study the building of pre-cast dwellings to assist in the clearing of the slums. I have heard many excuses for visiting Paris, but this is the best one advanced for years. During the most favourable building periods this year, 4,000 are idle. We had money, land, materials and labour, but the City fathers were in Paris studying the latest gimmicks for 'slum clearance'.

Our youth are the worst victims of the present Government's policy. The more positive proposals of the Carr report have been studied, pigeonholed and now forgotten. The parents of the children today skimp and save to permit them to stay at school until they are 16 years of age, in the hope this will prevent them taking blind alley jobs and that they will be able to secure an apprenticeship and a trade. But such is not the case. They cannot find the work. In March 1958, the Liverpool Lord Mayor convened a meeting of representatives of local authorities, industry

and commerce and other interested parties to discuss the problem of providing adequate employment for the school-leavers between 1960 and 1964. This meeting passed a resolution to hand the problem over to the Merseyside Development Committee and submitted their report on December 14, 1959.

What were the main findings of this report?

Firstly: what is the cause of unemployment?

Answer: 'Comparatively there is not only a high rate of unemployment, but also a high birth rate—that is to say, less jobs for more people. This to us is undoubtedly the most serious and important aspect of the whole problem'. But by the same logic it could be the 'low death rate'.

In this scientific age we have too many children. Our drug houses are marketing pills to keep down the population (and keep up profits). While in the Socialist countries every child born is an addition to the production power of that country, under capitalism it is another unwanted mouth to feed.

This report was not entirely barren of proposals for *solving* the problem of finding work for the youth of Merseyside. They had two recommendations:

1. *To sponsor a recruitment campaign for Her Majesty's Services.*

During the two World Wars, unemployment was our greatest recruiting sergeant. In these days they joined the Army to eat, not to fight. Today they put up for Parliament, not to get in, but to get out. So if the youth cannot get a job in industry, they can join the forces. Not a very original idea. The second recommendation of note was about as original as the first.

2. *'We suggest that serious consideration should be given by Commonwealth Governments desirous of stimulating emigration from this country, so as to encourage as many suitable young people as possible to accept the advantages that are offered by such Commonwealth countries.'*

What a prospect! So the youth can perhaps go to South Africa and maybe work for Cyril Lord, who has just left Lancashire and closed his factories for the cheap labour of the Commonwealth.

The Town and Planning Association have just issued a plan entitled *The Future Development of the North-West*. It says:

there is a case for giving some financial aid or tax concessions to all firms which develop in the North of England in such a way as to promote economic growth there, and check the migration southwards.

We are to continue the practice of bribing the wealthy industrialist to come and build in the development area. To get the employers to spread their enterprises to the North, it must be made worth their while. This is indeed the meaning of Tory freedom to develop; which roughly translated means, grab what you can. Of the 750 Industrial development schemes already approved for Merseyside, only 552 have been completed: of the 103,000 jobs estimated to result from this expansion, only 44,000 have materialised.

The urgent need at this moment is to increase the purchasing power of the working class: better wages, benefits and pensions would result in big improvements in the demand for consumer goods. So increase the pension of our aged people, and relieve the 4½ million of them who today live in want and misery. Cut the huge expenditure of war preparation and use the money saved to provide local authorities with low interest loans for houses, schools, hospitals and roads, and to scrap and rebuild all ships over twenty years old. End the embargo on East-West trade and give Britain her rightful independence to trade with all countries who desire to trade with us. Assist the under-developed countries to build up their economy by sending them not arms but technical equipment.

This was the policy behind the Merseyside Lobby to Parliament. This is the policy that can bring an end to the Tory rule in Britain.

SHIPBUILDING AND BRITISH ECONOMY

Ted Williams*

THE state of shipbuilding is an important sign of the strength or weakness of the economy of Britain. Not only has it a big contribution to make itself; when British industry and trade is in decline, it directly affects shipping and shipbuilding before long.

Britain's economy is slowing down, and each day more and more showing its inability to develop, under its melancholy succession of Tory governments in the last twelve years.

A warning signal is the present state of shipbuilding and ship-repairing, with yards closing down, many stopped or on their last

*As many of our readers will know, Mr. E. S. Williams is a member of the Executive Council of The United Society of Boilermakers, Blacksmiths, Shipbuilders and Structural Workers and is responsible for the important District No. 5, which includes London.—Ed., L.M.

contract. What is the outlook? And since joining the Common Market would not improve the prospect, what should be done?

First, the hard facts. The Shipbuilding Conference announce statistics each quarter of new orders booked, their estimated value, tons gross laid down, fitting out, on the berths or completed.

	Third quarter Tons Gross	First nine months Tons Gross
1961	160,000	502,000
1962	34,000	317,000

Although new orders booked each quarter give some basis for comparison, the figure which really tells a shipbuilding worker the shape of things to come is the Total Order Book.

Total Order Book at the twelve months ending September

	Tons Gross
1958	5,953,000
1959	4,473,000
1960	3,494,000
1961	2,791,000
1962	2,147,000

Even September 1958 was a steep fall from eighteen months earlier; for at March 31, 1957, there had been 6,741,000 tons gross on the order book. Today it is less than one-third that figure. What is more, the speed of decline has increased, as is shown by comparing the total orders at the end of the past eleven quarters:

Total Order Book at the end of each quarter

	Tons Gross
1960	
March	4,044,000
June	3,780,000
September	3,494,000
December	3,348,000
1961	
March	3,080,000
June	2,962,000
September	2,791,000
December	2,597,000
1962	
March	2,460,000
June	2,283,000
September	2,147,000

There were already disquieting features a year ago: for during the later months an unusually large number of orders had been cancelled—15 ships of 179,000 tons gross in 1961; contracts for

large passenger ships had come to an end, most of the new orders were for tankers, and only a low proportion were placed for British owners. This year the disquieting features have multiplied: there were 1,111,000 tons completed and only 563,000 new orders, lower than of recent years.

Unless there is a big increase in orders from British owners, things will become progressively worse: for throughout the world both in shipping and shipbuilding there is excessive capacity. The latest quarter's figures for British yards brings out how severe is this consistent depression in shipping.

According to the Shipbuilding Advisory Report (published on April 19, 1961, on the prospects of British shipbuilding) the annual capacity of British shipyards was 1,600,000 tons gross and it was utilised to the extent of 1,400,000 annually for the previous five years. For the years 1961 to 1965 the expected total was set at only 4,760,000 or 952,000 tons annually. On present orders it would seem by no means certain that even this will be utilised.

What does this mean in unemployment? According to the *Ministry of Labour Gazette* for October, in Great Britain there were 10,000 less workers employed in shipbuilding and shiprepairing at the end of September 1962 than the previous September: in mid-September 1962 the total unemployed in the industry was already 10,985, without taking into account the shipyards of Northern Ireland, which would mean well over another 1,250. But since then the position has worsened. For example, shortly before Christmas it was announced that some 1,400 Clyde shipyard workers were to be paid off because the Simons-Lobnitz yard at Renfrew was being bought up by a rival firm in order to close it down. British shipyard workers will never forget the creation and operation by financial interests of that instrument of economic destruction, the Shipbuilding Securities Ltd. This organisation was established during the recessions of the 'twenties and 'thirties for the purpose of buying up alleged uneconomic shipyards and then closing them down as a step towards the declared aim of a prosperous and competitive industry. Thousands of this country's finest shipyard workers were thrown out of work then by these closures, and left to walk the streets in a hopeless search for alternative work.

But nothing is inevitable, not even disaster. History shows that shipyard workers in Britain have learned to take through their trade union and political organisations, steps to ensure that improvements in working conditions, shorter hours and longer holiday periods

are progressed whenever possible and defended whenever the profit god looks in their direction for a sacrificial contribution to his insatiable appetite. Before coming to the question of what can and should be done, let us look briefly at what entering the Common Market might have to offer the industry.

Is this an organisation aimed at expanding world-wide trade? On the contrary. It puts a tariff wall round a small number of West European countries. In the words of the Labour Party Statement adopted by last year's Annual Conference at Brighton:

the apparent unwillingness of the Six to pay due regard to the economic problems of the hundreds of millions of desperately poor people in the Asian and African Commonwealth countries, raises most seriously the question of whether they are basically an inward-looking or an outward-looking community.

One might well be justified from this to conclude that the Six are very definitely an inward-looking community, with little if any regard for the problems of the wider world. Dependent as our ship-building industry is on world-wide as opposed to limited regional trade we must be concerned with the problems of economically backward countries, who in the world's tomorrow may well be our biggest customers. The British people must not allow themselves to be dragged into a community which is unresponsive to the plight of the under-developed countries; to do so would be taking a step away from the establishment of socialism which alone can finally resolve our economic difficulties, and under which an unprecedented world-wide expansion of production and trade can take place.

For many years our shipyard workers have urged Governments to enact legislation to ensure British ships being built in Britain. Many deputations have visited M.P.s at the House of Commons to demand that a halt should be called by the Government to the practice of British shipowners having vessels built and repaired on the Continent. They have argued that charity begins at home and are very mindful of the subsidies and other measures of relief afforded continental shipyards as compared with our own unsubsidised industry. Entry into the Common Market would mean that owing to the Treaty of Rome providing that governments in the E.E.C. shall not take any action which would restrict 'free competition', British shipyard workers would be practically defenceless against any steps shipowners might take to place orders in those yards within the Market Area which were capable of so-called 'economic' production. There can be little doubt that in such circumstances our shipyard workers would be exposed to demands

from employers for ever more concessions on wages and working conditions to achieve the goal of 'efficient working' which long ago they came to understand means reducing earnings *pro rata* to increased output.

Last July the Schleiker shipbuilding, steel and iron combine failed, after four years of active participation by Western Germany in the Common Market. Its failure caused a shudder of alarm in West Germany. Subsidies in one form or another are still provided by the Governments of countries signatory to the Treaty of Rome to their shipbuilding industries: according to report, the Schleiker shipyards despite their failure have orders to keep them fully employed until the end of 1963. Obviously, Britain's shipyards, unsubsidised as they are, entering the Market would herald an era of unparalleled hardship for the workpeople in the industry. Indeed, if the Schleiker yard could fail, with interchangeability and mobility of labour an accepted practice, what a bleak future would face British yards where higher earnings prevail and strict lines of trade practices operate. The *Rheinische Post* commenting on the Schleiker failure asked whether West Germany's industries were moving into a 'profitless phase', warning trade unions against a policy of higher wages and shorter hours, which might end by putting many of the population out of work. How do the Common Market countries propose to deal with the problem of trade recession, entering the 'profitless phase', or as the shipyard worker experiences this phenomenon, plain unemployment? According to M. Robert Marjolin, Vice-President of the E.E.C. Commission reporting to a press conference, the Commission had no clear-cut plan of action, only a vague recommendation 'to make a common approach to the difficulties of the shipbuilding industry'. Of course, the Treaty provides for the 'free movement' of labour within the Market Area; it does not provide for the policy of full employment. Britain's shipyard workers have over the past century experienced many occasions on which employers have attempted to introduce labour from distant areas to cut wages and hinder resistance by the trade unions to any worsening of conditions of employment. They will not permit employers once again to resort to such tactics.

British shipbuilders have naught to gain—but much to lose if our Commonwealth countries, with whom our ships carry out a continuous marine conveyor belt service in supplying large quantities of this country's necessities of life, are to be cut off and abandoned for the doubtful privilege of competing in a European Common

A Great Anti-Slavery



In the American Civil War, the industrialist North had suffered reverses at the hands of the Southern slave-owners, until President Abraham Lincoln finally declared for Emancipation, to be effective without compensation from January 1, 1863. In Britain the example of support shown by the Lancastrian cotton operatives was followed

Demonstration, 1863



other sections when a new 'Emancipation Society' was set up and held immense meetings in Manchester, Liverpool, Bradford and London. This wildly enthusiastic demonstration was held at Exeter Hall, London, on January 29, 1863—just one hundred years ago this month.

Market. This would indeed be surrendering the substance of work already enjoyed in the maintenance and development of our marine contacts with the Commonwealth, for the illusory shadow of obtaining orders in Western Europe, under difficult conditions.

Meanwhile take a look at American aspirations. On October 11, 1962, the Trade Expansion Act was signed by President Kennedy and became law. This Act gives the administration powers to trade off tariffs in international negotiations, and turn towards freer world trading arrangements, which will enable her to exploit her lead in industrial mass production and in modern agriculture. America also intends to help herself to the Commonwealth market. There would be little prospect of British shipyard workers participating in maintaining any American ships required to handle the estimated increase of American trade with Europe and the Commonwealth. The protective barrier that America has erected around its marine fleet is only too well known by shipyard workers in Britain, who daily witness very minor repairs being executed in our docks upon American vessels, whose owners are compelled by their own regulations to have major repairs carried out in U.S. shipyards.

British shipyard workers must say 'No' to the Common Market. Instead, they should press the government to extend credits to enable British yards to compete with those overseas. They should encourage a policy of 'Scrap and Re-build' all older ships. And above all, shipyard workers should take every step to hasten the end of the present Tory Government whose policies, or lack of them, has so reduced the economic position of our country, that before the world we now appear to be begging entry into the Market. We should be standing free, committed only to a policy of peace and progress.

ALL WHO ARE NOT SOCIALISTS ARE PESSIMISTS

The respectable critics have been very much down on Ibsen's play of *A Doll's House*, now being acted at the Novelty Theatre, and profess to be shocked. . . . I note the critics say that Ibsen's plays are pessimistic; so they are—to pessimists; and all intelligent persons who are not Socialists are pessimists. But the representation of the corruption of Society carries with it in Ibsen's works aspirations for a better state of things, and that is not pessimism. Therefore Socialists recognise in them another token of the new dawn.

(William Morris, in *Commonweal*, June 22, 1889.)

WEST GERMAN SCANDAL TRIAL

D. N. Pritt, Q.C.

ON November 29, 1962, the hearing began in West Berlin, outside the territories of West Germany (the Federal Republic of Germany), before an Administrative Court of West Germany, of proceedings initiated as long ago as October 20, 1959, by the then Minister of the Interior, an ex-Nazi named Schroeder (now Foreign Minister), calling for the banning of the V.V.N. (Union of Victims of Nazi Persecution), on the allegation that it is 'contrary to the Constitution'. The hearing had already been postponed on two occasions, on one of which it was revealed that the government attorney in charge of it had been an active Nazi jurist.

One Dr. Werner was the President of the Court on that November 29; he was a Nazi, having joined the S.A. (Brown Shirts) in 1933 and the N.S.D.A.P. (the Nazi Party) in 1937; he had held an important legal-educational post under the Nazi régime, had been active in the V.A.D. (organisation of Germans abroad), the foreign limb of Nazi militarist aggression, and in his thesis for his doctorate in 1934 he had eulogised the Nazi 'mission'.

Even without the disclosures about Dr. Werner, this proceeding has shocked millions of people everywhere, especially, I am happy to record, in West Germany itself; it had been mainly West German resistance that brought about the earlier postponements. The proceeding has shocked me too, but it has not surprised me, for I know the ruling-class and government of West Germany too well to be surprised by anything that they do to revive or encourage Nazis, or to destroy democracy.

At the opening of the second day of the hearing, on November 30, a West German Communist (ex-Communist, to be accurate; for the Communist Party is amongst the many democratic and anti-Nazi organisations banned and dissolved by the West German government and its courts) rose in open court and denounced Dr. Werner as a Nazi, giving full and accurate details. This denunciation created a sensation, for Dr. Werner's past was not generally known; and it threw the Court into great confusion. After some hurried telephone conversations with Bonn, one of which appropriately enough was with State Secretary Globke (a Nazi with an exceptionally black record, retained by Dr. Adenauer in a confidential position in the face of growing public pressure, inspired largely by the

V.V.N.), the court adjourned for a week; and even before that week had passed it announced a further indefinite adjournment.

What is at the bottom of this case? What exactly is the V.V.N.? What is the substance of the charge against it? What is the nature of the government of the new and powerful Nato state of West Germany, and of the ruling-class which it serves? And why do they stage this hearing far outside their own territories?

First, the V.V.N. It is an organisation to which any German should be proud to belong, for it comprises those who suffered under the Nazis or who fought against Nazism, within or outside Germany, in the resistance movement. It was founded in 1947, with the express approval of all four occupying Powers; it had a 'Praesidium' of distinguished Germans; amongst its members was Dr. Adenauer. (He resigned a few years later, alleging that it had been 'captured by Communists'. In reality he left because it was plainly opposed to the militarist and aggressive policies he was going to pursue; its leadership when he left was substantially the same as it was when it was founded, and it is substantially the same today. It has never been even mainly Communist.)

Most of the members of the V.V.N. spent long periods in the concentration camps and prisons of Hitler; they constituted the political cream of the German people in the twelve disgraceful and terrible years of Nazi barbarism, risking their lives to fight it. Thus they both redeemed as far as they could the honour of the German people and greatly helped the anti-Fascist struggle of the allied nations. Its members were—and could scarcely not be—of every variety of political opinion, with the one common link that they all opposed Nazism. Perhaps half of them were Communists, for half at least of those Germans whose courageous resistance qualified them for membership were Communists.

It should be—and it is—a cause for pride to belong to the V.V.N. It should be a matter of pride for the government of West Germany to protect and encourage the organisation, and it is in truth the binding duty of that government to do so; it is a body of exactly the kind covered by the provisions of the Potsdam Agreement which establish the legality of such organisations and call for their protection and encouragement; and the Potsdam Agreement is part of International Law which, by the very Constitution which the V.V.N. is accused of infringing, is made an integral part of the law of Germany.

The objects of the V.V.N. were and are to secure compensation

for victims of Nazi persecution, to achieve the root and branch destruction of Nazism and militarism in Germany, to build up a new democratic Germany under the rule of persons untainted by militarism and Nazism, and to educate young Germans in a spirit of militant anti-Fascist democracy. These objects are in faithful accordance with the Potsdam Agreement—and are anathema to the present rulers of West Germany.

Next, what is the charge against the V.V.N., to establish that it is not fit to live? And what are the true reasons for the move? And what other organisations are sought to be implicated?

The charge is based on the assertion that the V.V.N. offends against Article 9 of the West German Constitution; this Article proclaims the right of all Germans to form organisations, and adds that organisations 'whose objects or activities . . . are directed against the constitutional order or the conception of international friendship (*Volkerfreundschaft*) are prohibited'. Now, the Constitution, surprisingly enough in the light of the activities of the government, is full of noble sentiments; it talks of the liberation of the German people from Nazism, and it expressly condemns and makes criminal as contrary to the Constitution all activities calculated and intended to disturb the peaceful co-existence of peoples, including any preparations for aggressive war. It is not even content with that; in its Preamble, it proclaims the responsibility of the German people before God and man, and their determination, to serve the peace of the world in a united Europe. (It seems that amongst the many fields in which the British ruling class can no longer claim to lead the world is that of pious hypocrisy.)

The assertion that the V.V.N. is anti-Constitutional is based on the lie that it is 'under Communist influence'—ever-ready substitute for argument. No unlawful action is alleged—nothing but political opinion and control. (Just to add a further touch of hypocrisy, the Constitution expressly provides for freedom of expression of opinion, with no limitations beyond the 'provisions of the general law, and laws for the protection of youth and of personal honour'.)

There is little doubt that the real motive of the attack on the V.V.N. is to silence its consistent opposition to the militarist policies of re-armament and atomic armament, and its exposure of the hordes of Nazis in high office, with whom I will deal below; it is noteworthy that government hostility was greatly intensified after its campaign against Oberlaender and Globke. It is ironical that a body with such activities should be charged with offending against the Con-

stitution, which by incorporating the Potsdam Agreement prohibited just those activities of the government which the V.V.N. is attacking; it is in truth the ruling-class, with its militarist chauvinist aggressive policies that should be in the dock as anti-Constitutional.

It is significant that the Government is not content with attempting to murder only the V.V.N. It seeks also in the same proceedings to affect at least two other bodies. Firstly, it aims to prohibit all activity in Germany of the F.I.R. (Fédération Internationale de Résistants), the great federation of some forty resistance organisations in various countries. It thus seeks to cut off its citizens (these victims of neo-Nazi persecution) from all links with the survivors of the heroic struggles of those liberating, democratic, anti-fascists who earned our undying gratitude in underground and resistance movements. It seems that this ruling class and government has travelled so far along the neo-Nazi road that it cannot even let its people know anything of the history of anti-Nazism either in Germany or outside, lest they draw unfavourable conclusions about their own Government.

The other body affected is a publishing house, the Rodenberg Verlag, of Frankfurt on Main. This is sought to be banned as being under V.V.N. control. It is in fact an independent firm, in no sense belonging to or controlled by the V.V.N. It has published material for the V.V.N., and it has published a good deal of other books with a healthy anti-Nazi tendency; in particular, it publishes the weekly *Die Tat*, which played a leading part in the ultimately successful campaign against Oberlaender. The government plainly cannot endure anyone who reminds it of the anti-Fascist activities of the German people in the past, and thus of the Fascist activities of many of its officials and its ruling-class. Bluntly, it is by now Nazi, and hates all anti-Nazis. (One need scarcely add that, while this concern is sought to be banned, a large number of openly Nazi publishing houses go their way unmolested.)

Next, what of this ruling class and its government? I have already given some glimpses of it, but we must have a closer view.

West Germany is ruled by the same group of finance-capitalist monopolists who ruled Germany before and during the Hitler period, and who picked out Hitler to do their work for them. They are not nice people; one bunch of them, for example, ran Auschwitz as a profitable source of industrial slave-labour, and took a side profit on the supply of the poison gas which was used on the no-longer-exploitable victims. Even richer than they were under Hitler,

even more highly concentrated, even more powerful, and just as ruthless, they have been taken out of prisons by the British and Americans, given back their power and their possessions, and left to run their country. That is the ruling class which the Adenauer government serves; naturally enough, its whole governmental machine, ministries, army and navy, courts, police and schools are permeated with Nazis. Amongst Ministers themselves, there were above all Oberlaender and Globke, two men with black Nazi pasts so well-known that I need not describe them here. The campaign to root out Oberlaender lasted for many months, growing larger and larger, until even the stubborn 'fox' Adenauer had to give way and dismiss him (shortly afterwards giving him another good but less prominent post). When I asked a sober-minded German liberal lawyer in 1959 why Adenauer did not just get rid of Oberlaender, he replied that he was keeping him in order to retain the large Nazi vote for his party! (It may have been, too, that the ruling class would not lightly let the man be sacked.) The campaign against Globke has not yet succeeded; as we have seen, he was still available on the telephone on November 30 to deal with the crisis of Dr. Werner.

In the ministries at various levels, there are not only many Nazis, but not a few members of the S.S. which the Nuremberg tribunal declared to be a criminal organisation. About 80 per cent of the personnel of the Foreign Office, including the Minister, are Nazis.

As for the new 'defence forces' and the police, all the 170 admirals and generals held high rank under Hitler; and when I spent some time in West Germany in 1959 to 1960, the executive head of the police force of *every* town in the large 'Land' of North-Rhine-Westphalia was an S.S. man.

In education, there are still many Nazi teachers; and all references to the traditions and victories of the working-class movement, to the crimes of the Nazis, and to the resistance struggles, have been removed from the school books, and replaced by accounts of the 'magnificent victories' of Hitler's armies in 1939-1942.

As for political or semi-political organisations, there are 1,100 'traditional unions' preaching chauvinism and militarism with the approval and even encouragement of the government; forty of them are openly and expressly S.S. bodies. There is not a single clearly anti-Fascist organisation left alive, *except* the V.V.N.

Then the judiciary; in spite of many exposures and consequent dismissals or retirements, there are still on the judicial benches

1,100 men who, either as judges or as prosecutors, administered the savage Nazi laws, racial and otherwise. Nearly all of them have been parties to passing death sentences for trivial offences. (How would it feel for a member of the V.V.N. to come up before a judge in West Germany who was not just a Nazi like Dr. Werner but who had, say, sentenced a Jewess to death for handing a bit of bread to that V.V.N. man as the S.S. marched him through the streets?)

And even apart from their nurturing of Nazi officials, this government has systematically rooted out every fragment of civil liberty from their country; they have made a dirty word out of what they call 'extra-parliamentary criticism', *i.e.*, any criticism whatever made anywhere except in the parliament, where it can be controlled by the Whips and the Ministers; and they treat all serious criticism of their policies especially that of rearmament as equivalent to treason. The prosecution of *Der Spiegel*, which has fortunately created a great stir both in Germany and outside, is all of a piece with their treatment of hundreds of lesser victims. They have used their courts to prohibit as anti-Constitutional, or to persecute on other grounds, every democratic organisation in the country except the trade unions, who have so far been too strong to be attacked; but even these are now threatened under 'Emergency legislation'. The Communist Party, the peace movement, organisations of women and of youth, organisations seeking to hold a referendum on rearmament, and many others, have thus come under the axe.

In matters of policy, they not only preach all the anti-Soviet doctrines of Nato, but openly demand the recovery of all territories that were within Germany in 1939, and show these territories in their official maps as already part of the country. They proclaim that East Germany, the German Democratic Republic, which they still call 'the Soviet Occupation Zone', is not to be reunited but 'liberated'—a code word for conquest by military force. So little regard has Adenauer for any idea that the countries formerly allied against Germany might not like these expansionist ideas that as recently as November 5, 1962, he told his Press Conference in Washington that his government maintains its claim to those portions of Czechoslovakia which Chamberlain gave to Hitler in 1939. And any suggestion, even from America, that the Berlin question might be settled peacefully makes him very angry indeed, although he does not yet address Kennedy and Macmillan in the gutter language he habitually uses against his political opponents.

Lastly, why, as a sort of additional outrage, is this hearing to be

held not in West Germany but in Berlin? It has been made clear many times, and is now beyond argument, that Berlin is no part of West Germany; and under international law no state has any power or right to conduct its judicial activities in any foreign country without the permission of the government of that country. It follows that in this case the governing authorities in Berlin, and more particularly the British government, in whose sector this court is sitting, are allowing this outrage, and are accomplices in it. Why have the West German government picked Berlin? Is it just insolence? It could be, for they have on many occasions shown as much contempt for foreign opinion as they have for common decency. But it is more probable that they are hoping to establish some legitimation—a sort of squatter's right—for a future claim to treat West Berlin as part of West Germany. And it is just possible that they feared that if it were staged in West Germany there might have been unpleasantly large demonstrations at the court. This makes it all the more important that our government here should be compelled to stop the performance.

It is a very healthy development that the proceedings have excited so much opposition both abroad and in Germany; and the unmasking of Dr. Werner and the obvious dilemma into which it has thrown the prosecution, leading to an indefinite adjournment which even if it should prove to be short involves great loss of face and gives the opposition time to rally more forces, is a very hopeful start. We can rely on the West German opposition, led by such figures as Dr. Niemoller, to carry on the fight in Germany; but we have our tasks here in Britain. We must put a stop to the toleration and encouragement of Nazis and Fascists; we must insist on our government not permitting this case to be heard in West Berlin; and we must get rid of Messrs. Macmillan *et hoc venom omne*.

LIBERAL PARTY POLICY

Katherine Hood

AN enthusiastic delegate at this year's Liberal Assembly went so far as to say that the Liberals were 'giving a new meaning to "Land of Hope and Glory".' This was clearly a bit of a floater. For the Liberals prefer their new 'image' to remain untarnished by jingoism from their Edwardian past. Rather should it be draped in talk about 'human values', 'people count', 'the chance to make a dream come true'.

Whose dream? It is time for a careful answer to this question. For there is no doubt that the Liberal Party, the core of whose following is made up of disgruntled small businessmen and frustrated professional workers, is now gaining ground amongst wider circles—particularly among the generation too young to remember the Liberal past. The round of by-elections in November proved that the swing to the Liberals is persisting. In both the constituencies where Labour gained a seat—Woodside and South Dorset—the percentage of the votes polled by Labour actually went down. Labour won these seats because the Liberals took more votes from the Tories than from Labour.

The basic cause of the Liberal revival is, of course, massive discontent with the Tories. But in addition many of the new Liberal voters are genuinely moved by humane and progressive impulses; there is a healthy 'anti-establishment' mood involved. The sad thing is that the 'establishment' in their minds embraces not only the Government but Her Majesty's Official Opposition. This is the price we pay for Gaitskellism.

While Mr. Grimond scores debating points indiscriminately against official Tory and official Labour, the latter persist in replying that the Liberals have 'no policy'. This reply is not only inept, it happens to be untrue. And to get the Liberal voter to understand what he is actually voting for is the first step towards showing him that the cure for his discontents lies elsewhere.

Take first the crucial issue of our age—the H-bomb. There is a confused idea among certain C.N.D. supporters that on this question the Liberals are 'better than Gaitskell'. In practice the official policy of the Liberals is almost indistinguishable from that of Mr. Gaitskell and Mr. George Brown. The Liberals want Britain to cease manufacturing British nuclear weapons, but they want Britain to stay in Nato and Nato to have nuclear weapons. And they want the Government to 'strengthen political control over the use of nuclear weapons within Nato'. On nuclear tests the Liberal Assembly wanted all tests to cease 'pending a further effort to reach agreement at the 18-Nations Conference'. But it *defeated* a resolution which declared opposition to all future nuclear tests by any nation.

Take the second crucial question of our age—that of Britain's entry into the Common Market. The Liberals are so keen on the Common Market they almost give the impression of having invented it; they were actively campaigning for Britain's entry two and a

half years before the Tory Government decided to start negotiations for membership in 1961. The resolution on the subject adopted at the recent Liberal Assembly urges H.M. Government 'to indicate that it accepts the political and economic purposes which inspired the formation of the Community', and to press its negotiations for membership to a successful conclusion. Its resolution lays down no conditions whatever for British entry. The Rome Treaty is not only accepted lock, stock and barrel, but idolised:

This Assembly, concerned with the inability of both Labour and Conservative Parties to grasp the full potentialities of the European Community, calls for vigorous efforts to achieve closer political unity in Europe.

To this end the resolution calls for a strengthening of the European Parliament 'by giving it greater powers and arranging for direct elections of its members'. Now it is perfectly true that one of the dangers seen by opponents of the Common Market is that decision-making rests in the hands of a bunch of non-elected bureaucrats, so that in one sense it is arguable that this Liberal proposition might represent some advance. However, the Liberals themselves are doubtful about actually achieving this reform. The mover of the resolution said: 'I do not say it should be elected tomorrow. It is an evolutionary process'. Whether or not such reforms are achieved, the Liberals are still prepared to bind themselves in chains to the Rome Treaty, insisting that this does not mean a surrender of British sovereignty but 'pooling' British sovereignty. Pooling with whom? Krupp and Co.? Only one other organisation shows the same enthusiasm for European political unity, and that is Sir Oswald Mosley's Union Movement. And it is time to underline that when Mr. Grimond makes his stirring appeal to the 'spirit of adventure' in young people, he is not talking about the spirit which imbues the space conquerors, or indeed that which causes young people to risk their liberty on the banks of Holy Loch; he is talking about the 'adventure' of making common cause with all the most dangerous and reactionary forces in Western Europe.

What do the Liberals have to offer the trade unionist? In case any young worker is under the impression that the Liberals offer a chance to break loose from the paralysing grip of the right-wing trade union leaders, it should be made clear that what the Liberals want is just what the right-wing trade union leaders are always seeking—closer ties with the boss. This 'forward-looking' aspiration is known among the Liberals as 'partnership'.

Mr. George Scott who moved the resolution on 'a new industrial democracy' said that until now in the trade unions:

too great an emphasis had been placed on winning wage increases whose real value was often negligible. The Liberal Party asked the unions to recognise that there were many other benefits of more lasting value that they should be seeking for their members.

(*Guardian*, September 20, 1962.)

Foremost among these 'wider benefits' which the Liberals demand is a great extension of 'co-partnership' and 'employee-shareholding' schemes. There is, of course, nothing new about such schemes which have been ticking over here and there ever since the 'nineties. One advantage of them to an employer is that it is much easier to impose a cut in the dividend paid on employees' shares than it is to impose a wage cut. Thus the directors of I.C.I.—perhaps the leading example in this country of employee share-holding arrangements—decided last year that the amount being paid out in dividends on employee shares was more than could be justified 'having regard to a fair balance between stockholders and employees'; so the share-out has been revised—downwards. It seems that employee shares are not necessarily of such 'lasting value' after all. The second advantage of such schemes to the employer is that they can be used as a device for identifying the worker's interests more closely with the employer's and therefore undermining trade union activity for better wages and conditions. By co-ownership, said Mr. Banks, chairman of the Liberal Party Executive, 'much of the cause for suspicion between capital and labour, which holds up the establishment of a sensible national incomes policy, will be eliminated'. Get the idea?

An amendment was moved and carried in face of much opposition from the platform providing for employees to have the right to elect directors to a company's board. This indeed is a somewhat radical proposal. Can it be that the delegates were moved by grisly recollections of what happened to the employees of that pillar of the Liberal establishment, the *News Chronicle*? The survival of this proposal as a permanent Liberal policy is doubtful, as the *Guardian* tells us that it has produced a serious quarrel in the Party.

What do the Liberals offer the old age pensioner? At present retirement pensions are not enough to live on so that those who have no other additional source of income are obliged to apply to the National Assistance Board for supplementation after a means test. The Labour Party at its annual conference demanded that the standard pension should be at least equal to National Assistance—

in other words old age pensioners would get as of right the amount they now get after a means test. The Liberal Party, on the other hand, are in favour of an unspecified increase in retirement pensions, together with a public campaign to prove that 'National Assistance Acts are part of the welfare services to which those in need are entitled as of right'. The Tories have been carrying out such a campaign for years: it has not made the means test popular.

What do the Liberals have to offer the homeless? A call at the Assembly from a Stepney delegate who wanted a programme of 500,000 new houses a year and the repeal of the Rent Act went unheeded. Instead delegates were told that the party's housing committee had decided that only a 'modest' increase in the total number of houses built annually would be necessary—the target would be 300,000 to 330,000 a year for England and Wales (about what the Tories were achieving in the mid-fifties). But the Assembly decided in favour of the abolition of 'indiscriminate' rent subsidies from local rates and the introduction of rent rebate schemes (in other words, means tests for council tenants) thus apparently trying to do by compulsion what every Tory Housing Minister has tried to do by persuasion for the last seven years.

And though much was said in debate about the uncontrolled spread of British cities and the need for regional planning, the conference ended with this sixteen-word clarion call:

This Assembly categorically states that it is not in favour of the Nationalisation of the Land.

So much for official Liberal policy—it seems to bear little relation to the confused aspirations of the new Liberal rank and file, much of which in the localities is composed of well-meaning people whose civilised attitude contrasts favourably with that of the brash, go-getting ambitious young Tories to whom we are accustomed. But the fact is that the Liberal policy can hardly be other than it is. For the Liberals believe in capitalism and their policy is designed to keep capitalism going at a time when it is beginning to look a little frayed at the edges. And as we know inevitably under capitalism, 'freedom' becomes equated with 'free enterprise' and 'human values' are corrupted by the values of a profit-making system. The Liberal revival indeed presents Socialists with both a challenge and an opportunity.

To understand is hard. Once one understands, action is easy.

Sun Yat-Sen.

GREECE AND THE COMMON MARKET

Costas Koliyannis *

[On November 1, 1962, Greece became an associate member of the Common Market. At a time when the British Government is trying to push African countries of the Commonwealth into joining the Common Market as associate members, this analysis of the effect Greece's association on its economy and people is of special interest.—Ed., L.M.]

THERE can be no doubt about the results of Greece's association with the Common Market. The Greek economy will be increasingly at the mercy of West European monopolies.

In a speech before the Athens Chamber of Commerce in February, 1962, the Greek Minister of Economic Co-ordination, Mr. Papaligouras, admitted that the free movement of capital and labour inside the Common Market will create a state of 'open doors' and in this way it will be easy for the West European monopolies to infiltrate very quickly into all fields of Greek economy. West German capital, which is the leading force in the Common Market, is going to exploit these 'open doors' to the full, since it plans not only to acquire a predominant position in Greece itself, but also to use Greece for its penetration into the countries of the Near East. Indeed, as has been revealed by the Government daily newspaper *Kathimerini* of Athens on February 23, 1962,

the policy of 'open doors' has been imposed on insistent suggestions emanating from abroad, and especially from Bonn.

This policy will allow West European capital to establish in Greece whatever industries it thinks most profitable. The expected onslaught of foreign monopolies has produced deep uneasiness among Greek businessmen. The 'Association of Greek Industrialists', the Athens and Piraeus Chambers of Commerce, the professional associations, the Organisations of Greek Artisans have demanded that Greek industrial enterprises and handicraft industries be protected from West European monopoly penetration, which will result from Greece's association with the Common Market.

They have every reason to be worried. Up to now Greek industry has been protected by very high import duties. But it will be unable to survive after the elimination of this protection, when West

*First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Greek Communist Party.

European industrial goods will be able to enter Greece freely. The Athens Chamber of Commerce has published a report in which it points out that after the protectionist import duties have been removed, 67,000 out of 142,000 workers employed by the most important Greek industrial enterprises will become redundant because over one-half of these enterprises will close down, unable to withstand foreign competition. 'All their machinery will have to be sold as scrap', says the report. This is likely to happen despite the fact that in the agreements concluded with the Common Market countries provision is made that Greece will be allowed to keep her duties on industrial imports for twenty-two years, so that Greek industry may have a chance to use this breathing space in order to become competitive with the industries of Western Europe.

Meanwhile, with the alleged aim of cutting down costs to make Greek industrial production more competitive a ruthless offensive is being waged against the standard of living of the working class. We are now witnessing mass dismissals of workers and a considerable drop in agricultural prices, whilst thousands of artisans (some 30,000 tailors and 8,000 shoemakers, for instance) are being threatened by the setting up of huge foreign industries for the production of ready-made clothes and shoes. Nobody believes in Greece that it will ever be possible under the present régime for Greek industry to catch up with that of West Germany, France or Italy in a matter of twenty-two years. Indeed, under the present rate of development Greek industry in twenty-two years' time will lag even more behind than it does today. One needs only to consider that productivity in Greek industry, agriculture and services is just one-third of that of the Common Market countries and that in 1960 new investments in West Germany amounted to £1,400 million, in France to £1,400 million, in Holland to over £1,050 million and in Greece only to £6 million. In fact, in terms of productivity and technology Greece lags fifty years behind.

Even before Greece had joined the Six, trade with the Common Market countries had been developing most unfavourably for her. Greek exports during the first nine months of 1961 amounted to £9 million against £12 million for the same period of 1960. Greek imports from the Common Market countries on the other hand, which were worth £50 million for the first nine months of 1960, increased to £61 million during the same period of 1961. The enormous trade gap between Greece and the Six increased during the above period from £41 to £49 million. One can well imagine

to what catastrophic proportions it will further increase, with West European industrial goods entering free of import duties.

In recent years Greece's trade with the socialist countries has been developing very favourably. Greek exports went up from £10 million during the first nine months of 1960 to £11 million in the same period of 1961, whilst imports from Eastern Europe amounted to £13 million during the first nine months of 1961. Greece's association with the Common Market however will deal a heavy blow to this promising development. The first victim will be the trade between Greece and the German Democratic Republic. Indeed, protocol 4 of the agreement stipulates that West Germany

has the right to control Greek trade agreements with German territories upon which it exerts no sovereign rights.

This means that Greece will not be able to trade with the G.D.R. without the permission of Bonn. Incidentally during 1961 Greek trade with the G.D.R. increased by 100 per cent.

The association with the Common Market will also impose restrictions upon Greece's trade with other countries as well. The relevant protocols state that before signing any trade agreement with third countries, Greece must first consult with the leaders of the Common Market. The Karamanlis Government alleges that Greece's association with the Common Market will benefit greatly her agriculture. This is patently untrue. Indeed, the Six have not been able yet to agree among themselves about a common agricultural policy. And anyway, they seem very reluctant to assist Greek agriculture. During the last few years Greece has exported to the Common Market countries, on an average, 25-30,000 tons of tobacco annually. The Six have now promised to continue to buy from Greece just the same amount. That is all. Greece produces some 500,000 tons of citrus fruit annually. The Common Market countries will allow us now to export to them not more than 22,000 tons each year. Italy exports to the Common Market some 150,000 tons of grapes annually and now can veto any further Greek export of grapes to the Six over a 15,000-ton limit.

Why then has the Karamanlis government decided to join the Common Market? It has done so under the strongest American pressure and also because Greece's ruling class and the present government try in exchange for association to secure from the West even stronger support for their reactionary régime.

The Greek people, however, oppose the association. Workers, peasants, artisans, businessmen, the middle class have come out

strongly against any association with the Common Market, because it will mean the ruin of the Greek economy, and because they consider the Common Market as an instrument of cold war. Unfortunately not only the top leaders of the trade unions who are government agents, but also the political parties of the Centre have taken the same line as the Karamanlis administration. The Greek Communist Party, however, the Union of the Democratic Left (E.D.A.) and the Greek Agrarian Party (E.A.K.) have come out resolutely against the association with E.E.C. These parties support a policy of free trade with all countries and especially with the socialist states which are willing and able to assist Greece in her economic development without attaching any 'strings'.

THE VATICAN COUNCIL

The Rev. Canon S. Evans

THERE is a naïve view held by many people in Great Britain that the Roman Catholic Church is one homogeneous mass in which all think alike; and that this is particularly true of the clergy. The situation in this country where the Roman Church is a minority church and is therefore driven to greater cohesion has added strength to this view, although it has never been a true one and in countries where the Roman Catholic Church is the major one; just as the Church of England, it reflects within itself the contradictions of the country. Now, of course, 'the homogeneous mass' view is being completely destroyed by the Vatican Council, which demonstrates that there is no department of the life and activity of the Church upon which the most diverse views are not held by the Bishops themselves.

The election of Pope John XXIII was itself a sign of dissatisfaction among the Cardinals. Too many papal nephews held good jobs in the Vatican to encourage respect for the institution among those who were close to it and for a whole variety of reasons some change was essential and there can be no real doubt that John XXIII was elected as a moderate reformer. His first action was to increase the number of the College of Cardinals, increase the non-Italian element within it, and bring in Africa and Asia. His next step appears to have been unknown to all his colleagues, it was the announcement that he proposed to call an 'Ecumenical Council'.

Since the Council at Jerusalem recorded in the Acts of the Apostles the Church has been governed by Councils, Assemblies of

Bishops with their advisors so that the whole world church has been able to take fundamental decisions. The Anglican Articles speak of 'General Councils' and this is the meaning of the phrase 'Ecumenical Council'. Since the growth of Church divisions, however, there has been no possibility of calling a real General Council of the whole Church and there is even disagreement as to which of the General Councils of the past are to be regarded as such, and which decisions are therefore to be counted as binding. Neither the Orthodox Church nor the Anglican Church, nor any of the Protestant Churches can regard this Vatican Council as Ecumenical.

The Roman Church has held three Councils since the Reformation: the Council of Trent (between 1545 and 1563), the Vatican Council (1869-1870) and the present Council. The Council of Trent became the spearhead of the Counter-Reformation. It made minimal concessions to the whole spirit of the Reformation which had swept across Europe and poised against it an uncompromising rigidity which has dominated Roman practice ever since, although there has been no period in which it has not been challenged. Further than this it consolidated the *rapprochement* between the Roman Church and political reaction. Both of these things were carried forward by the Vatican Council of 1869-1870 which was brought to an end with its work unfinished, by the invasion of Rome by the Italian troops which drove out the French defenders of the Vatican. Before its hurried dissolution it had rejected the views of its finest scholars, rejected any kind of democratic procedure and decreed papal infallibility. This has generally been regarded as its most important work whereas in fact of much greater practical significance has been the decree which made the Pope the 'universal ordinary', that is, gave him complete jurisdiction over the local bishops. It is from this decree, for example, that much of the difficulty has arisen in regularising the relations between the Roman Church and the Governments of Socialist countries.

The real significance of the second Vatican Council now meeting is that it is the first decisive reversal not merely of 1870 but of Trent itself. Which trend within the Council wins on this point or that is wholly subsidiary to the underlying fact, which the agenda itself makes clear, that the overhanging cloud of the counter-reformation begins to be blown away and that the Roman Church begins to stride into the modern world: the consequences of this will be far-reaching. One significant reversal of 1870 is already apparent. Knowledgeable observers have long prophesied that some time

within the twentieth century the administration of the Roman Church would break down from sheer over-centralisation: already the tide has set the other way and one of the main demands before the Council is for more local autonomy.

The Council is free to discuss whatever its members decide. Three thousand bishops, archbishops, and abbots are free to attend. Four hundred and forty of them, together with three hundred and eighty-seven other experts have been involved in the preparatory work which has been divided into commissions to discuss theology; bishops; discipline; the religious (*i.e.*, monks and nuns); sacraments; studies; missions; the Eastern churches; the Laity and Liturgy, while there have been created special secretariats for mass media and Christian Unity.

It will be seen that the concern of the Council is not directly political but for all that, many of its conclusions will have far-reaching social and political effect. It is difficult to say how the tendencies within it are balanced: some bishops are clearly progressive, others such as the Spanish are clearly reactionary. Who will win or what compromises will result it is impossible to predict, although in the early days on certain matters concerned with voting those who came most desirous of change had their way.

It must never be forgotten that winds can change in their direction but this *caveat* having been entered it can be noted that certain initial straws in the wind have been wafted in sound directions. It has not been noted in this country that in the Pope's address to the Polish bishops he spoke of 'the western territories recovered after centuries' which is a significant repudiation of German revisionism; during the midst of the Cuban crisis the Pope appealed to the peoples of the world for peace; the presidential committee has issued an appeal to the world stressing 'the dignity of man and all that contributes towards the real brotherhood of nations'. And in his broadcast address on the opening of the Council, Pope John XXIII said: 'We repeat today that solemn warning. We appeal to all rulers not to remain deaf to the cry of mankind'.

Here at least is an approach which all can endorse. The Soviet *Literaturnaya Gazeta* has already endorsed it in an article which paid tribute to the Pope for his 'realistic position' on several present-day issues, and which saw hope in new trends in Vatican policy on the working out of relations between Catholics and Communists and on working for world peace.

BOOKS

Journey into the Past

Ivan Maisky

Hutchinson. 288 pp. 30s.

IN NOVEMBER, 1912, a somewhat forlorn Russian émigré landed at Folkestone from Paris via Boulogne; he spoke no English and he had not the five pounds which the regulations demanded of a third class passenger; he was on the point of being turned back when he produced a document proving he was a refugee, and was allowed to go on his way to London. A poor, almost penniless émigré. Twenty years later: 'at half past ten, two state coaches . . . arrived at the Embassy. . . . From the first coach stepped a high Foreign Office official who graciously bowed and said that he had been instructed to accompany me from the Embassy to the Palace. . . . I was in evening dress, complete with patent leather shoes, black overcoat and silk hat'. The forlorn émigré had become His Excellency the Soviet Ambassador!

This second volume of Ivan Maisky's Memoirs does not deal with his experiences as an Ambassador but gives us a truly interesting story of his long sessions in the British Museum, the life and privations of himself and his fellow émigrés, and his very shrewd and interesting appraisal of the British trade union and labour movement.

Several of the outstanding revolutionaries receive special attention and they are surely worthy of it. Chicherin, born into one of the oldest aristocratic families in Russia and, as a Foreign Office official, he wore the best clothes, ate the best food, and drank the choicest wines;

then as a Marxist and revolutionary he became an ascetic. Maisky writes: 'I can easily recall the Chicherin of those days. The solitary window of his dark attic looked out on the grimy roofs of London'. Had he been a churchman he would have been well on the way to canonisation, but being a revolutionary he went on the way to Brixton gaol instead. There he was confined for several months and it was only when Litvinov was accorded recognition as the *de facto* representative of the Soviet Union that he succeeded in getting Chicherin released from Brixton, a habitation to which he himself was sent a year later. Maxim Litvinov was the leader of the Bolshevik group in Britain. In the Communist Club in Charlotte Street the émigrés met, discussed, sang, danced, and gave theatrical performances; but also, most of them being quite poor, got tea and sandwiches at a very cheap rate. In the discussions with all the other groups, Mensheviks, Centrist Mensheviks, Social Revolutionaries, Bundists and others, Litvinov took a leading part, always putting the clear Marxist, Bolshevik line. But, like Chicherin, his turn came and off he went to gaol; in the young Soviet Republic Bruce Lockhart had been arrested. Finally, an exchange was effected and Litvinov returned to the Soviet Union.

In my early days in the Social Democratic Federation, Theodore Rothstein was a well-known name to me; he was one of my political mentors and so I read what Maisky had to say about him with especial interest. He was a young man of twenty when he had to get out of Russia; as such he got in touch with various people in the working class movement and became an active member of the Social Democratic Federation. He conducted a long

struggle against the imperialist Hyndman, a struggle in which we up in Glasgow participated. There are several other interesting sketches of émigrés, but I will only mention one; Prince Peter Kropotkin who, like the Italian, Enrico Malatesta, stood out as an exponent of anarchism. He held court at his home in Brighton; all sorts of people paid homage to him there. When World War I broke out, he forgot his anarchism and came out in support of the Tzarist War; and so, when the February Revolution took place and he wanted to go back to Russia, Britain and her allies were only too happy to help him get there, as they knew he would support those who were for carrying on the war to the bitter end. But when the Great October Revolution burst upon the world, he was lost; he did not understand what had happened; the revolution did not go the way he had wanted it and he could only gaze at the mighty movement that was changing Russia and which is destined to change the world, without the least understanding of its scope and content. He was provided with a cottage outside Moscow; I went there to visit him in 1920, with Jack Tanner, who was one of his disciples, and J. T. Murphy. Kropotkin was a poor lost soul with a daughter who was a vicious counter-revolutionary. What an end to a brilliant mind that was its own undoing through a refusal to study and grasp the dialectic of Marxism.

There is a nice story about George Lansbury, anything but a nice story about Ramsay MacDonald, and a short very fine pen-picture of Big Jim Larkin, and, as I have said a shrewd understanding of the British working class movement which all comrades will benefit from reading. And just one incident to show the

difference between 1913 and now. That year Maisky attended, as a visitor, the Trades Union Congress. He was surprised to hear delegates declare their allegiance to the Liberal Party. Out in the corridor he met and talked with the late James Middleton and the latter showed him a very significant table. In the elections of 1906 and 1910, while there were more than one and a half million affiliated members in the trade unions, the Labour Party only polled between three and five hundred thousand votes. 'This was remarkable. It meant that only twenty to thirty per cent of those paying their subscriptions to the Labour Party funds were voting for it at the elections. What were the rest doing? "The rest", Middleton explained, "voted for the Liberals or Conservatives or simply abstained *Lack of class consciousness, you will say. . . . Of course it is*"' (My emphasis, W.G.) At that time all of us in the movement were battling away, at street corners and public halls, to get workers class-conscious. Now the labour leaders, grovelling to and accepted by, the Establishment, labour might and main to keep the workers away from 'the wicked Communists' and all talk or thought of class; on the contrary, to recognise 'the common interest' and make plenty of profits for their good kind masters.

Like all others who read this volume, I look forward to the third volume, which I understand is now ready for the publishers, and which will deal with the movement as he saw it while an Ambassador, and with the many personalities that responsible post brought him into contact with. But read this volume while waiting for the next.

WILLIAM GALLACHER.

Factors in Economic Development

A. K. Cairncross

Allen and Unwin. 346 pp. 35s.

Theories of Economic Growth and Development

Irma Adelman

Oxford University Press. 164 pp. 30s.

PROFESSOR CAIRNCROSS, recently appointed Economic Adviser to the Government, is now to be their finest feather in the economic wings of a reconditioned Treasury. These wings that have been so long a-growing—a Central Planning Staff was created under Plowden in 1947—have still to show how many yards of unpowered flight they can sustain—unpowered, that is to say, by public ownership of the means of production or administration controlled by the working-class or a socialist system. However this appointment to a post of prominence adds interest to his new book which was completed just before he went to his official duties. It is not a unified presentation of the subject matter but a series of essays and articles of varying weight and mixed quality. Often they contain facts or comments of interest but the lines of enquiry they suggest hardly ever are pursued with persistence. One feels that Prof. Cairncross is perhaps too conscious of his audience and knows too well what will jar. For example, in his chapter on 'Foreign and Domestic Capital' he finds it necessary to turn aside from his discussion of the export of capital to insert, what he would call 'emotive phrases', to make it clear he does not share Communist views (*e.g.* 'I need not emphasize that the view of foreign investment as a "sink" for surplus capital is by no means dead. It is still part of the accepted dogma of Communist theory, conveniently extinguishing any merit that may seem

to attach to a loan or investment by a capitalist country. . .') (p. 51). His main technique is that of 'exploring the contrary point of view' (though never too deeply), but sometimes this trusted device leads him into fatuities when he queries (p. 75) whether capital is an important factor in the economic growth of a capitalist society!

Maybe it is not unusual for men to take as their motto the opposite of what they are and the Latin tag in his dedication (of which the gist is 'Nothing by halves') is precisely the opposite of Prof. Cairncross' economics; he seems always to disengage just when the consequences of pursuing truth begin to loom into sight.

Mrs. Adelman's book on 'Theories of Economic Growth and Development' is of a very different sort. It is a carefully constructed and well unified survey of basic theory of economic growth. After introductory chapters about the general framework of the analysis, she has chapters on Adam Smith, Ricardo, Karl Marx, Schumpeter and the Neo-Keynesians. She follows the best academic standards of objectivity and craftsmanship in the presentation of her material—which by consequence is highly useful to those for whom it is intended, namely students of economic theory. (Mrs. Adelman is Assistant Professor at Stanford University, California.) In her treatment of Marx—though clearly not herself a Marxist—she has sought the real substance of his writings and has recognised 'the scope and power of his analysis'. Whilst the book is for those who, to some degree, have specialist interests in economics, it does not—as a quick glance might suggest—call for a knowledge of mathematics. The mathematics she uses is not so much an instrument

in the argument as a convenient shorthand for summarising and comparing the different theories. The main defect of the book is its failure (whilst dealing quite well with the socio-cultural environment within capitalism) to consider the economic significance of a socialist revolution as a *qualitative* change in the socio-cultural—and political, legal and property—environment. Or, if this was regarded as a too 'difficult' or too 'different' topic, its existence and importance should have been clearly enunciated and the gap, because of its omission, pointed out.

JOHN EATON.

The Weapons Acquisition Process: An Economic Analysis

M. J. Peck and F. M. Scherer

Bailey Bros & Swinfen Ltd.

736 pp. \$10

THE HARVARD BUSINESS SCHOOL has provided an up-to-date structural analysis of an industry which has been of special interest to socialists since the campaigns of E. D. Morel and the Union of Democratic Control against the 'merchants of death' in the early twentieth century. The analysis is economic and primarily concerned with the government-business relationship in which decisions on weapon programmes in the U.S.A. are taken. The expense to the public purse of cost-plus systems; the influence of the services in demanding production and performance unrelated to control of expense, and the subsidisation of armament production by government provision of capital, are described through a number of case studies, and with a mathematically (if not grammatically) elegant application of 'weapon system development programme evaluation experiment methodology'. The authors point out that in the

production of 'weaponry' there can be no true market economy, and that the shift from government to private production has increasingly integrated government with private industry. They are sceptical of the amount of influence exercised by political considerations in the allocation of contracts, though 'this conclusion will be greeted with scepticism by many veterans of the weapons industry'. The contradiction is perhaps explained by their limitation of 'political considerations' to the efforts of congressmen to secure defence contracts for their own states. On political considerations as we would understand them, they refer shortly to the publicity campaigns and the employment of retired officers by armament firms (quoting Eisenhower's comment on the 'military-industrial complex') but do not go into the deeper implications of 'what is good for General Motors is good for America'. On the international level, they proceed from the assumption that 'barring some agreement on armament limitation (which presently appears unlikely) . . . the U.S. is therefore forced to make equivalent advances [with the U.S.S.R.] in the state of the weapons art to maintain qualitative parity.' The effect of forcing American-type weapons on the Nato allies, at the expense of British 'product-obsolescence' is not dealt with. But as at least three other volumes in this project are promised, perhaps some of the gaps may be filled later. In the meantime, the present volume offers a wealth of information on how one sector of capitalism works, and demonstrates how the essential characteristics of capitalism are maintained in a setting apparently far removed from its classical forms.

JUDITH TODD.

When Nazism Began

(The first exposure in the British press of German Nazism appeared in this article in Labour Monthly—before the January Putsch of 1923.)

The second group arising out of the Orgesch is that centring round the so-called 'National Socialists'. To them have come what remains of the Organisation Consul, the Organisation Kanzler, and the Freikorps Oberland. As extreme anti-Semites they have reconstituted themselves under this new name and are organising terrorist expeditions against Socialist industrial centres, attacks on Jewish shopkeepers, and the plundering of banks and post trains. In fact, even the Bavarian Government has been forced to issue warrants for arrest for highway robbery against some of the leaders of this group. They represent the extreme Right of the Fascist Movement in Germany—the romantic robber barons of the middle ages transplanted into the twentieth century, with the self-imposed task of saving the capitalist system. . . . The headquarters of the National Socialists and others of the romantic Fascisti type are at Munich. From here they dominate Bavaria south of the Danube. Through the secretary to the police prefect in Munich, Herr Glaser, one of their nominees, they control the secret service and apparatus of justice in this part of Germany. Woe to any person who crosses their path as the result of the Fechenbach trial showed, where ten years' penal servitude was given to German citizens who had dared to report in the Press the activities of their secret societies.

(From 'Bavaria and the German Fascisti' by M. Philips Price, *Labour Monthly*, January, 1923.)

NOVEMBER TOTAL

£66 8s. 4d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: B. W. Mackay (in memory of John Mackay), 15s 6d; B. W. Mackay, regular, 5s; E. Strachan Rogers, £2 2s; R. McLeod, 10s; G. C. Fitt, 2s 6d; R.F.B., £3; 'S. Mill', £1; 'Anon', Whitchurch, 1s; Les Bates (plus extra Christmas gift), 12s; Blackburn Branch, 2s; Oldham Branch, 1s; H. Brindle, 5s; 'Daisy Bell', £10; 'Windfall', £10; D. H. Strathern and friends, 10s; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; L'Humanite, 4s; S. Turner (for Daisy Mendez, Cuba), 5s; R. Dodd, £1; S. Townsend, 5s; N. Usher, 2s 6d; 'Oliver Twist and friends', 15s; M. Illing, 10s; C.T.H., £3; F.G.A. (Canada), 10s; 'The Butcher Family', 10s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; E.J.B., 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: N. Harding, 2s 6d; S. J. Berry, £1 4s; W. Wallace, £4; F. Rogers, 8s; J. Smith, 3s 6d; J.H.C. (Canada), 12s 10d; B. Thomas, 2s; Dr. Hewlett Johnson, £5; J.J. and J.McV., £1; S.H. (per A. Brandler), 10s; W. S. Richards (per Wrightson), £1; N. S. Horrod, 10s; 'Fisherman', £2 5s; Finchley and Friern Barnet Branch, 10s; G. Schafer, 2s; Dr. Higginton, 2s; R. J. Yates, £1; A. W. Elliot, 3s; J.K.W., £1; J. M. Sinclair, 2s; L. Conley, 12s; F. Crump, 2s; B. Silver, 2s; J. McKinnon, £1 10s; J. W. Mooney, 2s; A.C. (Canada), 12s 9d; M. Shapiro, 12s; A.M.C. (U.S.A.), £3 10s 3d; W.S.W. (Canada), £1.

Our thanks to you all.

Co-op. No. L.99482.

ANGELA TUCKETT,

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

FINchley 5135.

PEKING REVIEW

24 pages
weekly

●
£1 for one year's
subscription
airmailed from
China

●
English-language weekly
from China providing
up-to-date coverage of
the developments and
experience in China's
socialist construction and
of the Chinese views on
international affairs

●
and splendid
free gifts

●
if your 1963 subscription
is received by 26 January
... a bound copy of
**THE REVOLUTION
OF 1911** by WU YU-
CHANG and a charming
calendar illustrated with
Chinese paintings in the
traditional style.

CENTRAL BOOKS

37 Grays Inn Rd
London WC1

I should like a year's subscription to
PEKING REVIEW and two free gifts
I enclose £1

NAME

ADDRESS

LM Jan., 1963

Labour Monthly

Bound Volume, 1962

*It's a history
of the year and
a permanent record*

ORDER NOW

From your usual newsagents,
price £1.5.0d., or send
10s.6d., plus 1s.6d. postage and
your loose copies as soon as
possible to:

**THE MANAGER,
134, Ballards Lane,
LONDON, N.3**

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with
order to: 'Class Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134,
Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

VETERAN L.M. readers: your early copies and
pamphlets may be invaluable to others. Send
details to: L.M. Exchange Service, 134, Bal-
lards Lane, London, N.3.

WE BUY books, pamphlets. Socialism, U.S.S.R.,
Comintern, Spain. We collect: RIV 6807. The
Hammersmith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6.

URGENTLY REQUIRED—All back numbers of
Labour Monthly from 1921-1930 inclusive and
1939.

DUPLICATING OF ALL KINDS. Professional typing/
stencil cutting. Tape transcriptions. Verbatim
shorthand (official reports of conferences).
Translations. Mabel Eyles and Partners, 10,
Beaconsfield Road, Friern Barnet, London,
N.11. Phone ENT 3324 any time.

SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

198 pp 3s

an important collection comprising the basic Acts and documents of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR between 1956 and 1962

and a complete range of Soviet books and periodicals from

Central Books
27 Gray's Inn Rd
London WC1

WHY NOT BY POST?

NAME
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS

I enclose 18s. (if by wrapper, or £1 if by envelope), for year's subscription from the issue.

(SIGNED)

To **LABOUR MONTHLY**
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating
by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

For all interested in the fight for Peace and Progress in the Countryside and the problems of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.

Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or

Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

27, Bedford St Strand, London, W.C.2.

LABOUR RESEARCH

'Depressed Areas of the 'Sixties'

'West German Arms'

1s. or 1s. 2½d. post free from

Labour Research Department

161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor : R. Palme Dutt

BATTLE FOR JOBS ADVANCES

Les Allen : Tony Winter : Garfield Thomas

(Spokesmen for the unemployed in the North and in Wales)



BRITAIN'S HOUR OF TRUTH

The Editor



FOUNDRIES AND THE ECONOMY

Dave Lambert



Also : articles on U.S. Debts—China's Economy—Israel—
Eden and the Nazis

FEBRUARY 1963

One Shilling and Sixpence

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL. XLV

No. 2

FEBRUARY . 1963

CONTENTS

- Notes of the Month: Britain's Hour of Truth.** *Icy Freeze and Power Cuts—Cracks in the Western Alliance—Kennedy's Programme of Ultra Imperialism—De Gaulle-Adenauer Axis?—Twilight of Nato—For a New Deal in Europe—For Peace in the East—Alternative to Fulton, Nassau and the Common Market—Labour After Gaitskell.....R.P.D.* 51
- Foundries and British Economy.** The General Secretary of the Foundry Workers calls for real socialist planning.....**D. Lambert** 66
- Battle for Jobs.** Protest and action is carried forward in Wales and the North East...**Les Allen; Tony Winter; Garfield Thomas** 72
- Figaro and Columbia.** Author of 'Walls have Mouths' shows who pays the piper when U.S. calls the tune.....**Wilfred Macartney** 75
- China: Agriculture and Industry.** China's victory over natural disasters**Anna Louise Strong** 79
- Israeli Socialism?** A realistic evaluation of the Kibbutz movement **Eliezer Feiler** 84
- Lord Avon's Warning.** An exposure of Eden's rôle in the appeasement of Nazi Germany.....**Andrew Rothstein** 89
- Why We Must Raise Our Price.** An announcement. 64
- Readers' Outlook: *The Two-legged Animal*.....Angela Tuckett** 49
- Book Reviews.** 'Masters of Indecision', by George K. Young: *D. N. Pritt, Q.C.* 'The Fraud of Soviet Anti-Semitism' by H. Aptheker and 'Jews in the U.S.A.' by P. Novick: *Lazar Zaidman.* 'Prevention of War', by John Strachey: *Emile Burns.* 'Africa Today and Tomorrow' by John Hatch: *Jack Woddis.* 'The Nature of Politics' by J. D. B. Miller: *Bill Carritt.* 'Man and Evolution' by John Lewis: *Clemens Dutt* 93

READERS' OUTLOOK

The Two-Legged Animal

IN THE 'AFFLUENT SOCIETY' they go in for affluent names for class realities. The sack has become 'redundancy', and is administered by 'humane' methods. They merely 'seek to effect necessary redeployment by natural wastage and by postponement of entry'. This jargon being interpreted, means chopping off the older worker and pushing him out into the twilight at 60. It means telling the school-leavers to 'keep their heads' and go back into desperately overcrowded schools, where their luckier school-fellows are already waiting for non-existent places at University and training college. It means paying off a long-service man with four weeks' 'severance pay', provided he goes quietly the same afternoon, which they assert is 'the more humane way'. To which the foreman with 38 years' service on the receiving end of this humanity, commented on the radio: 'They use the humane killer on four-legged animals; but it's coming to it when they use it on the two-legged animal.' The plain truth is that these workers are 'severed' from their livelihood at the point when it is most difficult to organise to defend jobs; and the deathly chill of a 'pool of employment' is calculated to give those still in work cold feet. The top men of the 'affluent society' no doubt suppose the rest will cheerfully stamp on the fingers of those clinging to the bottom rung. What kind of animals do they take us for? We are not two-legged animals, but determined men and women, like those who write on page 72, com-

menting on Leo McGree's *Battle for Jobs* last month. These are not people who will go quietly without a fight.

Remember the readers working 'in a company town, with a company post-office', who therefore had to cancel the *L.M.* subscription? (Not Fordstown, Dagenham or Haleowen, or even U.S.A. but Companytown, Canada.) Their letter ended: 'When we "come out" for a holiday we shall write and send a donation. This—a generous one—has reached us, and with it what stories! In Companytown you don't have to be a Red for your letters 'outside' to be intercepted, merely sufficiently disgruntled with conditions to be writing after another job. So a Silent Curtain falls. Our correspondent ends: 'I do miss the news; but best wishes to you all in the coming year—and when we get "out" next, we shall hope to send another donation.'

This is the quality of the people making up *L.M.* readership, so many of whom sent good wishes (and New Year presents) from all over the world. To quote only a handful: From *Lincolnshire*: 'I didn't know whether I would be able to afford anything this month, but I think I knew all the time I couldn't afford *not* to subscribe.' From *Ayrshire*: 'How I would like to have been present and proposed a toast to all who help to make *L.M.* what it is—a guide and friend on the path to the future.' From *Wigan*: 'A very small present in appreciation of all that *L.M.* and we all strive for, socialism and world peace.' From

a *Durham miner's wife*: 'Our very best wishes and thanks for the Notes and articles, always so helpful and plain enough for anyone to understand.' From *London*: 'January L.M. is grand, real hard-hitting, especially for the industrial worker. You'll be glad to know that each of my 1962 copies has gone into Ford's factory through a worker at Dagenham.' From a *Devon Labour Party official*: 'Thanks for the ammunition every month to put the point of view of socialism across.' An *Edinburgh Communist*: 'I lent the 1960 number on the Indo-Chinese border and got a steady order placed with the news-agent—and another recruit to the Party.' From *Stoke*: 'While doing my household chores I came across a mislaid monetary gift to assist me over the festive season, which was a pleasure to me—and a greater pleasure to send it on to the fund.'

This is the lesson I learn from these readers' outlook: You read this magazine because you find it essential in the fight for peace and socialism. That is why we could always rely on you for support in every way, including financial support. That is why, when we come to the dire necessity of announcing a price rise, as we do on page 64, we know you will not only continue to support us, but work out yourselves, and with us, ways of getting over the main problem of the price rise: to prevent it being an obstacle to winning the new readers necessary to extend our influence—and yours—in Britain and the world. For we are not helpless two-legged animals, but men and women with a great purpose and a great cause, which must succeed.

ANGELA TUCKETT

Essex.

A very happy and progressive New Year to you all—and who deserve it more? Your mission and ours is no less than to save the world.

'Backslider'.

£32 13s. 0d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: S. Morrissy, 10s; 'Daisy Bell', £10; 'Windfall', £10; J. Hill (per Prendergast), £1 10s; 'In Memory of Joe Brien', 3s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; E. Strachan Rogers, £2 2s; 'Backslider', 10s; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; J. Tarver, 5s; B. Ainley, £1; D. H. Strathern and friends, 10s; L. Bates, 5s; H. Brindle, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 2s; Oldham Branch 1s; 'S. Mill', £1; R. Dodd, £1; L'Humanité (extra Xmas Gift), 8s; F.G.A. (Canada), 10s; M. Illing (plus extra Xmas Gift), £1; S. Turner (for Daisy Mendez, Cuba), 5s; N. Usher (plus extra Xmas Gift), 5s; J. A. Smith, 12s; 'Humphreys family', 10s; 'Butcher family', 10s; R.F.B., £3; 'Oliver Twist and friends', 15s; E. Strachan Rogers (extra Xmas Gift), £4 4s; B. W. Mackay, 7s 6d; G.I., 4s 6d; E.J.B., 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: Cambridge University Senior Branch, £2; C. A. Jeffery, 10s; K. A. Hill, 10s; T. C. Alexander, 10s; H. Sherwen, £1 2s; T. Russell, 3s; H. Fomison, £2; A. M. Baxter, £1; C. Thornhill, 2s; A. Chater, 4s; L. Marlowe, 10s; D. Mukerji, £6; G. Hunter, £2 2s; E. Morton, 10s; N. Rathbone, £1 2s; Coldharbour and New Eltham C.P., £2 10s; A. C. Spence, 2s; D. Vines, 2s; J. M. Sinclair, 2s; K. Meredith, £1; J. P. Mortimore, 8s; Dr. and Mrs. H. F. Walker, 5s; 'Anon' (Edinburgh), £1; J. Hall, 2s; C. Reid, 5s; Wood Green Communist Party, £1; Swindon Communist Party, 19s; H. Eldridge, £1 2s; J. R. Smith, 10s; S. Avyakananda, 5s; L. M. and R.D. (Canada), £2; I. Thomas, 10s; L. Bagshaw, 4s; J. J. Prewett, £1; F. Purcell, 2s; D. Smith, £1; G. and E. Bestford, £1; E. Thomas, 5s; S. Lawther, 10s; W. Arnison, 3s; E. Gerard, 2s; R. Johnson, £1; G. Hill, 5s; L. J. Green, 2s; J. W. Thompson, 3s; P. Tregidga, 2s; H.A.McE. (U.S.A.), £2; Wm. Murphy, 13s.

Our thanks to you all.
Co-op. No. L.99482.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

BRITAIN'S HOUR OF TRUTH

The truth shall make you free.—New Testament.

FIRST, Nassau. Then De Gaulle. Blow follows blow. The Tory card-castle of illusions of Britain's future in the world lies in ruins. Nassau gave the final kick to the Fulton dream of the 'special relationship' with the United States. De Gaulle added his hearty kick against Anglo-Saxon interference in the West European Alliance. Even the Tory Central Office has lost its zest about the avalanche of paper literature it had been stacking up in readiness to put over the Common Market. The myth of nuclear 'independence' has exploded with a super-sonic bang. Backwoods Tory M.P.s have been besieging Cabinet Ministers with complaints that Britain has become an 'American outpost'. They have awoken, as usual, fifteen years late.

Icy Freeze and Power-Cuts

Simultaneously the economic blizzard has revealed a Government without a policy for the people. This hour of revelation of the consequences of Toryism (aided by Tory-Labourism) since the war may not be pleasant. But it can be salutary. Even the icy freeze-up and power-cuts, which (like a stage direction in a Shakespearean tragedy) have accompanied the grim political and economic fiascoes of the opening weeks of the year, have demonstrated to every household the price of squandering the nation's resources to pour out millions on nuclear abortions or to bolster up reactionary sultans against their peoples all over the world, while grudging and cutting down the necessary provision of capital to expand adequately electricity generation (of course with the customary barefaced attempt to blame it on the workers). Similarly the setbacks and buffeting and isolation of Britain in the international field have demonstrated the bankruptcy of the Fulton programme and the necessity to search for an alternative. High official mandarins have been given at this late hour the theme exercise to try to elaborate alternatives to the Common Market, at the same time as their efforts are stultified by the simultaneous provision that their search must remain blinkered and fettered within the confines of the cold war straitjacket and subservience to Nato and

the United States. Along this road no solution lies. The need is for a real, and not a sham alternative. Exposure of the bankruptcy of Tory policy is not enough. This bankruptcy is becoming daily more plain to all. The Macmillan Tory Government has become a sitting duck for all to shoot at. What is most urgent now is to conduct the fight and win united support for the positive alternative programme which the present situation of Britain makes imperative.

Cracks in the Western Alliance

For it is not merely Britain that is now confronted with sharp decisions of policy, although it is in Britain that all the contradictions are most conspicuously mirrored. On the same day, January 14, the proclamation of President De Gaulle and the State of the Union Message of President Kennedy offered two conflicting programmes and lines of alliance for the Western imperialist world. The preponderant weight and influence still lies with the United States. But it was De Gaulle's open challenge which won the lime-light in the world's press and thrust Kennedy's annual statement to the side columns. For the ruthless French logic and clarity of De Gaulle's pronouncement cut like a knife through the genial blurred haze of 'interdependence' of Nato, O.E.E.C., the Common Market and the Atlantic Community, whose contradictions the normal official utterances of Western statesmen seek to cover in a fog of generalities. In Britain inevitably the immediate effect of banging the door on Britain's application to join the Common Market, short of complete and unconditional capitulation, received the most attention. This is understandable, since this offensive transformed the political situation in Britain, and threw into confusion the entire strategy of the Government and the electoral calculations of Toryism. But in fact the offensive was wider. The sharp edge was directed against the intervention of the United States in Europe, and it was only as a corollary to this that Britain was spurned as a jackal of the United States.

Ideology and Imperialism

Of course the super-clever political commentators, who love to fit all political phenomena into neat parallelograms, without regard to any serious analysis of the class basis of politics, seek to console themselves for the cracks and contradictions in the Western imperialist alliance by observing that exactly the same thing is happening with the present ideological controversy in the international communist movement. They are mistaken. The present

controversy in the international communist movement is an ideological controversy of tactics, such as has arisen not for the first time in the development of communism, and such as will require to be thrashed out, equally in the light of theory and of practice, in order to reach agreed conclusions. But it is an ideological controversy, involving the estimation of the varying contradictory aspects of the modern world situation, and in the light of such an estimation the judgement of the paths to be followed in order to reach the fulfilment of the agreed common aims of peace, peaceful co-existence, the banning of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war, and the advance of national liberation and of economic and social emancipation within each country. There is no conflict here arising from the social-political system within the socialist countries. There is no conflict of rival expansionist aims to carve up the world, annex colonies or spheres of influence for the export of capital, or battle over the spoils of colonial super-profits. The differences are subjective.

Conflicts of Imperialism

The conflicts within the Western imperialist camp, on the other hand, arise from the economic-political system of imperialism. They are conflicts of rival interests of rival imperialist groupings. These conflicts could only be resolved by the theoretical goal of ultra-imperialism, or the victory and domination of one stronger imperialism over every other. This has been in fact the governing aim of United States imperialism since the war. But the fulfilment of this aim is actually further away today, eighteen years after the end of the war, than it was in the decade immediately following the war. The present growth of new conflicts demonstrates this. This growth of new conflicts reflects the fact that the relative predominance of the United States has diminished, and the other imperialist powers have begun to recover from the wounds of the war. Certainly the Western imperialist rulers have a common class ideology of anti-communism, and have endeavoured to construct combinations on this basis, as with Nato. But these combinations are always in practice cut across by the conflicts of rival imperialist interests, as Lenin long ago pointed out, and as the unfolding of the second world war proved anew. The ideology of anti-communism is used by the Western imperialist rulers, not only to express their common hostility to the world of socialism and national liberation, but also to cover their rival imperialist interests. Hitler used the slogan of anti-communism, and built the Anti-

Comintern Pact of Germany, Italy and Japan, not only for the crusade against the Soviet Union, but also to launch the offensive against the rival imperialist powers, Britain, France and the United States. Similarly the United States in the recent era has used the slogan of anti-communism, not only to organise the cold war against the world of socialism and national liberation, but also to extend the domination of United States imperialism over the rest of the capitalist world. Thus the differences here correspond to the objective economic-political system of imperialism.

Kennedy's Programme of Ultra-Imperialism

President Kennedy in his State of the Union address set the aim in the international sphere to unify 'the Grand Alliance', 'the Atlantic Alliance'. On this basis he welcomed the steps towards the unification of Western Europe 'as a partner, not a rival'. In other words, the West European economic-political combination termed the Common Market must be a part of the 'Atlantic Alliance' dominated by the United States, not a separate alliance. Within this framework he had already expressed the approval and desire of the United States to see Britain enter the Common Market, as in accordance with United States policy, for the fulfilment of these aims. He wanted to see 'Europe move from independence to a more formal interdependence'. At the same time he sounded a sharp warning in the economic field that 'if the Common Market should move towards protectionism and restrictionism', that is, hinder American trade and expansion in Europe, 'it would undermine its own basic principles'. The strongest insistence on American domination came in the strategic field, in relation to nuclear weapons. The Nassau Agreement, which in practice ended the British claim to nuclear 'independence', was held up as the model in this respect. He emphasised that the U.S. 'expenditure of more than \$15,000 million (£5,357 million) this year on nuclear weapons systems alone is equal to the combined defence budgets of our European allies'. On this basis he had already given as his view in his statement released on January 10 that for the West European countries 'to begin to have these national deterrents which will amount to a fraction of our deterrent really seems to me to be a waste of resources'. If national 'pride' led the West European states to insist on a share in nuclear weapons or in their control, then such participation must be organised only as 'a truly multilateral nuclear force within Nato', i.e. under American

command. Such is the Kennedy programme for West European integration in a single 'Atlantic Alliance' under American control.

De Gaulle-Adenauer Axis?

Against this Kennedy programme the De Gaulle bombshell on the same day represented the most direct challenge. He repudiated the aim of 'a colossal Atlantic community under American dependence and direction' which would 'absorb the community of Europe'. For him the alliance of the Six represented an alliance of 'continental' powers against 'one and the same menace from one extremity to the other of their territorial ensemble', that is, a bloc equally against the East and against the West, or the old familiar Third Force confronting as a separate power the Soviet Union and socialist countries on the one side, and the United States and its British appendage on the other. On this basis he rejected Britain's entry into the Common Market unless Britain were to abandon its extra-European connections. Similarly in the strategic field the Nassau agreement was condemned as capitulation to the United States; the American offer of Polaris missiles rejected as involving subjection to the American strategic command; and the whole Kennedy conception of 'integration' in the nuclear field was repudiated. All the praise was reserved for Adenauer's neo-Nazi West Germany. Franco-German cooperation was proclaimed the cornerstone of French policy, German nuclear armament was declared to be entirely a matter for the West German Government to decide.

Hitlerite Resurrection?

It is evident that we have here, in terms of imperialist alignment, a resurrection in new forms of the Hitlerite 'New Order in Europe', which similarly proclaimed the economic-political-military 'integration' of Continental Western Europe, with Germany as the dominant power, Vichy France and Mussolini's Italy as the associates, and with the guns turned against the Soviet Union on the one side and against the United States and Britain on the other. Subjectively no doubt De Gaulle dreams of himself as the new Charlemagne leading the bloc. But the dominant power, economic and military, in the bloc is already that of West Germany, with the French iron and steel interests linked to the stronger German monopolists as in the days of Vichy. The West German Army is already the strongest in Western Europe and in process

of being further increased. The political forces within France which brought into being and today support De Gaulle's authoritarian rule are the same which supported Petain and Vichy. The former opponent of Vichy has become the Man of Vichy. After all the sharp plain speaking of De Gaulle about the United States and Britain, the tone of the references to West Germany became as obsequious and deferential as that of any British Government Minister referring to the United States. The German neo-Nazis and militarists may be well satisfied for the moment to let De Gaulle assume the airs of leadership and pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them, while they to a certain extent still put a bridle on their tongues and profess a more modest tone of willing docility and Atlantic co-operation—until they have secured, with French aid, the nuclear arms they covet. Then the adventures may begin. 'For us the second world war is not yet completed', as the recent Defence Minister Strauss said in the United States.

Shifting Trends

Nothing is here yet fixed in this rapidly moving international situation. To assume that De Gaulle's pronouncement represents the last word, even for France, still less for the Six, would be foolish. While Adenauer has supported De Gaulle, the internal situation in West Germany is unstable; even in France the balance of forces may change, as the opposition of Monnet, chief architect of the Common Market, to the line of De Gaulle has indicated. Britain has sought to mobilise the Five against France in order to hold off the final breakdown of the negotiations. The Brussels negotiations in the middle of January, which France sought to end forthwith, have been adjourned until the last days of January for a decision. On this slender basis whiffs of consolatory hot air have been spread through the British press to reassure the disillusioned and buoy them up with hopes that the setback is only temporary and that all will come right in the end.

Time to Face Facts

This spectacle of the spurned suitor hovering outside the door after he has been kicked out, or of the condemned victim clutching at forlorn hopes for a stay of execution, is as pitiful as it is humiliating. It is time to face the facts. The Five cannot carry the entry of Britain into the Common Market against the will of France, even if they should wish it; and it is doubtful if West Germany

wishes it; the others are of minor importance. The Treaty of Rome is explicit. The alliance of the Six can only be changed or extended by the unanimous decision of the Six. The Five have not even the right to opt out, in order to draw up a separate agreement with Britain. Adhesion is irrevocable according to the terms of the Treaty. They could only repudiate their obligations and smash the Common Market—an improbable prospect for the time being. Alternately they, or the United States and Britain, could seek to exercise pressure on France, or to offer a bribe (e.g. nuclear know-how) to make a deal. There is no sign of any immediate prospect of such attempts being effective. Certainly no one would predict the long-term possibilities of the internal political situation in the countries of Western Europe or of the further alignments and realignments within the Western imperialist camp. Nothing is irreversible in this sphere. But the immediate effect is inescapable. The immediate effect has been to wreck the Tory Government's international economic and political strategy, based on entry into the Common Market, and the short-term electoral calculations based on that strategy. The opponents of the Common Market, who were initially a limited minority at a time when all the political wiseacres were declaring that Britain's entry into the Common Market was of course inevitable, and that opposition could only be a sentimental gesture without effect, have now not only been proved justified in their stand. They have been proved more accurate in their judgement of the realities of the international situation. Now is the time to break with the policy which has been proved a humiliating flop and enter on the new paths which are open.

Vain Threats

Impotent fury of the Common Marketeers in Britain has opened their mouths. 'The fight with the French is now open', proclaimed the *Observer's* political commentator on January 20; 'it is the oldest war of all, the Anglo-French war'. The *Sunday Times* proposed on the same day to answer 'the General's blackball' by forming 'a free trade area of the United States, Britain and Efta' counterposed to the Franco-German combination of the Six. Denouncing 'the French Monarch' and 'the mesmerised Chancellor in Bonn', Lord Gladwyn, former Ambassador in Paris and main protagonist of the Common Market campaign, proposed in the *Daily Telegraph* of January 18 that the United States and Britain should reply by declaring that they 'cannot be responsible any longer for defending Europe' i.e. should threaten to withdraw the

occupation troops as a form of pressure. The same threat came from the United States Administration as a form of pressure on the Common Market :

Mr. Orville Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture, suggested that the United States might be unable to maintain its security commitments in Western Europe if the E.E.C. adopted protectionist agricultural policies. Addressing the National Council of Farmer Co-operatives at Miami Beach, Florida, he said that in 1962 the U.S. agricultural exports to Western Europe were approximately equal to the trade deficit on the overall balance of payments.

'This deficit was incurred primarily', he went on, 'to meet our security and assistance commitments in Western Europe and other areas. Any sizeable cutback in the volume of our agricultural trade would seriously impair our ability to maintain these commitments'.

(The Times, January 9, 1963.)

A palpable threat from the Overlord. But will it any longer be effective?

Defence or Menace?

To the mass of the peoples of Europe the prospect of the withdrawal of the American troops of occupation would undoubtedly bring great joy. This is indeed the proposal for the withdrawal of all troops of occupation on both sides which the Soviet Union has repeatedly urged and which the Western powers have so far rejected. But would even the ruling classes of Western Europe be terrified any longer by the threat of a withdrawal of the American military occupation, now that the initial fears of a popular socialist revolution during the first years after the war have been so far circumvented? The only exception might be for a while still the West German Government, not for reasons of defence, but to be sure of involving the United States in any actions directed towards their official aims for the expansion of their frontiers. Would the threat of American withdrawal terrorise De Gaulle into submission? It may be recalled that it was De Gaulle who insisted on the removal of the American nuclear bombers from France, on the grounds that they represented, not protection, but a menace to France, and the nuclear bombers were accordingly transferred to docile Britain.

Twilight of Nato

The truth is that Nato, which was always in fact a dangerous aggressive combination, has become today a still dangerous, but more and more obviously anachronistic survival. The only legal basis for the maintenance of American troops in Europe, specifically

Germany, after the war was to ensure the fulfilment of the inter-allied agreements for the destruction of Nazism and fascism and disarmament of Germany and to prevent Germany being rearmed. This basis vanished with the repudiation of Potsdam and rearmament of German militarism, although the Western representatives still have the effrontery to invoke this supposed 'legal' basis for their continued occupation of West Berlin. Nato was invented four years after the war as a substitute (in fact an illegal treaty in violation of the United Nations Charter) on the basis of a theory of the supposed impending menace of the invasion of Western Europe by Soviet armies. Not a single Western statesman believes in that theory today. The simplest practical proof of this has been the continuous resistance of the West European Governments (except for West Germany) to supply the contingents more and more frantically demanded every year by the American Nato Supreme Command as the minimum necessary to prevent a successful Soviet aggression. France withdrew almost its entire contingent for the seven years war in Algeria, involving half a million men, without the slightest sign of any alarm over leaving the front open in Europe.

Towards New Horizons

The modern international situation, and still more the modern strategic situation (the intercontinental ballistic missile was unknown when Nato was invented) is more and more making the whole structure of Nato a costly anachronism, still capable of mischief, but in practice by-passed by the new international currents. The present inter-imperialist alignments and realignments and conflicts, which now draw the centre of attention, the Common Market, the Adenauer-De Gaulle Axis, Efta, or the orientation towards or against the United States, are all developing outside the ghostly forms of Nato. Nato could still be put to some sudden dangerous use, so long as it exists, by West German militarist adventurers, especially if they were to succeed in their aim to get a finger on nuclear weapons, or if a reckless strategy were to develop from the side of the United States. The transition from the old rigid forms of Nato and anti-Nato as the sum total of international relations to the present fluid stage of shifting combinations and alignments is not necessarily a step forward. It can bring new and acute dangers, notably through the role of West Germany. But the present rapidly moving international situation can also

give new opportunities to make a fresh approach, to thrust aside old obstacles and work towards new concrete measures of negotiation and partial agreements for the reduction of tension. This is what Soviet policy has understood. This is where the new positive role of Britain could arise.

For a New Deal in Europe

The conditions are ripening to endeavour to replace the confrontation of Nato and the Warsaw Pact by some wider form of agreement for security on a European scale, possibly in the first place through a Non-Aggression Pact between the two alliances, and thus work towards further agreements for the withdrawal of occupation troops (which would lift a heavy burden from Britain's budget and overseas balance), a peaceful settlement in relation to Germany, a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe alongside a nuclear test ban, and extension of trade and economic co-operation between East and West Europe. Such aims would be far more sensible aims for Britain's foreign policy to pursue in the present situation in relation to Europe rather than continue to press an unwanted suit for entry into a restrictionist and reactionary Little Europe.

For Peace in the East

Similarly in the Far East it is essential to end the present abnormal and dangerous war situation maintained by United States policy. Fourteen years after the Chinese People's Revolution, after the Chinese people by their unity and heroism and leadership had prevailed against all the massive arms and subsidies poured in by the United States to buttress the hated Chiang Kai-shek, after the stability of the Chinese Government in the support of the people is attested by every observer of every political colour, the United States still refuses to recognise China, just as it refused to recognise the Soviet Government for seventeen years. China, one fourth of the population of the world, is excluded from the United Nations. China is refused rightful place amongst the ranks of the great powers. U.S. officially proclaimed policy is still to overthrow by violence the Chinese government ('the mainland invasion'). Reactionary militarist regimes are armed and subsidised on the borders of China. South Korea. Chiang Kai-shek in Taiwan. The U.S. Seventh Fleet has its guns trained on the coasts of China. 20,000 U.S. troops operate in South Vietnam.

The unhappy Indo-Chinese Border conflict is in reality only a part of this wider issue, where Western imperialism has sought to use India as a cat's paw in order to build a further front against China. It is to be hoped that the mediation of the Colombo Powers will help to make possible the negotiations which the Chinese have continuously offered for a peaceful settlement, and that the belligerent plans of the Anglo-American Military Missions will be thwarted.

Europe and Asia

The refusal to recognise the German Democratic Republic and fostering of expansionist German militarism in Europe. The refusal to recognise the Chinese People's Republic and fostering of expansionist military regimes and the American open war front in the eastern Pacific. These are the explosive danger spots in the world today. The danger is increased by the advance of nuclear weapons. China has proposed a nuclear-free zone in the Far East. Every effort should be made, while there is time, to hasten the fulfilment of these plans for nuclear-free zones in the Far East, in the regions of Europe and in Africa, while at the same time working for a nuclear test ban as a preliminary to the banning of all nuclear weapons and general disarmament.

Alternative to Fulton, Nassau and the Common Market

The Fulton programme which has in fact continued to govern British foreign policy since its formulation a year after the end of the war is in ruins. Fulton was devised when the British ruling class realised that Britain could no longer hope to equal the two greatest world powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. This realisation was revealed when Churchill already before the end of the war startled parliament by referring to the Big 'Two and a Half' rather than the Big Three. The essence of Fulton was to seek at all costs to prevent closer U.S.-Soviet cooperation, such as had been foreshadowed by the Roosevelt era, to play on anti-Soviet antagonism, and on this basis seek to establish Britain as the indispensable special ally of the United States, while at the same time building up under British inspiration a reactionary bloc of Western Europe with a rearmed Germany. Fulton was seventeen years ago. The whole balance of the world has changed since then. Fulton was three years before the final victory of the Chinese Revolution, the greatest advance of the socialist revolution

since 1917. Otherwise Churchill would have no doubt added Peking to his long list of 'ancient capitals' over whose loss to mourn (but no tears when the Western imperialist bandits sacked Peking in 1900). India was still subject. It was a different world.

Towards a New Policy

Today the Fulton programme, after having done much harm, is obsolete in the eyes of all. The United States spurns Britain save as a vassal. Nassau has shown that. The West European bloc has been built up under Adenauer and De Gaulle without Britain, and has left Britain a rejected suitor on the doormat. After endless squandering of resources the dream of 'independent' nuclear power is in practice finished. The gradual tentative approaches towards closer U.S.-Soviet negotiations since Cuba for extended partial agreements over other fields, and especially in relation to nuclear weapons—still precarious, but reflecting the new balance of the world—are recognised by all as carrying the hopes of the immediate future. It is time for Britain's rulers to draw a line across the bankrupt past policies, and advance to a new independent foreign policy in harmony with the aspirations of mankind for peace, as well as with the true needs of Britain for international economic co-operation. Such an independent foreign policy for peace and international economic co-operation is the essential counterpart and condition for the fulfilment of a programme of social and economic advance at home. Around these aims it is necessary to develop the fight for the defeat of the Tory Government, and to rally the entire labour, trade union, co-operative, communist and peace movement in the coming election for the victory of such a programme.

Labour After Gaitskell

All readers of *Labour Monthly*, irrespective of political differences, will mourn the loss of Hugh Gaitskell, Leader of the Labour Party since 1955. Certainly there were many and sharp differences which brought him in conflict with the left. He was a sincere liberal, a passionate hater of social injustice and inequality and one who strove for social justice, even though he confused this sincere philanthropic indignation over social injustice and inequality and desire for social justice with socialism, that is, the understanding that the class ownership of the means of production is the root cause of social injustice and inequality and that only the social ownership

of the means of production can end these evils. But in the last months before his untimely death, with the possible close prospect of becoming Premier, he was moving towards a higher stage of activity which might have had national and international significance. His vehement criticism of the Tory policy of capitulation to the Common Market, even though not the same as explicit opposition, raised for the first time an issue of battle on major policy between the two parties, helped to rally the movement, won support from the left and criticism from most of his former right wing supporters. When he followed this up by announcing his acceptance of the invitation to visit Moscow and have talks with Khrushchov, at the very same moment as Macmillan was journeying to Nassau to make his submission to Kennedy, this became also a political act, suggesting the possibility that he had moved to the realisation that rejection of the Common Market would require as its consequence a new initiative in foreign policy, especially in the sphere of East-West relations. Such a line of development, while wholly compatible with his continued right wing outlook, could have had a positive constructive significance in the present international situation. Whatever the possibilities, death cut them short. His successor will be chosen, in accordance with the British capitalist parliamentary traditions, as in the Conservative Party, by the M.P.s and not by the Labour Party Conference or Executive. But the question of the future of Labour policy is far wider than any question of personalities. In these critical coming months it will be the concern of every socialist and supporter of peace to strive to win the whole labour movement for the new stage in policy which is now so essential equally for the future of Britain and for Britain's role in the world.

January 21, 1963.

R.P.D.

WHY WE MUST RAISE OUR PRICE

OUR READERS' support and understanding has always been generously given in times of difficulty, when we set our problems before them. This we must now do as we are forced to raise the price of the magazine.

THE PRESENT PRICE OF *Labour Monthly* has been unchanged since as long ago as 1951. During these twelve years costs have steadily risen for all publications, as for everything else. Between 1951 and 1961 the national average price for all magazines, the National Income Blue Book shows, has risen from 79 points to 118 points. In other words, what was 1s. 6d. in 1951 would be about 2s. 3d. in 1961.

A PRICE RISE even of that amount has not by itself been enough to meet the higher production costs of magazines. Gaps were closed by bigger advertising revenues. Failing that, a close-down.

MANY FAMOUS MAGAZINES have closed down during these twelve years. Others are only maintained by subsidies, either from publishers for prestige reasons or from anonymous wealthy backers.

LABOUR MONTHLY has kept its price unaltered throughout these twelve years—although we do not get the advertising revenue to which we should be entitled as the most widely circulated serious political monthly. We do not have any millionaire backers either. Yet our journal has survived now for forty-two years. How has it been done? Can the seeming miracle continue?

READERS' DONATIONS and the devotion and sacrifice of our small staff and unpaid contributors have combined to bridge the gap between costs and income over most of the twelve-year period. But for the special donations given us in our Fortieth Birthday Year (1961) the need to consider putting up our price would have come sooner than this. Unfortunately, we cannot put it off any longer in face of present conditions.

FOR EXAMPLE, to take only two items. Printing costs have increased steeply, and as our lease falls due for renewal, our rent and rates will be more than doubled this year. We shall have to raise the price to 2s.—less than the average rise in price of magazines during this period. This new price will start with our March issue.

WE UNDERSTAND the difficulty this may mean for many readers, not least those whose circumstances oblige them to get their copy by postal subscription, and who may be hard hit at having to find all the money in one go. So we have decided to try to ease the position by a special concession. Read the announcement on page iii of cover for details.

WE ASK THE CO-OPERATION of all our readers in A GREAT DRIVE to extend the readership and support of *Labour Monthly*. Is it taken in your branch, welfare institute or club? Is it taken in your public library? Every reader can help in this. Not a reader must be lost. Where there is difficulty, try if two or three can club together. Every new reader won means a new and informed supporter for the aims of socialism and the left in the trade union and labour movement.

BECOME A GUARANTOR if you are not one already. Win new financial backers. The letters which flow into our office show the warmth of support for our journal and the cause we seek to serve. Let this support be translated into financial support, in order that the good work may go on.

THE COMING MONTHS will bring new and urgent political tests and tasks for the people of Britain and for the peoples of the world. We believe that the role of our magazine, tested during these forty-two years of fateful events, will be needed more than ever to help in our common tasks during this coming year.

R. PALME DUTT, *Editor*.

R. PAGE ARNOT, *Associate Editor*.

ANGELA TUCKETT, *Assistant Editor*.

Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties

FOUNDRIES AND BRITISH ECONOMY

D. Lambert

General Secretary, Amalgamated Union of Foundry Workers.

BRITISH foundries form a basic industry supplying iron, steel and non-ferrous castings, mainly to the engineering industry, the building industry and to nationalised concerns. Foundries do not often market finished products. They supply components to their parent firm or to other firms on a contract basis. It follows that the fortunes of the industry are not directly controlled by those who run it. They are determined by the prospects facing those sections of the economy which foundries service. Because of this, foundry workers have never limited their concern to what is happening in their own industry, but are deeply involved in the broader social and industrial problems of our time.

The foundry is an important industry, employing about 170,000 workers, 123,000 in iron foundries and 16,000 in steel. The remainder are in non-ferrous foundries for which no reliable manpower statistics are available. Since the Second World War the changing pattern of life in Britain has brought about many changes in the foundry, in the character of its labour force and the numbers employed. The effect of these changes can best be illustrated by a study of the excellent statistics on iron-foundry production supplied by the Iron and Steel Board, which has an interest in foundry affairs.

When the steel industry was nationalised, iron foundries (except for a few 'tied' foundries) were excluded from the legislation because they are associated with so many other industries. The Iron and Steel Board is authorised to exercise general supervision over the industry, and in this it works closely with the Joint Iron Council, which represents the industry on all matters except wages negotiations. This form of organisation developed under war conditions and the problems of transition to the post-war era. It has been maintained. In a recent review of the iron-founding situation, Mr. N. P. Newman, President of the Joint Iron Council, declared:

If we are to have a planned economy in the future on a national scale, the iron-foundry industry is probably as well placed as any to estimate its needs and count on their being met.

Given rational planning for expansion, foundry workers could accept this assurance with some confidence in the future. But Tory 'planning' in the textile, coal and railway industries has shown the devastation which their restrictive concepts of planning can cause. Because foundries service all these industries they have been seriously affected by the changes taking place in them. Indeed, a study of the changes in foundry production can provide the basis for considering what is happening in British economy as a whole, and what needs to be done to overcome the social and economic problems to which these changes give rise.

Taking the period 1949-1961, the following table shows the significant changes in the production of iron castings over these thirteen years :

Section of Industry	1949	1961	% Change + or -
	(Thousand Tons)	(Thousand Tons)	
1. Cars, Commercial Vehicles, Tractors, etc.	335	695	+ 107
2. Metals (mainly Iron and Steel) ...	444	606	+ 59
3. Building and Allied Industries ...	322	461	+ 43
4. General Engineering	570	610	+ 7
5. Pressure Pipes	545	499	- 8
6. Railway Equipment	322	273	- 15
7. Misc. Industries	260	208	- 20
8. Heavy Engineering Plant	396	311	- 21
9. Coal Industry	41	31	- 25
10. Domestic Goods	153	112	- 27
	3,388	3,806	+ 12

Iron castings for motor cars, commercial vehicles and tractors accounted for 18 per cent of the total output in 1961 compared with 10 per cent in 1949. In addition, aluminium castings have replaced iron in many cases. The annual production of aluminium castings, mainly for the car and the aircraft industries nearly doubled, from 48,000 tons in 1949 to 93,000 tons in 1961. So the foundry has a vital stake in these key sections of industry and can be a decisive factor in shaping its progress.

The post-war expansion of the steel industry has increased the demand for iron castings. Most of the increase in Section 2 is accounted for by the production of ingot moulds for the steel industry. In the same way, more house building and other types of building made necessary an increase of 139,000 tons of castings

by 1961 in Section 3. These three industries, cars, steel and building, show how the foundry is affected by changes in diverse sections of the whole economy. The advances in these three sections are offset by the decline in demand for castings in others. General engineering certainly shows a slight advance of 7 per cent, but within this section the demand for castings in the textile industry declined from 165,000 tons in 1949 to 107,000 in 1961. The 1961 figure, too, is a substantial improvement on the position in 1958 and 1959, when demand had slumped to 82,000 tons.

In part, the progress since then is due to the drive of certain firms producing textile machinery in securing large contracts from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. This pattern of events, which the Amalgamated Union of Foundry Workers has always encouraged, will certainly be even more important in the coming years, not only for textile machinery but for all the specialised tools and quality machines which our industrial experience enables us to produce better than our world competitors.

In heavy engineering, castings for ships' engines, propellers and boilers have been reduced by half. This is partly due to the decline in shipbuilding and the change from coal-burning to oil in ships. Iron castings for ships have also been replaced by prefabricated steel sections, one challenge of changing techniques which the industry has so far failed to meet. In 1949, the weight of castings required was 190,000 tons. By 1961 it had fallen to 93,000 tons and it continues to decline. The decline of the coal industry has cut their demand for iron castings by 25 per cent. The slashing of the railway system had already cut demand by 15 per cent in 1961, and the worst effects of Dr. Beeching's policies have yet to be recorded. The decline in 'domestic goods' has taken place despite a great expansion in demand. This is due to the extensive use of sheet metal or plastics in place of cast iron in the production of gas cookers, refrigerators, etc.

That is the debit side. These developments have changed the shape and character of the foundry industry. More than 500 iron foundries have closed since 1949. About 1,400 remain in production, but hardly a week goes by without some famous names in foundry history vanishing. New foundries have opened, catering for the needs of the new mass-production industries. Fords, for example, now employ more than 3,000 workers at their Dagenham foundries alone. Similar developments have taken place in the Midlands to feed the car industry there. Completely new shell

moulding and die-casting plants have been built around the car industry to mass produce high quality precision castings, relatively unskilled labour without any previous foundry experience being trained to man the machines.

Concentration of foundry production in these areas has been accompanied by a serious decline in employment prospects for foundry workers in all the main traditional foundry areas. Scotland and Northern Ireland, Tyneside, the North West (including Merseyside), Yorkshire and parts of South Wales have all suffered in varying degrees.*

Area	Production of Iron Castings (Thousand Tons)			Employment (Thousands)		
	1949	1961	% Change	1949	1961	% Change
1. Midlands (Birmingham)	590	853	+45	35.5	36.5	+ .3
2. South, S.W. (Home Counties)	303	436	+44	18.1	17.9	- 1
3. Wales	201	237	+18	3.6	4.1	+14
4. North (including Cumberland)	349	411	+15	9.1	7.2	-22
5. N. Midlands (Derby)	737	748	+ 1.5	20.6	19.7	- 4
6. North-West (Lancashire and Cheshire)	383	377	- 1.5	20.9	14.7	-30
7. E. and W. Yorkshire	404	372	- 8	16.0	13.5	-16
8. Scotland and N. Ireland	421	372	-11	22.4	15.1	-33
	<u>3,388</u>	<u>3,806</u>	<u>+12</u>	<u>146.2</u>	<u>127.7</u>	<u>-13</u>

The tremendous growth of productivity in the newer foundries is shown in the Midlands and Southern areas where production has gone up by 45 per cent and 44 per cent, respectively, with almost the same total labour force as in 1949.

It is not surprising that Mr. Newman, President of the Joint Iron Council, could declare in the report earlier referred to:

We have the highest output per man year in Europe. We produce castings more economically than any other country in Europe . . . our methods of production and technical skill are certainly equal to those of continental foundries.

This was said to support his view that the industry had nothing to fear in facing the challenge of the Common Market. At least it is a change from the whines and groans about the 'lazy British workers' laying down beside the job. Mr. Newman, it should be noted, was talking about the industry as a whole. The majority of British foundries are small. Production methods have not been greatly changed. Yet productivity has improved in these 'traditional' foundries, too. The results give Mr. Newman good cause for satisfaction. For the workers concerned it has all too often meant unemployment, short-time working and higher accident rates due to the increasing strain of production schedules.

Total production in Scotland and Northern Ireland fell by 11 per

cent between 1949 and 1961, but manpower was reduced by 33 per cent in that time. In the North West, including Merseyside, production in 1961 was only slightly less than in 1949, but manpower was down by 30 per cent. This trend is apparent in Yorkshire too. The position on the North East Coast is that manpower went down by 22 per cent and production rose by 15 per cent. The increase in production was largely due to the output of ingot moulds in the North. If this is taken into account, the pattern in this area is similar to the position in Scotland and the North West, *i.e.*, a slight increase in production and a decline of 22 per cent in the number of workers employed. All this gives added point to the consistent pressure from the Amalgamated Union of Foundry Workers within the labour movement for some positive direction of industry to those areas of the country where employment prospects have declined in the last decade and where thousands of highly skilled workers can find no use for the training and experience acquired in the only trade they know. We have to think about this more.

This pressure is beginning to make an impression on the public mind and on political leaders who are looking now with one wary eye on the General Election. The nearer we get to it the more attention will be paid to reasoned arguments for the growth of industries in the depressed areas. After the election these arguments can be quietly forgotten again. We need to force through public commitments to a constructive policy of directing industry now if the problems are to be correctly solved. We need to think more about this, too. Demanding the direction of new mass production industries may not be the most effective answer to employment problems in the depressed areas. The figures show that a tremendous growth of production is possible on this basis so far as foundries are concerned without any great increase in the numbers employed in the industry at all. Nor is it any answer to the problem if an expansion of the car industry in Scotland or on Merseyside is won at the extension of short-time working in the Midlands or the South. The extent of this short-time working in the 'affluent' areas is a factor all too often overlooked.

The greatest need is for a planned expansion of the main sections of our economic life in a way that will utilise and develop to the full the skills acquired by our craftsmen and technicians. This skill is our greatest national asset. It is being squandered. We must provide work that will give craftsmen a chance to use the talents they have and which will restore confidence in their future as

craftsmen in the industry for which they have been trained. If they have work the other sections of engineering workers have better prospects too.

It is true that the number of craftsmen needed in many industries will steadily decline. In iron foundries, for example, the total labour force declined by 13 per cent between 1949 and 1961, but the number of skilled moulders dropped from 43,500 to 29,300, *i.e.*, by 32 per cent in the same period. Many foundry craftsmen are demanding restrictions on entry to the craft because of this. This is not surprising and in some areas it may well be necessary. Meanwhile, a survey conducted by the Engineering Employers' Federation in 1961 revealed the fact that only one-third of the lads who enter foundries as apprentices are staying to complete their training. The rest drift into less-skilled occupations which, ironically enough, offer better prospects of security and higher earnings. There is not much time. One generation of skill and experience is wasting away. A new generation is being stifled by lack of opportunity. We shall pay a heavy price for this unless the stranglehold of Tory restrictions can be broken soon.

We need an expanding building industry, a planned policy of 'scrap and build' for shipbuilding, the modernisation of our machine tool industry which has been badly neglected, a generous policy of technical aid to under-developed countries. Given these objectives, the foundry industry can make a decisive contribution towards a truly affluent society. But this, to again quote Mr. Newman, needs consistent planning which

will channel money in the right directions instead of being ruled by the alternate periods of flood and stagnation we have experienced in recent years.

Even some captains of industry no longer look on 'planning' as a dirty word. They may not follow the logic of their thoughts through to accept the need for public ownership. This would be too much to expect. But we do not have to convince *them*. We have to convince our own labour movement about what needs to be done. We have to put in power the kind of Government that really believes in Socialist planning and will give the workers of this country a chance to show that they can live up to the aspirations of the Foundry Workers' motto:

Together moulding a better world.

That is, as it must always be, our real objective.

BATTLE FOR JOBS ADVANCES

(The Battle for Jobs described by Leo McGree in the January issue, is now being waged in a tremendous campaign building up in Wales and the North leading to the lobbying of Parliament by delegates from Wales and from all the Federations of Trades Councils in the North. These campaigns of almost unprecedented scope are vividly described in the letters below.)

MAY I ADD a postscript to Leo McGree's pithy article in the December *Labour Monthly*, on the Mersey Lobby for Jobs.

This action undoubtedly sparked off a resolution which was adopted at the November meeting of Tyne-mouth District and Whitley Bay Trades Council calling on 'the North East Federation of Trades Councils to propose to the rest of the Northern Federations, that a Northern Trades Union lobby of Parliament should take place as early as possible'.

North East decided to support the kernel of our resolution and to put the machinery in motion on December 8. As a consequence the Federations of the North East, Teeside, Cumberland and Westmorland, Yorkshire and Lancashire met at Darlington on January 12, 1963, and agreed on a considerable programme of activity. Firstly, that a Lobby of Parliament should take place on March 26, preceded by a mass meeting in London on the Right to Work, which the Leader of the Labour Party and the Chairman of the Trades Union Congress would be invited to address. Secondly, deputations should be sent to the Prime Minister, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Board of Trade and Transport Ministry. Thirdly, that liaison should be made with the trades councils of Glasgow, Belfast, South Wales and Glamorgan, North Wales and Cheshire, and the London Federation. Lord Hailsham was to

be pressed for increase in unemployment benefits.

There is good reason why such a formidable programme was decided upon by all these important bodies. On unemployment the picture has changed rapidly and dramatically in the northern region, that is the N.E. Coast, Cumberland and Westmorland and North Yorkshire. In December 1961, there was 40,243 registered unemployed and in December 1962, 64,851 registered. The outstanding vacancies notified to the Ministry of Labour at December 1961 were 7,360 and at December 1962, 4,798. This is bad enough at first glance, but if one probes deeper one sees that the position really started to deteriorate in May (when the figures normally improve with seasonal work) till October, when employment prospects plunged with 17,207 workers becoming unemployed from then until December.

So far as youngsters are concerned, we are worse off here than anywhere in Britain; for example on Wearside 6 per cent, Teeside 7 per cent and West Durham 10 per cent of the July 1962 school leavers are without their first job and some of them have five or more G.C.E. passes. There were at December 10, 3,240 boys and 1,886 girls unemployed, a figure three times as high as a year ago.

The problems socially stem, in the main, from the distress caused by the reduction in income. No one here doubts for a second that the

unemployed today are worse off than those pre-war. There is, however, a curious feature arising out of the exodus South due mainly to the closures in the Durham coalfields. For instance, four Durham Parish Councils, Coxhoe, Kelloe, Shincliffe and Cassop cum Quarrington met to discuss among other things, the effect of the drift on council property. The four councils named have a combined population of 12,000 and there are 3,700 houses, quite adequate to their need; but in two years 450 miners and their families have gone south and the fears of the Labour Councils are that council houses may stand empty and become a drain on their very low resources. Hence the importance and emphasis the Durham miners place on the need to build in Durham a coal-fired Power Station which would guarantee the jobs of 10,000 miners.

I commenced by a request to add a postscript to Leo McGree's article. After a moments reflection I rather think that I should have said he had written the preface to a new edition of a very old story with a different ending. A lead-in to the next chapter might well be a quote from an old pal: 'Even a magician could not make the Lions of the Battlefield the mice of industry'.

LES ALLEN,

Secretary, Tynemouth & Whitley Bay Trades Council.

IN BATTLE FOR JOBS, Leo McGree spotlighted one of the most damnable features of the present unemployment position. That is the increasing numbers of young people, and particularly school-leavers, joining the ranks of the unemployed. Wales has not been excluded from the Tory attack on living standards. Hundreds of young people now are unemployed or have been forced to

remain at school as an alternative to walking the streets looking for jobs that do not exist. January figures of Mid-Glamorgan are expected to be the worst for seventeen years and the total figures for Wales to rise to more than 37,000. Cardiff youth unemployment figures on January 7 are a sign of the worsening trend in youth unemployment and the inability of industry to accommodate school-leavers. A fine tribute to Tory planning. Of the 369 boys who left school at Christmas, 89 had not been able to find suitable employment and a further 89 had voluntarily returned to school, and 40 girls were still looking for work.

In the valleys too, this has become a serious problem. With the continued threat of pit and rail closures ringing in the ears of the people, and more and more factory workers becoming redundant, the prospect in the valleys is grim. Short-time working has become quite commonplace to hundreds of factory workers. Firms like I.C.I. and B.S.A. have closed down branch factories at Merthyr and with every take-over bid in the cities, yet another factory comes under the axe. The workers of Murphy Radios at Hirwaun were given notice to finish within no time of the take-over by the big Rank Organisation. In the Rhondda valley quite a number of small light industries are working on short-time or at under capacity. Young people walking the streets, standing at street corners being forced to idle away the day in very much the same way that their fathers did a generation ago. Mining may have been the mainstay of the Welsh economy in pre-war days, but this position no longer remains. Since the last war, subsidiary industry was channelled into the valleys, creating jobs for the sons and daughters of mining fami-

lies who would have hitherto been obliged to follow in their parents' footsteps, either by descending the mine or migrating to the more prosperous cities. This new development in the structure of the Welsh industrial scene has now been halted and in a number of cases reversed by Tory government policy. The large industrial combines, centred in London and the North, who were quick to take advantage of the preferential treatment accorded to firms setting up factories in the valleys, are now amputating their many branches in an attempt to consolidate their position in the 'highly competitive market in Europe'. Railways are being closed. A number of pits are on the books for closure.

The Battle for Jobs in Wales has already begun. On February 13 Miners and Railwaymen are to lobby Parliament on the question of 'Threatened Closures and Unemployment'; it's a long awaited unity of miners and railwaymen. The whole question of unemployment—in all trades—has become the real issue of the day. It is to the credit of the miners and railwaymen that they have been able to win the maximum support for this lobby embracing all sections of the people.

This lobby on February 13 will affect all sections of the community, employed and unemployed, housewives who have to manage on the weekly dole money, young men and women who have to postpone their plans for the future, as a result of Tory attacks on jobs.

TONY WINTER, *Cardiff*.

OUR FACTORY is threatened with closure at the end of January this year. At present 222 are employed, two-thirds of whom are women, the majority are single girls; many are juveniles. We were first told of the

close down in the middle of December 1962. A notice was put up saying that the factory was to close due to economic reasons and 'the falling down of forward orders'.

My feeling then was one of shock because our factory had the best record for stability of employment on the Hirwaun Trading Estate. It is a lesson for those in other factories because our employment seemed so sure. The first reaction of the workers was also one of shock, then, 'we'll get another job'. There were plenty of jokes about what sort of jobs, but now the feeling is changing, bitterness is creeping in and the majority realise that they may be receiving unemployment benefit at the end of the month. There appear to be two opinions, 'What can we do?', or 'We can't do anything', but the idea is now gaining strength that we should do something as we have nothing to lose. The reserve is breaking down and our workers are beginning to want to put up a struggle to make their voices heard. So we have organised petitions, to the Council and the Trades and Labour Council, to the M.P., to the Managing Director. On Friday, January 11, a deputation of our Shop Stewards, A.E.U. officials, Councillors and the M.P. went to Birmingham to see the Managing Director.

Trade Union officials have a set procedure, which is excellent in its own way; but it is essential that the ordinary trade unionists should do everything they can to make their voices heard through petitions, meetings, demonstrations to support their elected union officials in their negotiations to keep factories open. It is only when we are working that we can fight to maintain our work. It is too late when we are unemployed.

GARFIELD THOMAS,

A.E.U. Convenor, Aberdare.

FIGARO AND COLUMBIA

Wilfred Macartney

FIGARO in the opera was full of devices and strategies, a devious but delightful fellow. In real life his creator, Beaumarchais, was even more resourceful and on a greater stage than the Theatre Francais (Comedie Francaise) could provide in an Eighteenth Century of war and revolution. The main and lasting beneficiary of his talents (and talents) was these 'united states'. His favourite nephew was killed fighting there. In 1870, nearly a hundred years after the Declaration of Independence, an ex-United States Minister to France, John Biglow, wrote these words :

To him more than any other person belongs the credit of making Louis XVI comprehend the political importance of aiding the colonies in their struggle with Great Britain; he planned and executed the ingenious scheme by which the aid was to be extended; he sent the first munitions of war and supplies which the colonists received from abroad and he sent them too, at a time when, humanly speaking, it was reasonably certain that without such aid from some quarter, the colonists must have reasonably succumbed.

Nonetheless poor Figaro did not get paid for the millions he expended nor for the services he rendered; indeed it was not till thirty years after his death and fifty years after the Declaration of Independence that his daughter and grandson made the long and severe journey (in those days) to Washington and extracted from an unwilling Congress a tenth of the sum due.

The American historian James Breck Perkins wrote :

It is sad to reflect that almost everyone who attempted business relations with our country at the time of the Revolution, ended in bankruptcy.

For Beaumarchais was not the only Frenchman so treated. Le Ray de Chaumont, owner of the Hotel de Valentinois, which he lent to Franklin free of charge for use as the headquarters of the American commissioners at Passy, also took an active part in supplying the insurgent colonists, with results scarcely more rewarding than the efforts of Beaumarchais. Indeed, perhaps even less so; for while the latter's descendants did eventually obtain at least a fraction of the money due, Chaumont's son, who also made the journey to America and remained there for some years, was completely unable to extract any of the money owing to his father, and finally abandoned his attempts in despair.

Thomas Paine, the author of *Commonsense* and the Godfather of the American nation, was given by a similar Congress a sort of

pauper's funeral. Only six people were there. A Quaker watchmaker, a French woman, Madame Bonneville and her two sons. There were also two Negro men who rode on the wagon to dig the grave and lift the coffin. Not one person of distinction took time to pay his respects, to stand over the grave with uncovered heads or to say a few words at the funeral service. Tom Paine at the time of his funeral was disfranchised by the nation he had done almost as much as Washington to create. Nations born of revolution usually immediately pay their obligations contracted to sympathisers when in exile or in prison. The Bolsheviks paid immediately on attaining power the funds they had raised in exile. The Irish immediately they were in power did the same and more recently the State of Israel has been most punctilious in settling all outstanding debts incurred during their fight for statehood. John Milton wrote that 'the child will show the father'; the United States in its maturity has been living up or down to its childhood. It is a record of rapacity towards its debtors and repudiation for its creditors.

In the nineteenth century State after State in America defaulted on its bonds; these were not commercial issues, they were loans offered for tender by sovereign States ostensibly for public works; even today the State of Michigan is in default. An ingenious economist after the 1914-18 war worked out that with interest, simple interest, mark you, not compound interest, the Americans owed its Allies in Europe more than the total so-called war debts. But what a rumpus Columbia kicks up when the drab thinks she is being bilked. 'They hired the money' snarls Coolidge the 'loan shark' when asked for forbearance by his French allies who had lost millions of lives in the 1914-18 war. One can almost see the shadow of Beaumarchais shuddering.

The stupor which British statesmen fall into when on the Potomac is deadening; only on the way home does the victim come out of his Lethelike trance. It is said that when Baldwin woke up two days out of New York he was so startled at the terms he agreed upon that he was frightened to cable Bonar Law the facts. When Bonar Law, a tough iron and steel broker accustomed to the Glasgow and Montreal metal markets, heard the facts, he exclaimed in an icy fury: 'You've lowered the standard of living for a generation here' and then paraphrasing Kipling 'If blood be the price of America, Oh God, we ha' paid in full'. This was especially galling for Baldwin because Kipling was his first cousin. Yankee millionaires had an odd fascination for Kipling, who lived among them for years and in

his novel *Captains Courageous* showed this queer trait. Bonar Law was so angry that he threatened to resign and that would have meant the fall of the Tory Government; instead he died.

And so it continued even up to the great crash of 1929 and even during the long slump when *all* the banks in America closed and there were 25 millions out of work with no relief; yet the U.S.A. although broke seemed to dominate the British Treasury and Cabinet;* *e.g.*, unemployment cuts of 1931, etc.

It took the hilarious London Conference of 1933 to point the lesson. This Conference took place in the Geological Museum in Kensington; it was fitted up with a 70-ft. bar enjoying extra territorial rights; which means in plain English, no licensing hours and drinks from every nation and for every national.

The American mission was housed at Claridges Hotel, said by some to be a staid sort of hostelry. The Americans turned it into a wild west saloon. The Conference was about tariffs, the gold standard and managed currency, the kind of things so beloved by the Micawber-like bankers of the thirties; everybody double-crossing each other and the United States knifing the rest and indeed, often knifing themselves and literally so; for Senator Kay Pittman of Nevada pulled a bowie knife on a delegate suspected of being soft on silver and chased him down the hotel corridors almost into the arms of Queen Maud of Norway, who sighed for the trouble 'these people' had caused her direct ancestor George III.

Roosevelt shot a torpedo into the conference which nearly blew up the Geological Museum, with a telegram repudiating everybody and everything. It was not considered convenient to pay the U.S. Gold Notes so they were cavalierly set aside under the pretext that the state was in mortal danger. At the opulent entrance to Claridges, fisticuffs were exchanged between Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, and Raymond Moley, a kind of overseer sent by Roosevelt, just as Hull was getting into his car to spend the week-end with Lady Astor and the Cliveden set; but worse or better was to follow. At a Royal Garden Party the following week, King George V, an irascible old sea-dog (one of the few, let it be said, who was not impressed by the U.S.A., dynastically 'the shape of things to come') violently upbraided a prominent American republican, while Queen Mary shook her famous parasol at the unfortunate wife.

*British Official subservience to America was resisted by Sir Ben Smith, Minister of State for Supply in Washington, an ex-heavyweight boxing champion of the Royal Navy and organising Secretary of the Licenced Vehicles Workers' Union, an able and courageous man, who was recalled from Washington in 1945.

Anyhow, whether effective or not, the scene was riotous enough for the United States Ambassador to complain; a kind of Boston Tea-party in reverse. The final irony of London was its one tangible achievement. Senator Kay Pittman of Nevada, whose sprees had shamed his own delegation and scandalised London, emerged in the end the single victor. When he sailed for America, he had in his pocket, signed and ready for operation, an international agreement on silver. It was at this time that the London property dealers got American business in perspective. The late Howard Samuel used to tell with glee of his interview with the Manager (a Vice-President) of the Bank of America,* previously the Bank of California who wanted a West End office. Samuel asked who was to guarantee the covenant. The irked clean-cut Vice-President pointed out that the Bank of America was the biggest bank in the world. Samuel replied, 'Yes, but it closed once'. 'But we were the first to re-open' said the Vice-President. 'Ah, but you closed' jeered Samuel, visions of voids in his head; and it is a fact that since then any covenant of any size by any American firm must be guaranteed by an English bank, or more often an insurance company, *e.g.*, all the new American hotel ground rents are guaranteed by either Pearl, Legal and General, or Guardian; in fact the American tenants become kind of managers for the City and the great landlords: munificently paid, it is true, but bond-posting nonetheless!

Now a century and a half later, with two world-wars, revolutions, slumps galore, the picture, *mutatis mutandis*, is the same. The huge interest rate charged by American bankers to her allies in both wars makes the present situation so sinister. The brutal breaking off of lease-lend, the substitution of Marshall aid with its restrictions and the American loan, a money-lender's dream!

The Americans are governed today by cash considerations because their situation is approaching the desperate. One cannot change dollars in Zürich at the official rate (tourist traveller cheques are dealt with normally) but should 10 million dollars be offered a considerable discount will be demanded; no wonder the arbitrage boys are doing well.

One facet is the Skybolt head-on collision and the pressure upon Great Britain to increase the B.A.O.R. thus relieving the Americans

*Giannini, founder of the Bank of America, when the Bank of California, used to ask immigrants, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish, tomato growers and fishermen, not how many acres they had or how far the crop was advanced when these people applied for a loan, but how many children they had. If the solicitor replied 'four and, say one, in the oven', he got his loan, thus proving the Marxian theory of labour value because five people working on a collateral would get more out of it than two.

of the cost of the G.I., who is paid about five times more than the Swaddy and whose coddlings call to mind the luxurious life of the Janissaries and the Praetorian Guard. The Skybolt has been over-represented as a Kennedy power hallucination. In *The Times*, January 11, 1963, Kennedy is quoted as saying: 'It seemed to us . . . we were better off to put our money elsewhere'. More regard should be paid to a Congress with its more than century-old desire for its dependents or allies or anybody else to carry the burden.

De Gaulle with his bitter war-time memories, especially the United States' refusal to hand over to him the gold in Vichy-controlled Martinique, is not so tractable. Maybe the General remembers Figaro and the poor hotelier of Passy.

Commentators appear surprised that the Bahamas was the venue for the recent meeting. Now in protocol the host country pays the bill. This is not to say that Kennedy would not buy Macmillan a Bourbon or even a Scotch, but the problem was whether Congress would pick up the tab and block the estimates had Columbia been the hostess, especially buying drinks for Limeys, who are always broke anyhow and asking for things, so why trouble to entertain them? So in the words of Seneca—*Tenacissimi sumus eorum quae pueri percipimus* 'We hold closely to what we perceive in childhood'. The young U.S.A. observed and grimly perceived. It has paid off.

CHINA: AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY

Anna Louise Strong

A GOOD crop has been reaped this autumn on the North China plain, so at long last, grain is in fair supply in all areas. Honan and Shantung were the last bad spots; but summer rains brought good autumn crops, and similar good news comes from other parts of the country. The bonus of good weather in Honan is only the crown added to the steady advance of two years under the programme to aid agriculture. The early rice crop in Kwangtung was good for the second year, despite torrential rains that twice broke railway lines around Canton. The Peking area had its driest summer and early autumn in forty years, but still the vegetables and fruit flood the city's markets. This is the result not of good weather, but of the electric-driven pumping systems that today give China

twenty times as much horsepower as in 1957. And these in turn are only one aspect of the work being done to make agriculture a sure foundation for China's next industrial advance.

Ironically, just at this time a French correspondent returning from Hong Kong tells how newsmen eager for 'China news' asked 'When are they going to collapse?' Averill Harriman told a Congressional committee: 'In 1959 China was going ahead so fast that I was gravely concerned. Since then China's food production failed and the communes collapsed'. Whether the reporters got their information from Harriman or vice versa, they will have to wait to cover the demise of China!

People living in China learn of farm gains by an increase in supplies; by a drop in prices in the 'free markets' where peasants sell surplus, and by steady additions to the ration (two big ducks or chickens were offered to every Peking family, outside the ration, for the National Day feast, October 1). This is the concrete evidence that convinces the people. Premier Chou En-lai declared that the 1962 crop is 'somewhat higher than that of 1961, which in turn, was higher than 1960' that 'the most difficult period is over' but that 'many difficulties remain' and for next year and perhaps many years the policy must still be 'to readjust industry to the technical transformation of agriculture' and to develop the national economy 'with agriculture as foundation and industry as leading factor' and 'continue to improve management, variety and quality of goods'.

This restrained programme may not seem exciting to people who in 1958 dreamed that crops would keep 'leaping' forward by huge percentages each year, with industry rising even faster. When Chou adds that 'the natural disasters for three consecutive years . . . and the mistakes in our own work have caused us difficulties', one wonders what 'mistakes' he means. Are the communes now considered a 'mistake'? Apparently not, for they are listed among the 'three red banners' for the nation's advance. Most people even say: 'The communes saved the country'.

Perhaps the big mistake from which many others grew was the over-estimation of the grain crop of 1958. The crop was terrific and nobody ever knew how big. Peasants who had formerly measured by buckets with an eye to taxes were guessing without scales or measures, with no danger of increased taxation and with desire to make a record. At the same time they were organising communes, 'putting all China on ball bearings' in three summer

months by hand-hammering bearings from iron; driving on 60 million strong, to make steel and then, 70 million strong, to build reservoirs. In the midst of all this they 'estimated' that 1958 harvest, and then went off and left part of it in the fields. The important thing was not that China had 'lost face' by confused statistics. The real trouble was that the Chinese believed their figures and acted on them for a year, at all levels. Communes sold grain lavishly to the state and some later found they had not kept enough to eat. The state in turn was convinced that the 'Big Leap' and the communes were so magical that fewer peasants could henceforth produce more grain. So every province happily built industry, believing grain and raw materials would easily be obtained.

In this situation, steel production tripled in the three years 1957-59 from 5.35 million to 18.45 million. In the first two years, the 'Big Leap' raised gross industrial output by 115 per cent, though the plan had called for only 100 per cent in five years. To achieve this, tens of millions of peasants poured from the farms into the cities to work in new industries or study in newly-built technical schools. Then, in 1960, the worst natural disasters of the century struck the farms, and it became clear that agriculture could not feed this expanded city population with either grain for its workers or raw materials for its machines. Even without the disastrous weather, some readjustment was due. With every province and almost every county building steel mills, and even communes making synthetic rubber from sweet potatoes, central control was urgent. On March 30, 1960, the head of the State Planning Commission, reporting on the plan, noted that the output of industry was already three years ahead of schedule, and stressed the need of 'simultaneous development of agriculture' as the 'foundation' of the economy. He urged that industry 'turn attention to putting agriculture on a modern base'. One year of many natural disasters had shown the need for strengthening agriculture, but the worst disasters had not yet struck. Had the weather turned friendly, the adjustment of industry to agriculture would have been comparatively easy.

Some Western critics think China exaggerated or even 'fabricated' the natural disasters. On the contrary, China began by belittling them and stressing the power of man to overcome them, pointing out that some communes 'conquered' a flood or fought a 300-day drought with success. Reservoirs and irrigation systems dug by communes saved some communities from famine. But reservoirs last only as long as their sources, and when drought followed

drought, the great Yellow River sank so low that for eight months children waded across it. This disclosed that the entire Yellow River system has not enough water for all the farms in its basin in a dry spell of several years. New sources must be found either underground by pumping or by syphoning water from the Yangtze to the North, a task beyond China's present strength.

The year 1960 was the worst: 60 per cent of all the cultivated land of China was hit by 'disasters, either drought, flood, hurricane, high winds or pests' and 40 per cent was 'seriously affected'. *The Times* on December 30, 1960, described the natural disasters as 'worse possibly than China has experienced for a century' and added that the 'succession of rainless days' on the northern plain was 'longer than that which led to China's last major famine in Honan in 1943, when . . . an estimated two million died'. Rewi Alley, who has watched China for 35 years as an engineer engaged in welfare said the blows dealt by nature in 1959-61 are rather to be compared with 1926-29 when drought in six north-west provinces brought an estimated 20 million deaths. This time, the strength of the nation was mobilised against the disasters. The Communist Party turned attention to the need for increased output of grain and Vice Premier Po I-po said that the tremendous leap in industrial production had 'won time' and that the two remaining years of the Second Five Year Plan should be devoted to the 'technical transformation of agriculture' and the expansion of light industry to meet daily needs.

Many plans for industry and for educational programmes were temporarily shelved for the fight for food. The nation-wide slogan became: 'No one shall starve!' There was great hardship in many areas, but no wholesale casualties such as followed disasters in China's past decades. For there was no abandonment of communities, no scattering of starving people to die along the roads.

The government phrase 'with agriculture as foundation and industry as leading factor' does not deny the importance of heavy industry, nor is it a temporary retreat. It affirms the relation between agriculture and industry. Heavy industry is the 'leading factor' in transforming China's ancient society and backward agriculture into a socialist society. It determines the way and form of change, whether this be tractors or nuclear power. But agriculture is always the foundation, which industry may remould but on which it must be built. If the foundation be shaky, industry cannot be built. This has always been recognised in China. In the first five years of the republic the major investment was in irrigation for

agriculture; then, when crops seemed sufficient, China turned to build heavy industry. But when disasters struck it was found that all the irrigation provided was not enough and the farms could not feed the industries. So most capital construction was halted except for the needs of agriculture, and industrial production either 'cut back' or adjusted to agriculture's needs. And millions of peasants were told: 'You had better go back home and grow grain'. This was not a popular move. Retrenchment never is. Nobody was compelled to go, except as the ending of a job compels.

Meanwhile, production of all kinds of goods for agriculture has been stepped up. Besides the tremendous increase in pumps for irrigation, four new tractor plants are being built. A second marked change is the growth in variety and quality. Though total steel output is reduced, China produces about 10,000 kinds of rolled steel; while some coal mines have closed, others are being converted to modern hydraulic methods. Not all reservoirs have power plants, but China has designed and built some with capacities of several hundred thousand kilowatts. Thus, even in a period of cut backs, China presses ahead technologically, until a sure foundation in agriculture will provide the base for another great advance.

Governor Shao of Kiangsi said: "Man's will, not heaven, decides" was a fine slogan in 1958. We still believe it. But until we create much more mechanisation, "heaven" has still a word to say about our crops'. The governor had done a lot in Kiangsi to make 'man's will' prevail. But he knew that many old walls remain in China that will break under pressure, and that not all rivers are yet tamed. He also knew the forces that will conquer them. The 'Big Leap' that began in 1958 transformed China—and not only because it nearly tripled in three years the output of industry and of steel. Its greatest achievement was that it awoke to life a new type of peasant, conscious of his power to bend nature to his will. The process proved more complex than the peasant thought at first. But nobody who lived through that 'Big Leap' forgets it. And many say 'The greatest thing we learned was the power that lies in the Chinese people. We also learned the need of clearer plans'. A friend said to me 'The "Big Leap" is a process and we are in it still. It is a way of advancing by great drives of the people. After each drive there may be pauses for adjustment and filling in but we think that, taken over 10, 20 or 30 years, China's progress will be perhaps the biggest leap the world has known.

(Abridged from THE NATIONAL GUARDIAN)

ISRAELI SOCIALISM?

Eliezer Feiler*

OFFICIAL Israeli propaganda, theorists of the Zionist-socialist parties in Israel, champions of 'democratic socialism' all over the Western world, and even a number of well-meaning people from the new states in Africa and Asia, all have much to say about what they term 'Israeli Socialism'. It is time to deal more thoroughly with this aspect of Israeli life and provide a sober and realistic evaluation from a scientific working-class standpoint.

Let me begin with a typical quotation, making clear what the Zionist-socialist theorists claim. P. Lavon, then Histadrut† General Secretary said:

There remains the basic fact that in Israel—and in Israel alone out of the entire world—a society was established whose economy belongs in its overwhelming majority to free working people. If the term socialist economy has a meaning, then we have come nearer than any other state in the world to the advancement of the real content of this term.

(*Davar*, April 9, 1959.)

According to this view, the Kibbutz—the Israeli agricultural collective farm—is the supreme creation of this socialist economy. Thus, one of the more 'left' leaders of Israeli Zionist-socialist reformism, A. Ben-Aharon of the Achdut-Ha'avoda party, said:

we have established an important nucleus for the achievement of a socialist society—the Kibbutz.

(*Davar*, December 11, 1957.)

It is instructive to note that more sober-minded people of the same circles, notably economists and sociologists, have recently come to somewhat different conclusions. Professor H. Halperin, director of the Agricultural State Bank, himself a prominent member of the ruling party, wrote in 1961:

The Kibbutz as such is in danger. Notice that at the beginning of the century we had in this country a co-operative *movement*, but now such a movement no longer in fact exists. We have co-operatives with imposing institutions; but a movement we have not got . . . We are engaged in exporting co-operative principles, but we ourselves possess no such movement. And what is more, signs of degeneration are beginning to appear in the existing co-operatives . . . and this causes serious concern. The lack of a movement threatens to impair our most important creation, the apple of co-operation's eye—the Kibbutz.

(*Davar*, September 19, 1961.)

*Mr. E. Feiler is a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel.

†The federation of Israeli trade unions.

This statement is proof that there are people even within the reformist camp who realise that there is a discrepancy between their theory and real life. It is difficult within the scope of a short article to deal in detail with every feature of so-called 'Israeli socialism', so I shall touch only briefly on the State and Histadrut enterprises.

S. Mikunis, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Israel, giving a report to the 14th Congress of the Party, dealt with the argument that the extent of the State sector in economy was proof that Israel is socialist:

If we adopt these 'theories' advanced by the leaders of Mapai* among other things we should have to conclude that the social order and economy of the neo-nazi West German state of Adenauer and Globke are 'mainly socialist'. After all, there the state-controlled part of the national economy, at least as far as industry is concerned, is more extensive than that in Israel.

Regarding the Histadrut sector the report pointed out

Foreign monopoly capital has also designs on the economic enterprises of the Histadrut. These enterprises . . . began as producer, consumer, contracting and credit co-operatives; in the course of time, however, they became typical capitalist enterprises, owned jointly by 'Hevrat Ovdim' (the Histadrut holding company) and by foreign and Israeli capitalists. The U.S. Ampal Corporation is one of the principal channels through which investments and loans are transferred by American capitalists to Histadrut-owned enterprises (250 million dollars between 1948 and 1959). Recently, West German capital, too, has been penetrating these enterprises.

Mikunis quoted the Hamburg paper *Die Welt* which on September 12, 1959, wrote that the 'atmosphere in Israel is favourable to foreign investment, due to the fact that the Histadrut is a big employer of labour . . . and is not fettered by Marxist doctrine'. He remarked: 'As we see, the Ben Gurion government and the Histadrut have won the admiration of international monopoly capital'.

When we turn to investigate the facts in more detail, the essential class character and the trends of development in the Israeli Kibbutz movement, I feel it is necessary to stress once again that we in no way deny that a valuable part can be played by co-operative organisation of agricultural production and producers, even in conditions of capitalist society. While always remembering Lenin's definition that, under capitalism, co-operatives are bound to be 'co-operative capitalist institutions', we at the same time value the Israeli agricultural producers collectives (the Kibbutzim) for their efficient and

*The right-wing Social Democratic Party, at present in power.

original form of organisation, for their high level of management and agrotechnics. But with all due respect to the members of the Kibbutzim for their devoted toil, for their principles of communal life and of physical labour, we cannot forget that they exist and produce in conditions of capitalist society, subject to its laws.

We therefore deny categorically that they are 'islands of socialism' quite independent of their environment. On the contrary, the Israeli Kibbutzim, numbering about 230 settlements and comprising about 18,500 families, are producers' co-operatives of workers who are collectively exploited by big capital.

Here is some evidence: The first Kibbutz (*Degania*) was founded fifty years ago; most of its younger members joined it after the First World War; but figures show that they are still very deeply in debt, that they are still not the real owners of their farms and are paying immense sums of interest. If anyone argues that this is normal, and that the farms have not yet achieved economic independence, he is painting too rosy a picture and falsifying the facts. The following table, taken from a report on *The Situation of Israeli Agriculture* published by the official Horovitz-Commission in 1960, is striking: *

Year	Total Capital Invested in all Kibbutzim (in millions)	Capital belonging to the Kibbutzim (in millions)	% of total
1952	73.9	4.8	6.5
1954	138.8	6.9	4.9
1956	249.7	10.0	4.0

This means that 96 per cent of the whole property of all the Kibbutzim, does not belong to them; and that the percentage of their own capital far from increasing, is actually decreasing. Of course some people may argue that this is the average since the formation of new Kibbutzim distorts the general picture. But here are some figures for 113 long-established Kibbutzim only: Their overall debt *increased* from £122 million in 1955 to £269 million in 1960 (figures cited by Sh. Rosen, general secretary of the Hakibbutz Haarzi movement). Taking the interest paid on loans by all the Kibbutzim, you find that in 1954 the £6 million to be paid for interest could be taken from the sum of £11.7 million of gross profit, in 1957 the 17 million to be paid already absorbed all the gross profit which in that year only amounted to 17 million. Now the situation is worse. A working family in the Kibbutz has to pay yearly an average of £1,200 interest.

*Figures throughout are given in Israeli pounds, denoted I£.

At present, interest represents an average of 12 per cent of production costs in Israeli agriculture. There are even cases where the average is 24 per cent . . . This is an excessively high interest rate, which is scarcely equalled anywhere in the world.

(Professor H. Halperin, *Davar*, May 4, 1962.)

What made the Israeli collectives fall into such ever-increasing enslavement to big capital and usurers? The iron laws of capitalist economy apply to all producers—whether private or co-operative. The drive of capital for maximum profit; the need for working farmers to compete with the dumping of food surplus from the U.S.A.; the continuous rise in methods of production (machines, fuel, fertilisers, water, selected seeds, etc.); all this compels the Israeli farmers, whether smallholders or members of co-operatives, to invest more and more and to increase the organic composition of capital. This means in consequence that they must get ever more entangled with the big capitalist corporations, be they open financial trusts, or disguised as 'National' or 'Histadrut' institutions.

These economic developments, which show themselves among other things in severe crises of overproduction of agricultural commodities for the home market, have also very serious social repercussions for the Kibbutz movement.

Since finance capital in agriculture striving for maximum profit, is interested mainly in monocultural crops for export (oranges, peanuts) or raw materials for local industry (sugar-beets, cotton-fibre, oil-kernels), it comes into conflict with the established practice of intensive mixed-farming usual in the Kibbutz economy. The Kibbutz settlements are reluctant to switch over to farming methods which demand a huge number of farmhands during the limited harvest season; mixed farming provides steady employment for the Kibbutz member all the year round. In their efforts to break up these Kibbutz farming methods and force methods suitable for monoculture production upon them, monopoly capital is actively assisted by the Israeli government, which by administration and taxation encourages wholesale slaughtering of dairy cattle, laying hens and so on. Thus the way is paved for introducing wage-labour from outside into these 'islands of socialism' and the exploitation of one toiler (the labourer) by another (the Kibbutz member).

It is only natural that the pressure of the immense debt burden, as well as the appearance within the Kibbutz of employer-wage earner relations, bring about a crisis in the traditional Kibbutz ideology and society. People who have been taught ever since

childhood and told for years that they are building socialism, or even that they have attained the final stage of communism, suddenly realise that they are exploited, or that they themselves are bound to become exploiters; and they fall into despair, nihilism and degeneration. There are signs of complete loss of perspective; hundreds of families leaving their Kibbutz settlements for good. There are symptoms of social differentiation between the Kibbutzim, and even within the closed society of each Kibbutz. Pages could be filled with quotations from statements made, articles written and discussions by Kibbutz members who feel that the ideological ground is vanishing from beneath their feet. It is, therefore, obvious that the Kibbutz as a form of social life and form of organisation of agricultural production, is a shrinking phenomenon. In 1948 the Kibbutz membership was 6.5 per cent of Israel's total population, and 51.6 per cent of the rural inhabitants: by 1958 it had been halved, dropping to 3.9 per cent and 24.2 per cent respectively. Since then it has certainly fallen further.

But there is not only despair and acceptance that capitalist development is inevitable. More and more Kibbutz members themselves begin to understand that only struggle can save their many modern and efficient collective villages. Discontent with the actual development and ruling agricultural policy, as with credit and monetary tie-ups are voiced on an ever wider scale at meetings of organisations of the agricultural collectives and co-operatives. Of course not all criticism is principled, not many arguments are Marxist, the ways of struggle proposed are not very class conscious; but things are moving. But the same change in outlook will come about among this section of the Israeli working population as are beginning among the industrial working class. The members of the Kibbutz movement will have to realise that as exploited toilers—like all toilers under capitalism—they must abandon the illusion of having set up 'socialist nuclei'; they must understand that their collective farms cannot develop and flourish in capitalist conditions which prevail in Israel; that only by joining in conscious class struggle in fraternal unity with the wage labourers can they save the way of life they have created from degeneration and loss of every progressive social features.

LORD AVON'S WARNING

Andrew Rothstein

THE volume of memoirs recently published by Lord Avon (Anthony Eden) covers most of the period during which British Conservative Governments helped Hitler and Mussolini in their successive aggressions. As he writes himself in his foreword, he was a Minister at the Foreign Office from 1931 until February, 1938, and therefore was in 'direct contact with the personalities then shaping world policy'. One may say at once that his book,* both by its revelations and by its omissions, draws once more a well-known picture, but sharpens the principal features by valuable inside information.

Particularly outstanding is the record of how, whenever Eden's personal views or even tentative actions clashed with the settled determination of his party leaders to help the Fascist governments, the leaders (Baldwin, succeeded by Neville Chamberlain) went ahead and he knuckled under. In March, 1935, after interviews with Hitler, and on his way to Moscow to discuss the worsening European situation, Eden cabled a warning to London not to 'encourage her (Germany) in her blackmail', and urged a joint statement by the Great Powers making this clear—but the Cabinet 'took a different course' (p. 143). Later that year he suggested that a meeting of the British and French Prime Ministers with Mussolini should be used to 'confront' him with his obvious preparations for invading Ethiopia—but 'the subject was not raised at all' (p. 179); and when he proposed that, in private talks at Geneva about the now imminent Italian attack, he should declare the Government's readiness to fulfil their obligations under the League Covenant, his colleagues 'did not accept my recommendations' (p. 244). He says he favoured stopping oil supplies to Italy in December, 1935, which would have compelled Mussolini to negotiate and presented 'a salutary warning to Hitler'—but the Government would not 'run the risks' (pp. 295-7). By January, 1937, the Italian and German invasion of the Spanish Republic with large regular forces, brazenly passed off as the sending of 'volunteers' to help the Franco rebellion—which documents have long shown the Italian and German leaders took part in preparing, months before it began in July, 1936—was in full swing. Eden sent a memorandum to the Cabinet

*The Rt. Hon. The Earl of Avon. *The Eden Memoirs. Facing the Dictators.* Cassell, 1962. pp. 660. 42s.

saying that the Nazi adventure was becoming 'a menace to the peace of the world': and advocated using the British Navy to exclude war material and 'volunteers' from Spanish ports. But 'I was unable to convince my colleagues' (pp. 433-6). In November, 1937, Lord Halifax, then Lord Privy Seal, was invited to visit Hitler. Eden realised that this was calculated to create the impression of British support for Hitler in his acts of brigandage; and urged that Halifax should discourage German intervention in Austria and Czechoslovakia. Instead (as British and German diplomatic documents show) Halifax used language to Hitler which could only encourage attacks on both countries (pp. 508-516).

These are but a few examples. The volume abounds with others, showing that the ruling Tory clique was determined to shut its eyes to all Hitler's and Mussolini's villainies, provided a working arrangement with them not to touch western Europe could be reached. Even a very cautious and tentative proposal by President Roosevelt in January, 1938—to address foreign diplomats in Washington on the desperate need to recognise 'essential principles in the conduct of international relations'—was rejected out of hand by Neville Chamberlain, because it might 'greatly irritate Hitler and Mussolini' (pp. 548-560). It is interesting to learn that Britain's own Pentagon, the Chiefs of Staff, a couple of weeks later circulated a memorandum objecting even to discussions with the French and Belgian Staffs about mutual defence against Nazi Germany, because 'we should not appear to have both feet in the French camp' at a time when efforts were proceeding to reach agreement with Hitler (pp. 499-501).

Lord Avon throughout writes as though such a settled line of policy was due to the trustful blindness of the Tory leaders, to a wilful refusal to face facts about the aggressive policy of Hitler and Mussolini, to Chamberlain's doting confidence in the possibility of agreement with them to preserve world peace, and belief that to bring about such an agreement was his 'mission'. But such a version does not hold water. Chamberlain, like Baldwin before him: their close associates Simon, Hoare and Halifax: their intimate confidants Dawson, editor of *The Times*, Lord Lothian and Thomas Jones (a member of the Cabinet Secretariat from 1916 to 1930), could all read, and understood very well what was going on. They were well aware of the potential menace which reviving German finance-capital and militarism, Hitler's twin backers, represented for the British Empire. There was method in their madness, however. If there is one thing that stands out from their memoirs, diaries,

biographies and other published papers, it is that they proceeded on one, would-be Machiavellian assumption—that Hitler could be induced by concessions to turn away from the west and attack the Soviet Union, as the common enemy of what they understood by ‘civilisation’: the capitalist system. One need go no farther than *The British Case*—the pamphlet written by the anti-Munichite Lord Lloyd of Dolobran, with a preface by his opponent, the Munichite Lord Halifax, Foreign Secretary, and circulated all over the world in 1939, once these sagacious policies had landed Europe in war—to see these calculations set out in black and white, with the furious Tory reproaches to Hitler for letting them down.

Can it be that Lord Avon had not noticed them, he who once, on Red Army Day (February 23), 1943, warned the British people that ‘the boggy of Bolshevism’ had been used before the war ‘to frighten Europe’ while Hitler conquered country after country? That is hard to accept. What makes it harder is that, on his own admission, he himself played some part in the game. He defended to the French—even if he took no part in negotiating—the perfidious British naval agreement with Hitler in June, 1935, which violated the Versailles Treaty by giving the Nazis the right to build up to 35 per cent of British tonnage (pp. 230-1), and which, by accepting German naval domination of the Baltic made nonsense of the friendly assurances Eden had given in Moscow in April (Lord Avon does not mention this aspect). Again, when Hitler violated the Treaty on his own (and the Locarno agreements of 1925 as well), by sending troops into the Rhineland in March, 1936, Eden played the principal part in restraining the French and Belgian Governments from replying with a threat of military action, as provided at Locarno (pp. 343-351). He omits to mention that the Soviet Union offered to join in such measures, if agreed by the League Council—and that most Tory M.P.s, as well as the Tory press, showed that hatred of the Soviet Union was the deciding factor in determining their opposition to any action against Hitler. When the Spanish Republic was attacked, Eden ‘had no political sympathy with either side’, he writes—overlooking his own declaration in Parliament on November 19, 1936, that ‘other Governments’, *i.e.*, the Soviet Union, were ‘more to blame’ for intervention than those of Germany and Italy—but goes on to say that from early 1937, ‘if I had to choose, I would have preferred a (Spanish) Government victory’ (p. 441). But this preference did not prevent him from continuing the pro-Franco policy of the Chamberlain Government for another twelve months,

and thereby helping to ensure the defeat of the Spanish Republic.

There are other outstanding examples of his silence on the anti-Soviet purpose of the Baldwin and Chamberlain policies: on Chamberlain's notorious statement from 'an authoritative quarter' on April 11, 1935, for instance, which publicly told Hitler he was free to 'go east' provided security was assured in the west: or on the anti-Soviet, *i.e.*, pro-Fascist instructions given to Eden himself by Baldwin on July 26, 1936, on how to handle the Spanish war (revealed by Thomas Jones).

In short, Lord Avon was by no means as consistent in advocating resistance to the Fascist aggressors as he now wishes to appear. It would be of course awkward today, when he himself has rallied to the anti-Soviet cause he once condemned, to recall that this was the real and overall purpose of Tory policy in the 'thirties. For that might suggest to the thoughtful reader that present-day talk of a 'Soviet menace' and 'no more Munichs' is as insincere as the talk of a 'Communist menace' and 'no ideological blocs' was in the 'thirties. There was no Communist menace then, there is none today. But British Tory policy was *primarily* anti-Soviet then, under one disguise, and is *primarily* anti-Soviet today, under another: that is the root of the matter. Lord Home has obligingly reminded us in recent months of this continuity of hatred for the U.S.S.R., as the Tories' guiding thread in foreign policy. It helped to bring about the second world war in the 'thirties, and the sooner the British people expel Lord Home and his Cabinet associates from the seats of power, the less danger there will be of a third world war in the 'sixties.

Thus Lord Avon's memoirs are a new warning that the main enemy of the British people, of its peace, security and prosperity, is the Tory party—in 1963 as in 1933. This is not to deny the value of the work as a quarry of important facts. It is most useful, for example, to learn that when its author told Parliament, in October, 1937, that Britain 'will join no anti-Communist and no anti-Fascist bloc' the Prime Minister did not like it, 'and Lord Dunglass, his Parliamentary Private Secretary, commented to Jim Thomas (Eden's P.P.S.) that he feared the Prime Minister would be upset, as this speech would undo much of his conciliatory work, especially with Mussolini' (p. 508). The Lord Dunglass of 1937 is the Lord Home of 1963.

BOOKS

Masters of Indecision

George K. Young

Methuen. 196 pp. 21s.

MR. YOUNG'S THEME is that the makers of policy in modern Britain are incapable of arriving at decisions, and that our society has become 'sterile, without an inner spirit, and clutching on to a decaying style'. In this he may not be wholly wrong, but he has no conception of the causes of the decay and thinks that the defects of society can be cured by improvements in the machinery of government; he reminds me of a man who thinks he can revive an utterly worn out engine by using a better lubricant. His lack of understanding can be gauged by some of the views he expresses. Nazism he regards as the result of a national neurosis; the Nazis had power placed in their hands 'by those who had lost the capacity for action'; and the strongest barrier against Nazism is the family. The South Africans (the whites) have done more than any other European group to help the African to his first freedom—from want; and there is nothing inherently immoral or sinful either about *apartheid* or *baaskap*. He finds it 'hard to see the immorality of the Suez intervention'. Anti-Semitism in pre-Hitler Germany was aggravated 'by the influx of Jews from the East'. And 'the Russians' have an 'underlying Slav peasant suspicion'. The book is indeed marked throughout by infinite cynical scepticism on many points and an uncritical acceptance of baseless propaganda stories on others.

D. N. PRITT.

The Fraud of 'Soviet Anti-Semitism'

Herbert Aptheker

New Century Pamphlet. 24 pp.
25 cents.

Jews in the U.S.A.

Paul Novick

New Century Pamphlet. 56 pp.
25 cents.

THE PROMINENT SOVIET SCIENTIST, Professor Lev Davidovici Landau, aged 52, a noted physicist, has been awarded the Nobel Prize for Physics, for his 'pioneering theories for condensed matter, especially liquid helium'. This news itself did not receive widespread attention in the British press. Much less was noted the fact that Professor Landau is a Soviet Jew, a product of Soviet society. Was this an oversight by the 'Students of Soviet Affairs', littering the desks of the *Guardian*, *The Times*, *Daily Telegraph*, etc.? Could not the 'Kremlinologists', who spends so much time in studying the names of criminals in the Soviet Union, in order to discover if there are any Jews amongst them, also have noted that Professor Lev Landau is a Jew? This episode emphasises the timeliness of Herbert Aptheker's pamphlet which deals with just this ugly treatment in the West of the Jews in the Soviet Union. Aptheker has brought together in this pamphlet many facts which show the conditions Jews enjoy in the Soviet Union—and also exposes the deliberate slanders and provocative activities of the so-called 'Kremlinologists'. He exposes 'the "special passport" hoax', the 'so-called "Quota System"' and the 'No outstanding Jewish leaders' allegations. For example, he cites among many other prominent Jews, M. B. Mitin, chairman of the C.P.S.U. Department of Political and

Scientific Education; N. Tsarapkin, Chief Soviet delegate at the Geneva Disarmament Conference; Savely Feinberg, Chief of the Theoretical Section at the Institute of Atomic Energy, etc.

Timely, too, is the appearance of the report made by Paul Novick, editor of the Yiddish American daily newspaper *Morning Freiheit*, on the paper's fortieth anniversary, in which he deals with the position of the Jews in the United States. This report shows that there are hundreds of thousands of Jewish workers still in the 'old' traditional trades like tailoring, shoe, food, etc., and in heavy industry. The conditions and struggles these workers contend with is illustrated by the fact that whereas years ago the needle trades' workers occupied the front rank in regard to wage earnings they now stand in the nineteenth place in New York.

A reading of these pamphlets will show the contrasts in the fortunes of the Jews of the two countries—with the advantages Socialism has to offer.

L. ZAIDMAN.

The Prevention of War

John Strachey

Macmillan & Co. 334 pp. 40s.
(Paper 15s.)

THE PREVENTION OF WAR is the most urgent task now facing mankind. Nuclear warfare threatens extinction. So far we can agree with Mr. Strachey's thesis. But when he goes further, it is along the well-trodden road of the cold war. The West must be ready to meet Russian aggression. Nato must have thirty divisions instead of the present twenty, and short-range nuclear weapons.

What about disarmament? Not a hope, thinks Strachey. In fact, it's

a mistake to talk about it. It would mean 'a world power-vacuum'. 'Somewhere, somehow, there will have to be a centre of power, wielded by somebody.' Only a world power, equipped with nuclear arms, can keep the peace. So after 300 pages of labour, Strachey produced the solution: since neither Russia nor the United States will give up nuclear arms, let them agree not to use them against each other, but to prevent other nations from having them. The prospect for the nineteen seventies, Strachey hopes, is that 'the nuclear super-powers arrange humanity's affairs amongst themselves (and no doubt to suit themselves) and for that purpose keep the rest of the world in order'. This is not peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems that Strachey has in mind. He says that nowadays there is a tendency for the capitalist and communist economic and social systems 'to approximate to each other'. Give them time, and they will become identical. Strachey, of course, has 'proved' in his last two books that capitalism has changed its nature, and that imperialism has ended. Now he 'proves' that communism has changed its nature. So we are all just classless world citizens: a classless world government, armed with nuclear weapons, will keep us at peace. This 'solution' shuts its eyes to real class forces. The pre-

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. ■ line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class Ads.', *Labour Monthly*, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

VETERAN L.M. readers: your early copies and pamphlets may be invaluable to others. Send details to: L.M. Exchange Service, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

WE BUY books, pamphlets. Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: RIV 6807. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6.

URGENTLY REQUIRED—All back numbers of *Labour Monthly* from 1921-1930 inclusive and 1939.

vention of war depends on the strength of the socialist states, the liberation movement, the working class and progressive forces. These fight for nuclear and general disarmament, not for the preservation of nuclear weapons 'to enforce the peace'.

EMILE BURNS.

Africa Today—and Tomorrow

John Hatch

Dennis Dobson. 344 pp. 30s.

THIS NEW VERSION of John Hatch's earlier work, *Everyman's Africa*, is some 80 pages longer, and contains much background material which is useful to the newcomer and at the same time handy for those who are more familiar with developments in Africa.

After a short and rather unsatisfactory historical chapter, the book then takes the reader region by region, and territory by territory, on a quick tour of Africa.

The final short chapter attempts to draw some general conclusions, and it is here, perhaps, that Mr. Hatch's views are most clearly expressed. It is not without interest to note that in his earlier version, Mr. Hatch ended with a similar chapter in which he openly spoke of the West ensuring that Africa is not 'lost to the democratic world', and stressing that 'The West must awaken to the fact that the character of a new continental society is at stake'. It is a sign of the times, that in his new book Mr. Hatch has abandoned his more open advocacy of measures to keep Africa 'with the West', and has donned the more fashionable garb of the 'two bloc' theoreticians, as a means of persuading the African people to isolate themselves from the socialist world.

But even so, the imperialist wolf still peeps out from behind the Social Democrat's sheepish garb. Mr. Hatch even claims that 'Most of the newly independent states would have been economically better off, in the short-term view (how long is 'short-term'?—J.W.) by remaining dependent on European imperial powers'; and further, that 'for a long time to come, Africans have to envisage much of the economic and financial control of their continent remaining in other countries'. That may be Mr. Hatch's view. Fortunately, the people of Africa have other ideas.

JACK WODDIS.

The Nature of Politics

J. D. B. Miller

Gerald Duckworth & Co. 296 pp. 30s

HERE IS A BOOK about the nature of politics, expressed in terms of contemporary events, movements and personalities, but from the first page to the last lacking any analysis of class, state and party. Professor Miller, who for five years has been lecturing at Leicester University, is unimpressed by the class struggle as a motive force of history. His observations lead him to the conclusion that political activity is a combination of qualities concerned with the 'expression, advocacy, settlement and modification of disagreements'. It is hard to conceive a thesis more likely to bewilder the young men and women, who before they go to sit at the Professor's feet read the latest about the U.S. blockade of Cuba or the Tories' declared intention to join in the Common Market, despite the opposition of a majority of the nation.

BILL CARRITT.

Man and Evolution

John Lewis

Lawrence & Wishart. 150 pp. 12s. 6d.

JOHN LEWIS is well known for his well-informed and lucid accounts of aspects of Marxist philosophy, particularly in relation to the scientific outlook on sociological questions. In this book he begins with an up-to-date sketch of the biological basis of man's evolution.

But the major part of the book goes on from there to show how evolution applies to the moral, social and intellectual capacities of human nature. In the course of it he deals with many questions of topical interest, such as the survival of the fittest, racism, wars, over-population, social progress, etc., giving a stimulating exposition of Marxist views in opposition to current reactionary theories.

CLEMENS DUTT.

LABOUR MONTHLY

FORTY YEARS AGO

A CRITIQUE OF PLEBS MARXISM

What is the explanation of this pathetic and abject failure? It is not an accident; it is instinct in the whole of Plebs teaching and thinking, with its barren 'science' and abstract class-consciousness, leading only to Labour Party vagueness. The explanation is to be found in the very character of the 'Marxism' taught by the Plebs . . . the essence of Marx is left out. The economics (Marx never wrote about 'Economics') is taken in unreal abstraction, and the history and politics is slurred over or omitted. The value for the class struggle becomes nil. Promising young men are sent to the Labour College for two years and come back budding snobs and trade union officials.

(From 'More British Marxism', *Labour Monthly*, February, 1923.)**PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED****BOOKS**

- Alliance of the Working Class and the Peasantry. V. I. Lenin. Lawrence & Wishart. 410 pp. 6s.
 Britain in the Sixties: Housing. Stanley Alderson. Penguin Books. 176 pp. 3s. 6d.
 Historical Materialism. Maurice Cornforth. Lawrence & Wishart. 148 pp. 10s. 6d.
 Studies of War. P. M. S. Blackett. Oliver & Boyd. 242 pp. 21s.
 British Foreign Policy. F. S. Northedge. George Allen & Unwin. 342 pp. 38s.
 Income Distribution and Social Change. Richard M. Titmuss. George Allen and Unwin. 240 pp. 25s.
 The Cage. Thomas Hinde. Hodder & Stoughton. 222 pp. 16s.
 Collected Poems. Arturo Giovanniti. E. Clemente & Sons, Chicago. 220 pp. \$4.
 Anatomy of Big Business. L. C. and F. W. Park. Progress Books, Canada. 272 pp. \$2.75.
 Aneurin Bevan. Vol. I. Michael Foot. Macgibbon & Kee Ltd. 536 pp. 45s.
 American Foreign Policy and the Cold War. Herbert Aptheker. New Century Publishers. 416 pp. \$4.75.
 Technical Progress in the U.S.S.R. Edited by Y. Maksaryov. Central Books and Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow. 238 pp. 3s. 6d.
 Cause, Principle and Unity. Giordano Bruno. Background Books, Daimon Press. 178 pp. 10s. 6d.

Published by the proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3. and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

NEW SUBSCRIPTION RATES

SPECIAL CONCESSION.....

AND DELIVERED TO YOUR DOOR!

(All Post Free)

Second Class Mail (Unsealed Envelope)

Great BritainOne year 21s., six months 10s. 6d.
 OverseasOne year 24s., six months 12s.
 CanadaOne year \$3.50
 U.S.A.One year \$3.50

First Class Mail (Sealed Envelope)

Great BritainOne year 23s., six months 11s. 6d.
 Commonwealth CountriesOne year 27s. (Canada \$4.50)
 Outside Commonwealth.....One year 35s. (U.S.A. \$5.50)

Airmail

(To those many readers throughout the world, who may wish to have their copy by the speediest mail possible, we quote below some examples of airmail rates for both First Class (sealed envelope) and Second Class (unsealed envelope) airmail. We name but a few countries here, and we shall be pleased to quote rates, on enquiry, for any other country.)

Iraq, Israel	One year 49s.	(2nd Class)	69s.	(1st Class)
India, Hong Kong	One year 54s.	„	99s.	„
Australia, China	One year 59s.	„	114s.	„
Canada	One year \$8.50	„	\$15	„
U.S.A.	One year \$7.50	„	\$14	„

Labour Monthly

Bound Volume, 1962

*It's a history
of the year and
a permanent record*

ORDER NOW

From your usual newsagents,
price £1.5.0d., or send
10s.6d., plus 1s.6d. postage and
your loose copies as soon as
possible to:

**THE MANAGER,
134, Ballards Lane,
LONDON, N.3**

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating
by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

For all interested in the fight for Peace and
Progress in the Countryside and the problems
of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.

Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or

Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

27, Bedford St. Strand, London, W.C.2.

TRADE UNIONISTS

Has your branch seen our
"Problems of Trade Unionism
in the 'Sixties" series?

Special Rates for Organisations

Labour Monthly,
134, Ballards Lane, N.3

LABOUR RESEARCH

'Contracts of Employment Bill'
'Compensation for Redundancy'

1s. or 1s. 2½d. post free from

Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London. W.C.2

Problems of Contemporary History

R. Palme Dutt

Lectures given in Moscow University on the problem of objective interpretation
of current events.

Library edition 15s.

Paper covers 7s. 6d.

A Philosophy of Man

Adam Schaff

A leading intellectual of the Socialist world (Professor of Philosophy in Warsaw)
discusses the perennial problems of human freedom and responsibility.

15s.

LAWRENCE & WISHART

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor : R. Palme Dutt

FROM GAITSKELL TO WILSON

E. M. Winterton



AIRCRAFT AND THE ECONOMY

G. H. Doughty



BATTLE FOR JOBS: THE LOBBY

W. Morgan Williams : C. Maxwell : H. Green



Also : Marxism after 80 Years (R.P.D.)—Trade Union
Structure—Macartney on Mayfair

MARCH 1963

Two Shillings

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL. XLV

No. 3

MARCH . 1963

CONTENTS

- Notes of the Month: Marxism After Eighty Years.** *Hour of Decision—Forty Years Back—Forty Years On—Vision of 1983—Battle to Save Mankind—And Now?—Towards the End of the Road—End Game and Mate*.....**R.P.D.** 99
- From Gaitskell to Wilson.** What lies behind the Establishment's interest in the choice of Labour's leader.....**E. M. Winterton** 107
- Aircraft and British Economy.** The Draughtsmen's General Secretary pinpoints the industry's problems and needs.....
G. H. Doughty 111
- Negro Emancipation.** Karl Marx's analysis confirmed in this account of an anti-slavery demonstration 117
- Battle for Jobs: The Lobbies.** Wales, Scotland and the North-East show the strength of this fight.....**W. Morgan Williams, Charles Maxwell, Horace Green** 123
- Black and Yellow.** An exposure of pride and prejudice in the golden square mile of Mayfair.....**Wilfred Macartney** 128
- Voting in United Nations.** Key resolutions on independence of colonial countries 133
- Trade Union Growth.** Historical sketch pointing the need for change in structure, as outlined in the Communist Party's Draft Resolution on Trade Unions.....**Jim Gardner** 135
- What Readers Say: On the Price Rise**.....**Angela Tuckett** 97
- Illustration:** Lancashire Cotton Operatives, 1863 120-121
- Book Reviews.** 'Income Distribution and Social Change', by R. M. Titmuss; and 'Takeover', by William Mennell: *John Eaton*; 'To Katanga and Back', by Conor Cruise O'Brien: *C. Desmond Greaves*; 'Goering' by Manvell and Fraenkel: *D. N. Pritt, Q.C.* 139

WHAT READERS SAY

About The Price Rise

As soon as the February *Labour Monthly* was published explaining that the price would have to go to 2s., beginning with this issue, letters began to come in from readers with their reactions. Here are some of the first to reach us:

William Gallacher, Paisley.

I see *L.M.* is up in price. To honour the occasion, give the attached pound note to Angela.

E. Strachan Rogers, Brixton.

In response to the announcement in the February issue, I am increasing my monthly tribute to £3 3s.

H. A. Scott, Edinburgh.

I enclose an extra 5s. to cover the additional cost of my subscription from March to December, since I had just renewed. I am sure readers will understand your difficult problem and the necessity for raising the price. My thanks to all concerned for the good work done.

Joe Whelan, Linby, Notts.

It is a pity you find yourselves in such a position that compels you to increase the price. However, I believe your friends will know whose fault it is—the rotten economics of capitalism. You have done well to delay it so long. It may make it a bit more difficult to sell; but even if it does, it will be well worth the effort. When you think of people in colonial countries who walk 20 miles just to hear someone read some pages from *L.M.*; when you think of the brave lads who gave their lives or the men and women who are in gaol because they fight for justice, peace and independence, remember *L.M.* inspires their strug-

gles and gives guidance to the winning of the battles. I think we are getting off light when we can go to the newsagent and order it for 2s. Don't make any attempt to apologise for putting it up. I can assure you, as a miner, it shines a better light for me than my cap lamp in the dark pit. We owe you more than you will ever owe us.

D. Smith, South Shields.

Dear Sir, I enclose 5s. to cover the extra on my subscription between March and December. And I also enclose £1 towards the *Labour Monthly* printing fund.

R. M. Lang, Angus.

Herewith 10s. to cover any increase for the current year in my sub. My copy goes first to a member of the Labour Party locally, who has also seen the wisdom of reading along a Marxist line. It then goes on, at your suggestion not a few years ago, to the trade unions in Berlin. Don't trouble to answer this, please; you have lots else to do.

G. Chambers, Sussex.

Here is my mite towards your appeal—let me know as soon as the increased rate is due on my subscription. I thought the February number very good, both R.P.D. and Andrew Rothstein. But how slow the English world is to move! I fear the official Labour Party has no

desire to change the present system; it wants to share in it—the bigger share the better!

D. Sandwell, Yorkshire.

Dear Madam, Although I read a great many political journals, I have never yet set eyes on one with such a high degree of journalistic skill and sheer readability as the *Labour Monthly*, to which I was introduced only two years ago. This magazine should be read by all the workers of this country, for whom it so courageously struggles with never diminishing devotion. Please find enclosed a small donation for fund.

'Backslider', Essex.

In the twilight of life, able to do very little for The Cause, I am able to face the future with fortitude and a burning belief in the final liberation of mankind. So much of this I owe to you all. It is a mighty inspiration. One day, let me hope

very soon, the veil of lies will be torn from before the eyes of our fellow countrymen. Good luck to your efforts.

Bill Somerset, Northern Ireland

The increase will be a challenge as well as a body blow; our fraternity will not so lightly give up their favourite mentor. If some have to abandon buying their own, I shall suggest they should continue to pay their 1s. 6d., to share a copy with another. That would mean a shilling for the fund, and all would still read it. I hope it won't be necessary, but you know what unemployment figures we have here.

Les Bates, Blackburn

Yes, *L.M.* must go up. The writing is on the wall for us Socialists and Communists if we want our truths in print for guidance. We shall have to make them pay their way. The Queen's head is on all coins—still.

To these correspondents and to their like amongst our readers in Britain and the world, our deep appreciation and thanks.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

£98 19s. 10d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: 'Daisy Bell', £10; 'Windfall', £10; R. McLeod, 5s; D. H. Strathern and friends, 10s; Royston Green (year's donation in advance), £2 8s; G. C. Fitt, 1s; 'Backslider', 10s; S. Morrissy, £1; R.F.B., £3; N. Usher, 2s 6d; L'Humanite, 4s; L. Bates, 5s; H. Brindle, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 2s; Oldham Branch, 1s; Marie Philibert, 13s; 'In memory of Joe Brien', 3s; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; 'S. Mill', £1; R. Dodd, £1; F.G.A. (Canada), 10s; 'Oliver Twist and friends', 15s; D. Sandwell, 4s; C.T.H., £2 2s; J. A. Smith, 6s; S. Turner (for Daisy Mendez, Cuba), 5s; J. Tarver, 5s; B. W. Mackay, 5s 6d; 'The Butcher family', 10s; S. Townsend, 10s; E.J.B., 10s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal), 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: W. G. Garvey, 3s; H. Cohen, £1 1s; W. D. Johnston, 10s; J. Steele, 10s; P. Feltham, 2s; W. L. Dutton, 2s; A. Bush, £1; R. C. Champion, 7s; H. F. List, 10s 6d; P. J. Waller, 13s; M. Bennett, 10s; H. M. McClatchey, 2s; W. M. Cormack, 5s; J. A. Fraser, 10s; D. A. Hamilton, £1; A. Ramage, 10s; E. Williams, £1; J. L. Smith, 5s; Dr. W. Thomas, 2s; C. H. B. Locke, 10s; J. Redfern, £5; Miss C. Wrench, 2s 6d; A. E. Giebler, 5s; P. Tero, 7s 6d; E. J. Gillett, 10s; M.G.J., 6s; H. A. Scott, 2s; Mrs. K. P. Ghosh, 2s; J. J. Christie, 5s; S. R. Broadbridge, 12s; G. Callicott, £2 2s; A. L. Parsons, 8s; J. Laird, 10s; A. Albert, 2s; A. W. Hickson, £1; L. E. Bond, 5s; A. Jordan, 6s 9d; Mary Vanstone, £3 3s; J. D. Munro, 3s; T. Drinkwater, £1 2s; T. Shields, £1; Finchley C.N.D., £2; Dr. J. S. D. Bacon, £1; T. Sorbie, £1; H. Rosen, 3s; D. P. Rees, 2s; W. S. Harland, 11s 6d; H. C. Smith, £1 2s; J. MacQueen, 8s; R. Owen, 1s; 'Companytown, Canada', £6; F. H. Luck, £1; L. Wyvil, 8s; D. A. Ware, 2s; R. Alderson, 7s; C. Rosenberg, 7s; H. M. Barnett, 6s; G. Dowling, £2 2s; M. R. Davies, 5s; W. Davies, 2s 9d; Mrs. D. Spencer, 4s; T. Crichton, £1; W. Rickeard, £1; E. M. Berlyn, 15s 3d; Miss E. Midgley, 2s; R. Smillie, 5s; A. G. Neville, £2 6d; F. G. Colman, 10s; J. Wood, 12s; E.M. (U.S.A.), 14s 7d; W.H. (Australia), £5; L.R. (U.S.A.), £4 18s.

Our thanks to you all.
Co-op. No. L.99482.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

Notes of the Month

MARXISM AFTER EIGHTY YEARS

The First World War and the October Revolution ushered in the general crisis of capitalism. The second stage of this crisis developed at the time of the Second World War and the socialist revolutions that took place in a number of European and Asian countries. World capitalism has now entered a new, third stage of that crisis, the principal feature of which is that its development was not connected with a world war.

Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, 1961.

EIGHTY years ago Marx died. This eightieth anniversary is taking place in a world situation which is powerfully confirming all his teaching. New horizons are opening. On the one hand, the socialist world, guided by Marxism, is drawing close to the moment when it will represent the majority of world production, as it has already demonstrated its superiority in the rate of economic advance, science, technique, education and social provision. On the other hand, the deepening bankruptcy of the capitalist world is further shown in the present economic difficulties of all capitalist countries, the collapse of the post-war 'economic miracles' and 'managed capitalism', under-use of capacity and extension of mass unemployment, sharpening of trade conflicts and inter-imperialist antagonisms, and cracking of the Atlantic Holy Alliance.

Hours of Decision

Certainly the road is not yet smooth. The arms race still drains resources alike in the capitalist and socialist worlds. The menace of war is still grave. But it is significant that, whereas the previous advances of socialism have been achieved in the conditions of social explosion through the contradictions of capitalism bursting into war, the present advance is being achieved in and through the fight for peace, the united blocking of the capitalist drive to war by the new world majority, representing socialism and national liberation. This is a new world situation, not merely confirming the teaching of Marxism, but requiring to be carried forward along fresh paths in the light of that teaching. The coming years are the most critical. All the contradictions of the present economic and political situation are most sharply featured in Britain, the original cradle of capitalism

and now the scene of its most manifest decay. The failure of the Macmillan Conservative Government after a decade of fiascoes is recognised by all. But is Labour ready with any adequate alternative programme? Such is the crucial question facing us at the present moment in this particular corner of an ever more rapidly changing world.

Forty Years Back and Forty Years On

The first occasion for one of these periodic reviews of the advance of Marxism in the world in these Notes was forty years ago when we wrote under the title 'Marxism After Forty Years'. That was in 1923. The period between the death of Marx and the foundation of this journal forty-two years ago was less than the period between the present number and that foundation issue. The living personal memory of Marx and Engels was still strong among many then active. Lenin was still alive to give direct leadership to the world (and incidentally the inspiration to the foundation of this journal). The young Russian Socialist Revolution had beaten off the wars of intervention, and advanced in that year to the new Constitution, replacing the old 'Russian Federation of Soviet Socialist Republics' by the new 'Union of Soviet Socialist Republics', thereby delivering a death blow to the last remnants of the old Russian chauvinist traditions by obliterating the very name 'Russia' from the official title and revealing instead the new principle of the union of free and equal nations (a warning to Western editors who still insist on calling the U.S.S.R. 'Russia'). In the capitalist world Poincaré was invading the Ruhr; Curzon dispatched his ultimatum to Moscow; Fascism (still a new term) had seized Italy; Hitler attempted his first coup in Munich. Grim shadows of the future.

Vision of 1983

In those early Notes 'Marxism After Forty Years' we wrote:

World history today is Marxism alive. There was no need to refute his critics. History refutes them. Even while they pen their last lines to their Critical Examination they find themselves having to pack up their bags before the gathering storm of the Collapse and the Revolution. A hundred times 'disproved' and 'discredited' by critics whose names are now only known to Marxian students, for half a century declared 'obsolete' and 'antiquated' by theorists whose writings already carry about them the flavour of pre-war antiquity, a thousand times denied and watered down by faint-hearted followers afraid to break

with bourgeois learning and prejudice, today Marx stands master in the modern world—the Key to its interpretation and the power that moves it.

With the confidence of those years we threw out the challenge:

A hundred years from Marx's birth saw the first Proletarian Revolution and Proletarian State. Will a hundred years from his death see the World Proletarian Republic?

Twenty years still to run. 1983. Much may still happen. Marxism predicts world trends, not dates. But, judging by the advance of these forty years, the prospect of the victory of communism on a world scale by 1983 is not inconceivable. Certainly the race advances with accelerating speed. The goal draws closer.

Marxism After Fifty Years

1933. The offensive of world reaction against Communism and human progress has entered a new and desperate stage. Hitler has been placed in power from above by the German ruling class, backed by Anglo-French-American finance and diplomacy to crush the German working class, to rearm Germany and prepare the second world war. This grim outcome of the renunciation of Marxism by the Western labour movement, of the lying promises of Social Democracy to offer an alternative painless path, leading in fact to world economic crisis and fascism and the drive to a new world war, prompted us to draw the lesson in writing of 'Marxism After Fifty Years':

Where today have all the movements that have abandoned Marxism, that have abandoned the Communism of Marx and Engels, the majority movements of post-war Social Democracy and Labourism, where have they brought the working class? In every country where they have dominated, they have brought the working class to a pitch of weakness and defeat, of misery and worsening of conditions, of staggering under the blows of a daily more aggressive world reaction, without parallel for half a century. In Italy, to the victory of Fascism. In Germany, where fifteen years ago the workers held all in their hands, the Counter-Revolution has been put back in the saddle by the help of Social Democracy, and the workers' movement is left at the mercy of the murder-bands of Hitler. In Britain, where millions and millions of workers listened hopefully to the call of Labourism, put Labour Governments in office, came out on the General Strike, today the capitalist offensive throws all the burdens of the crisis upon the workers, reaction reigns in the form of the National Government, and all the leaders of the Labour Party cynically throw off the professions of

allegiance to the movement they no longer need, and join the National Government, leaving demoralisation behind.

Indulgence must be asked for thus quoting old words of thirty years ago. But when today the same shamed and discredited Social Democracy has the effrontery to present itself anew, under the latest alias of 'Democratic Socialism'—concealing the same poisonous anti-Marxist contents and formulas under the new label because they know that the old label now stinks in the nostrils of all—then it is necessary to remind the younger generation of the record. Drawing together the lesson of 1933:

The examples of the Russian Revolution and of the German Revolution over these fifteen years teach the workers of the world on a giant scale how a workers' revolution can conquer and how a workers' revolution can be laid in the dust.

Battle to Save Mankind

Hitler. Fascism. Nazi Rearmament. Munich. The supreme offensive of world counter-revolution to destroy Marxism and Communism for ever. From the moment Hitler was placed in power in 1933 the British Premier Macdonald flew to Geneva to propose the doubling of the German Army and to Rome to propose a Western Four-Power Pact of Britain, France, Hitler and Mussolini. Foreshadowings of the future. The supreme ordeal of our time had opened. The supreme battle to save the future of humanity. Of this testing time and battle now opening we wrote in March, 1933:

The whole world today is Marxism in action. Every other theory and world outlook lies in ruins, shattered and impotent before the march of events. Marxism alone rides the storm, and casts its searchlight in front on the path forward of humanity. . . . Marxism is the weapon of this concrete fight in progress, of a fight both theoretical and practical, of what is in the last resort a physical fight of millions of men against the existing régime of violence and exploitation. . . . It was never more necessary than today when the fight is close and urgent, when all the forces of barbarism, of world war more destructive than ever before, of imperialist savagery and anarchy, of Hitlerism and all 'the wild asses of the devil' are threatening their supreme attempt to engulf the world and destroy all human culture, and when the sole force of world order and civilisation is the Communist International and the Soviet Union.

In this ordeal the international communist movement and the Soviet Union proved worthy of their trust and saved mankind from fascist slavery and destruction.

Marxism After Sixty Years

1943. The year of Stalingrad. The height of the ordeal—and the first gleam of the dawn of victory. The international counter-revolution did not conquer. The Nazi armies, before which every other army in Europe had broken in rout, met the armies of socialism and met their master. The Munichite front had been broken by the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact. The phoney war, which combined passivity against Hitler with plans of military adventures against the Soviet Union, had been succeeded by the alternative tactics of the peculiar alliance, when the withholding of the second front for three years enabled the entire weight of the Hitlerite forces to be hurled against the Soviet Union, with the confident calculation and prediction of all the Western general staffs and politicians that the Soviet Union would be destroyed. Their calculations were frustrated. By 1943 panic seized the Western rulers at the prospect of the fall of fascism and the victory of communism. The planning of the post-war Western front against the Soviet Union and communism; the preparation of the Anglo-American atom bomb under the Quebec Agreement as the weapon, not against fascism, but for future domination against the Soviet Union; the Churchill secret memorandum against 'Russian barbarism' in post-war Europe; the organisation of the second front, after the Nazi armies were already beaten, to prevent the victory of the peoples in Europe; all date from this turning point. But everywhere the peoples rose in the enthusiasm of alliance with the Soviet people for liberation. The citadels of fascism fell. The old capitalist order was in fact only restored in Europe as far as the writ of the Anglo-American armies ran. Elsewhere the people's anti-fascist liberation movement took over, and entered on the building of socialism. The surge of national liberation swept through Asia and Africa. A new world was arising. The costs had been heavy, not least in the Soviet Union. But in this hour of trial and ordeal Marxism had received its highest vindication.

Marxism After Seventy Years

1953. The new world has arisen. Socialism is now a world system. The glorious victory of the Chinese Revolution has, as Lenin predicted in the last words he wrote, made the world victory of socialism assured. From one-twelfth of the population of the world before the war socialism now reaches to over one-third, and

together with the new independent states of national liberation embraces three-quarters of mankind. The old counter-revolutionary front of the wars of intervention and of the Hitlerite Axis has now been renewed on a yet more extensive scale as the cold war front of American imperialism, extending its network of military alliances, subsidies and bases into every continent. In vain. 1953 was the year of inauguration of Dulles as Secretary of State, and in his inaugural television broadcast he complained that the capitalist world was suffering 'encirclement' by communism. In our review of 'Marxism After Seventy Years' we summarised the world picture as seen by Dulles:

Dulles surveyed the 'gloomy world situation' for the benefit of his viewers, and what did he see? In Asia? Communism. In the Middle East? Communism. In Africa? Communism. In South America? Communism. And in Western Europe the American 'investment', as he described it, of thirty billion dollars to ensure obedient vassals was in danger of being rendered null and void by the resistance of the peoples. And on top of this came the supreme complaint, expressed in his inaugural statement to the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee on January 15: 'The Russians have achieved all these results without using a single Russian soldier.'

Strange and revealing complaint. The American war lords have covered land and sea in every continent and region of the world within their reach with their bombers and their bases, their troops and military missions. They have spread destruction and devastation thousands of miles from their shores. And to their amazement they discover that everywhere the peoples turn against them. They discover that Communism is spreading everywhere 'without a single Russian soldier'. Incomprehensible situation to the mentality of a Dulles. For to him the words of Lenin are beyond his understanding: '*The teachings of Marxism are all-powerful because they are true.*'

Dulles has passed from the scene. His clarion calls for 'Massive Retaliation' to 'Roll Back the Tide of Communism' no longer win an echo. The new lords of Washington have not yet abandoned his dreams. But their troubles are mounting.

And Now?

1963. Ten more years of accelerating world changes have sped forward. We are moving into a new world situation of limitless new possibilities to strain the imagination of the most daring. The shift in the world balance is today universally recognised, and has even begun to find partial reflection in the United Nations. The old

conservative centres of imperialism, still the most wealthy, still bristling with arms and threats, have begun to be seen by all as the declining minority sector of the world. During these years each successive major aggressive adventure of imperialism and counter-revolution has met with defeat. Korea. Vietnam. Suez. Hungary. Algeria. Most critical of all for the demonstration of the new still precarious world balance the experience of Cuba, and the checking of the planned aggression of the American giant last year against the heroic Cuban nation, thanks to Soviet aid. Few and rarer have been the temporary successes of counter-revolution, as in the American armed overthrow of the popular régime in Guatemala, or the present shameful reactionary coup and terror régime in Iraq. But the tide of history cannot be reversed. The post-war dreams of nuclear domination of the world by Western imperialism are ended for ever. Therewith the foundations of the cold war have begun to crack. New alignments and shifts begin to appear in inter-imperialist relations. But the practical conclusions have not yet been drawn. The framework of the old still seeks to strangle the emergence of the new. Hence the peculiar new unstable international situation into which we have entered, pregnant with menace and opportunities, and calling aloud for the action of the peoples to take advantage of the possibilities now opening before us.

Towards the End of the Road

It is a new world situation without previous parallel. The philosophy of imperialism has always been the philosophy of the Big Stick, as the old President Theodore Roosevelt termed it; of domination; of superior power to dictate to the lesser breeds; or war to the death between rival imperialist powers for the redivision of the world. The gospel of the atom bomb as the post-war Saviour of Western civilisation; of Fulton; of the Truman Doctrine; of Dulles, breathed this philosophy. Now the conditions are changed. The dialogue has to be between equals. Dimly the new rulers of America begin to envisage this, then shrink back from the conclusions. The arms race is raised to yet more crazy heights. The current United States peace-time arms budget exceeds the war-time peak of 1945. Economically crippled and staggering Britain has to shoulder a crushing arms increase to close on two thousand million pounds. More and more voices ask: To what end? Since there can no longer be victory of the old social order by superior power, the choice becomes voluntary suicide ('Better dead than red'). It is a measure of the bankruptcy of the old order that such a slogan can be coined.

End Game and Mate

Logic points to the alternative: Peaceful Co-existence. The parallel peaceful existence of differing social systems, providing the most favourable conditions for the great social transition of our epoch. Freedom of every people to choose their own future. No more foreign military occupations and bases and sectional military blocs. An end to nuclear weapons. Disarmament. These themes become, no longer merely pious aspirations, but the bargaining issues of international political negotiations. But the negotiations have so far invariably become stalled. For the alternative also fills the Western rulers with horror. Peaceful Co-existence? But that would mean the peaceful victory of Communism throughout the world. Never. Raise higher the barricade of weapons of power; invent new weapons; new, more deadly, poisonous, multi-killing weapons; extend the arms race throughout space, through outer space. So the fateful round is renewed. The vicious circle revolves without conclusion. Either way the rulers of the old order see the end of the road in sight. Mate in two moves. The vicious circle can only be broken by the action of the peoples. And in this action also Britain, Britain under its present rulers despised and kicked about by all, can play a key part, once its people awaken to their present opportunity.

February 18, 1963

R.P.D.

LABOUR MONTHLY

FORTY YEARS AGO

Unemployment : A Call to Action

Confronted with what is euphemistically called 'the slump', the Government of Great Britain found itself completely incapable of providing any measure by which to surmount the difficulty. Its immediate efforts were centred on balancing the Budget because, for the first time within memory, there was a danger that the national accounts of the United Kingdom might show a deficit. Apart from this the attitude of the Government was no different from the mob of financiers and capitalists who kept repeating during the last months of 1920 (as they were to keep on repeating during the whole of 1921 and 1922) that there was bound, very shortly, to be a revival of trade. . . . But if the leaders of capitalism have been no better than witch doctors, the leaders of Labour have been like the ignorant believers in their witchcraft. . . . The most remarkable thing is that this unemployment was treated as a 'question' and a 'problem' instead of being itself a call to action of the whole of the workers against the capitalists.

(From 'The Labour Movement and the Unemployed', by R. Page Arnot, *Labour Monthly*, March, 1923.)

FROM GAITSKELL TO WILSON

E. M. Winterton

WITH the election of Harold Wilson on February 14, the Labour Party has its leader and the country a future Labour Prime Minister. But it would be wrong to forget the unprecedented events in British public life which took place around the death of Hugh Gaitskell and the preparations for choosing his successor. It would be unpardonably shortsighted not to see how the most experienced capitalist class in the world, taken off its guard under the stress of sudden events, revealed the intense interest it has in the affairs of the Labour Party going one way, and not another.

The fatal illness of Hugh Gaitskell was treated by the mouthpieces of capitalism—the BBC in particular—like that of a monarch, with special reports all through the day. When the end came on January 18, the Prime Minister made a television obituary speech, reproduced on sound radio, within 24 hours. Then on January 21, at the first subsequent meeting of the Commons, came the special 24-hour adjournment: ‘no other leader of the Opposition has ever been so honoured’, wrote *The Times* parliamentary correspondent. The same could be said of the memorial service at Westminster Abbey on January 31, with its 2,000-strong congregation including most Ministers, the Diplomatic Corps, representatives of the Queen and her husband, and the Archbishop of Canterbury officiating.

Was all this simply a token of respect for a brilliant personality and political leader? The comments of the capitalist press itself are the answer. What the ‘Establishment’, or, in Marx’s and Lenin’s language, the executive committee of the capitalist class, were striving to show, was that the British capitalist system—the nation *as they understand it*—had lost the most acceptable Labour Party leader it had ever had, one in whose hands the interests of class collaboration were safe.

This is what the *Guardian* editorial meant when it wrote (January 19) that any new Labour Party leader must follow Gaitskell in his ‘non-doctrinaire approach to economic and industrial policy’, which is, being interpreted, his many years’ fight against depriving the capitalist class of the means of production in order to abolish it altogether. His ‘firm commitment to collective defence and multi-lateral disarmament’ means his support of Anglo-American-West

German-French war alliance against the Soviet Union, and the spending of one-third of the Budget since 1950 on armaments. For his 'readiness to see gradual reform of the Labour Party's structure from within' read: to impose rule by Labour M.P.s on the vast machinery built up for parliamentary purposes since 1900 by the British workers, just as in the parties of big business—with leaders of the bigger unions having the right to use influence behind the scenes, much as the business men do for the Tories and the Liberals, but nothing more. It was the loss of *such* a leader that *The Times* was mourning—one whose successful defiance of the Scarborough Conference decisions 'should have permanently devalued the conference as a policy-making body'—when it wrote (January 24) that Gaitskell 'would have been of the greatest service to the party and the nation at a time when so many strands of British policy have become snarled or been abruptly severed'.

That was the point. The policies pursued by all British Governments since 1945 were bankrupt. Gaitskell had gone at a time when 'the Government may be said to be almost reeling on the ropes', and there was no time to spare (*The Times* political correspondent on January 21): when there was a 'crisis inherent in the political and economic situation of Britain' (*The Times* leading article, February 11). The utter fiasco of the Tory Government's policy, to use George Brown's inelegant but expressive terms, had found expression in 'a slap in the face in Paris, the order of the boot in Brussels, and a kick in the Bahamas as well, just to make sure'. Brown forgot to mention the post-war right-wing Labour Governments which, pursuing the same policies, were equally responsible for such ignominious consequences. It was a time, too, when swiftly-mounting mass unemployment was bringing back to Britain the miseries of the thirties—those same miseries of which right-wing Labour intellectuals, whose leader was Gaitskell, had declared, just over ten years ago in *New Fabian Essays*, that 'chronic excess of the supply of labour over the demand for it, as we all know, has disappeared from the social scene' (Strachey); and that 'there will be no repetition of Jarrow and Ebbw Vale, dole queues and hunger marches' (Crosland).

In such a situation, who could tell what would happen if the new Labour Party leader, instead of continuing to defy the basic principles of Socialism, carried further the alarming trend which Gaitskell had shown in the last months of his life, of attacking Tory surrender of Britain's interests and independence in the Common

Market negotiations? Might that not give new encouragement to the rank-and-file demand for Socialist policies which had already defeated Gaitskell once, over 'Clause 4' in 1960? Or, as the *Economist* blurted out on January 26, might there not be 'graver misgivings about running the risk that in a few months' time the prime ministership of Great Britain might suddenly be thrust into the hands of an unprepared and inexperienced new Labour Party leader?'

With one accord the capitalist press began trying to guard against such a risk. George Brown of course was the man for the job (need one recall his inspiring right-wing record?). He together with Gordon Walker—who by the way hastened to decline the honour—would provide a combination of 'experience, temperament and abilities': while Wilson 'might well be judged outside as likely to embitter party and class politics' (*The Times*, January 24). The *Economist* was all for Brown, too—Wilson displays 'over-agility of mind', is weak on 'statesmanship at home' and cannot command 'wholehearted trust from Britain's allies abroad' (January 26). Wilson was 'too clever by half' (Tory candidates at a London brains trust, February 7). Brown was 'more able than sometimes appears . . . blunt, rough, straightforward'—whereas Wilson was 'cool, devious, calculating, intellectual as well as clever', and 'thought by some an intriguer' (*Daily Telegraph*, February 8). And so on.

There was one laughable, almost pathetic, moment when an attempt was made to pass off that well-known right winger, James Callaghan—ardent champion of Nato, supporter of an 'incomes policy' amounting to 'wage restraint', thrown off the Labour Party's N.E.C. by the constituency parties just because of his views—as a middle-of-the-road man. This was because some of the pundits suspected that Brown's rugged politics were more acceptable to Fleet Street than to the working class. Callaghan had 'always managed to avoid being labelled either right or left' (*Daily Telegraph*, January 25). He stood 'a better chance of defeating Wilson than Brown would' (*Guardian*, the same day). He was a 'middle or compromise candidate' (*The Times*, February 1). And so on—but not for long.

Finally, when the first ballot showed that Harold Wilson was after all the likely choice, the tone changed once more. The oracles began assuring their readers that things were not so black after all. Wilson was not quite the 'weak-on-reds' that they had made him out to be, and in any case pressure could be brought to bear. For a time, at

any rate, 'he would need to have a Gaitskellite bias' in order to command a majority, and left wingers 'are doomed to disappointment', *The Times* political correspondent had already forecast on February 4, and he repeated in other words on February 8, after the ballot. 'The reconciliation is bound to come on right-wing terms. . . The pursuit of middle-class votes is not a left-wing occupation' (Rees-Mogg in the *Sunday Times*, February 10), while James Margach in the same issue foretold that Wilson's centre position would be 'broadly identical' with that of Attlee and Gaitskell before him. In fact he could resist the left better than Brown. Naturally, these assurances became doubly sure after Wilson's election—he will 'hold the Gaitskell line' (Jacobson, *Daily Herald* editor, February 15).

These explanations, adjusted to the situation which the forces of reaction had to face, are instructive. They give away just how those forces intend to bring pressure to bear on the Labour Party leadership, and what channels they intend to use. The one force they say nothing about, however, is that which influenced Gaitskell over the Common Market last year and the Labour M.P.s since his death—rank-and-file opinion. You might think from their writings that the working class did not exist at all, or had no means of expressing its view, to M.P.s and leaders alike. Yet these are the days of the big lobbies on unemployment; of the great struggle at Fords; of the campaign of the miners and the railwaymen against artificially-organised redundancy; of the progressive victories in the co-operative elections; of the rise in membership of the Communist Party and the Young Communist League in face of all the slanders and victimisations! *The direct intervention of the working class in British politics*—this is what the political speculators on 'Brown v. Wilson' most fear. This can frustrate all the knavish tricks of the enemies of Socialism. This is what can bring back into the everyday political struggle, even in Parliament and in spite of Gaitskellite tradition, the burning need to apply Clause 4—'common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange'—now that the bankruptcy of their private ownership is shouting aloud.

Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties

AIRCRAFT AND BRITISH ECONOMY

G. H. Doughty

General Secretary, Draughtsmen's and Allied Technicians' Association.

AT the present time the whole of British economy is in a mess and substantial sections are deep in a trough of despair. After being led to believe that the economic salvation of Britain lay in joining the Common Market, the breakdown of the negotiations in Brussels appears to have been a blow of considerable force, capable of producing shattering results. It matters not whether the rosy promise of economic rehabilitation did lie within membership of the European Economic Community. What is transparently obvious now, is that the Government put all its economic eggs into the Common Market basket and, after the crash, is grasping around for some relief from the effects of ten years of Tory rule and freedom from national planning.

Why should the aircraft industry merit special lament at this time of national crisis? The answer lies in the fact that the history of the British aircraft industry is significant. It is an example of lost opportunities, due to absence of proper planning and forward thinking, and has involved very large sums of public money, for which we have all too little to show. It is now a matter of national prestige. In the period immediately following the war, the world looked for new passenger and freight planes, including the civil versions of the large-scale, long-range aircraft, which had been produced during the war. The scene was set for a dramatic expansion into the field of commercial flying. During the war Britain had tended to concentrate on fighters and medium-range bombers, whilst both the Americans and Russians had developed heavy long-range aircraft. Nevertheless, the position was open for Britain to make rapid strides in a world which, for several years to come, would not produce strong competition from other Western European countries. America still had a large domestic market to satisfy and the Soviet Union was deeply committed to large-scale rebuilding of its lands and those sections of its industry which had been devastated by war.

Three important factors appear in retrospect to have been in Britain's favour at that time. This country was principally respon-

sible for the development of the jet engine. Indeed, one of the more favourable aspects of this matter is that until recently British aero engines have kept in front and have provided much employment. In addition, the post-war Labour Government brought the major civil aircraft users in this country under integrated public ownership. Also, arising from activities during the war, we had already in existence a highly developed research establishment under Government control, devoted to the needs of the aircraft industry.

So it would appear that at that time there was a large potential demand. Britain had the resources of manufacture; the basic research facilities and access to public funds when public needs were in existence. Yet, today the industry is struggling. It is technically behind the Americans in the production of long-range jet aircraft; has been overtaken by the French for short and medium haul jet machines and is manoeuvred out of many markets for defence aircraft and service freighters by political considerations. As is well known, our defence and our advance striking power has in the last decade been strategically designed around a large V-Bomber air force which was equipped with an air-to-land missile. (Stand-off types.) But this was then made redundant by the Nassau Agreement, which was to replace the bomber with a submarine entirely dependent on an American designed and manufactured missile for the delivery of its hostile armament. Our defence planners now run around like scalded cats. The aircraft industry, having gone through a long period of hesitancy, stop and go, dependent upon what particular aspect of defence technique was popular at a certain time, now grinds slowly to lower production levels. Even the previously fully occupied aero engine division has its troubles.

In civil flying we have had some successes, an outstanding one being the Viscount, but we have also had too many failures and partial successes. Now, our manufacturers have the job of selling aircraft, produced some years after foreign types of similar capacity and ability, in a physically and politically restricted market. What then has gone wrong? Much has been written about each section of the industry and many inquests have been held. But in this article one can do no more than refer to some of the more important factors which have helped to bring the unfortunate situation about.

Probably transcending all other considerations is the absence of any co-related central direction of design and research, or control of production. The industry, in spite of its reliance upon public funds for development and the production of most civil and military orders

solely from the Government, still manufactures almost entirely for reasons of profit; and in this direction has done very well for its shareholders. Much of its past effort was dissipated by the production of too many types and undeveloped prototypes; too many competing elements existed, each of which had too little research capacity to plan ahead or to engage in the ever-increasingly expensive newer types of aircraft.

For long periods the industry was feather-bedded by development and defence contracts, most of which were terminated after large amounts of public money had been used, and before anything of use had been produced. The lack of effective market research for civil aircraft has been obvious. Astonishingly enough—in view of the bottomless pit for public money in the development stage—so was the absence of Government assistance in arranging part exchange deals with overseas users, to encourage them to buy newer types of British aircraft. This compares most unfavourably with the practice of the Americans and others.

The many problems of the industry became so obvious a few years ago that even the Government noticed them. By pressure, through a threat to apply economic sanctions, by withholding orders and development contracts, they brought about a financial reconstruction of the industry. So there are now two major air frame makers, two major aero engine makers and one group handling helicopters. However, neither the largely state-owned Short Bros. & Harland factory, nor the privately-owned Handley Page company, have found their place within these groups; so long as they remain outside, complete production assimilation is not achieved, since they are active competitors to the main groups and manufacturers of similar types of aircraft. The re-organisation of the groups in terms of production is far from complete, and in truth many components of the major groups exist rather like they did before financial re-organisation, so that the vision of more efficient production organisation due to re-organisation is somewhat illusory.

These problems were all enough in themselves to create major headaches, but the whole position has been exacerbated by a series of the most extraordinary reversals of defence policy, both in regard to the design and the strategic use of aircraft and air missiles. The war in Korea started this, and since then, the industry has been at the mercy of rapidly changing personalities in the War Ministry and the Ministry of Aviation. If there is anything consistent in this series of events, it is that slowly and surely the British aircraft

industry has been squeezed and squeezed; and slowly and surely it is being replaced by equipment purchased from the United States.

An ability to design and manufacture modern civil and military aircraft and aero power units has become a matter of prestige to the major industrialised countries of the world. The resources to do this are considerable, the technological demands are enormous and the field of application ranges far beyond the actual construction of aircraft. New materials have to be produced to stand up to strains never previously experienced. Air friction can be so great as to burn up many of the metals at present widely used in aircraft construction; new problems challenge the aerodynamicist and enormous capital outlay is necessary to deal with the basic question of feasibility of design studies, let alone the actual manufacture of new types.

It may be that more than one aircraft-producing nation desires that these developments be not taken too quickly, because of the risks to capital and the need to undertake highly specialised research, without having a reasonable prospect of an early reward. But it will be done by someone, and here the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. possess many natural advantages. It may be considered easy for Britain to drop out of the race for developing new types of aircraft; but if she does, and even if she then concentrates on the production of the conventional types, she must inevitably reduce herself to a position in which the rest of the world will regard her as a second-class aircraft power, and she will certainly prejudice the position she now holds as being the leading producer of aero engines.

This is not an easy decision to make, but far more will be lost if we decide to hold back than if we risk the research necessary to the manufacture of new types of aircraft. Our national airlines, for the time being, have to use American aircraft for trans-Atlantic journeys and our European services find stern opposition from foreign-made medium-range jet airliners. We have also recently learned that in spite of our hopes of producing a commercially useful helicopter of British design, we have to purchase machines from the U.S.A., and it appears that we shall in future make a machine of American design, but with British engines.

How long we can rely on using our own engines must depend on what role we play in the design of airframes. With the newer types envisaged, the frame and power unit tend to become a complete entity and lack of knowledge of one part prejudices new development work on the other part. The aero engine industry ceases to

be a 'jobbing shop' for the airframe industry. Yet the British aircraft manufacturing industry is contracting. The closure of De Havilland's Portsmouth and Christchurch factories, the Gloucester works of Gloster Whitworth Co., and the Reading works of Handley Page, immediately threatened the employment of thousands of workpeople and technicians and lost a considerable part of our manufacturing capacity. This is not all, for we know that in many other aircraft and aero engine factories the future is grim and more redundancy is inevitable. Napier's of Acton is the next factory to go out of existence. The limited world demand for conventional civil aircraft is now aggressively chased by many rivals and the demand for military types is difficult to assess.

We cannot call time back, nor can we use justifiable recriminations against disastrous decisions in the past, to find immediate solutions to our present difficulties. But these conclusions can be drawn:

That the aircraft industry in Britain appears to be drifting into a major crisis;

That public money is still being used to assist the industry, but without any appreciable public rewards;

Employment in the industry is in a critical condition and no one faces the future with confidence;

That the cautious attitude of the present day management and the profit conscious background against which it works is most unlikely to meet the needs of the time;

That the patchy organisation arising from recent amalgamations is badly equipped to deal with future demands; and

That the industry, due to its almost complete reliance on public funds, is holding back from the necessary design studies required for an investigation into supersonic aircraft.

The Government seems to be hovering between a policy of 'wait and see' what happens in the U.S.A. or the result of participation within a form of international consortium with the French. This path has been already trodden by American interests—one wonders how much is left for us, or was this part of the Common Market deal?

The modern aircraft industry is a highly sophisticated affair. It is highly complex in structure, requiring huge capital resources for production and design and heavily dependent on Government for defence and civil orders and facilities for fundamental research. It is most significant that where it has made most progress in recent years is the Soviet Union, where the public resources of a large country back the domestic aircraft industry, or in the U.S.A., where public money is available in large amounts through defence contract

arrangements. More recently the French Government has made very large sums available to the French aircraft industry for new research.

It is quite certain that enormous resources in technical knowhow, equipment, materials, manufacturing capacity and skilled labour has to be supplied to the British aircraft industry if it is to survive as a major influence. The industry must be planned for a dynamic purpose. The British people will ultimately have to decide whether the Government, which, after all, is the principal customer and provider, shall continue to provide massive sums without ownership responsibilities and benefits.

A short-term policy would appear to be :

A national and international sales, research and service organisation;

Assistance in part exchange of existing machines by airline operators in the sale of new fleets;

A shorter life span for other, older types of aircraft now flying and more rigid service and safety requirements;

A central planning and advisory service to the industry on future civil types to be designed.

A long-term policy can only be effective if it embraces a readiness to engage (even beyond enquiries into feasibility) in full design studies, especially into the possibility of a British designed and engined, medium-range, supersonic airliner for international civil use. It should be within our technical competence to produce ultimately a Mach. 2 type capable of a performance at least equal to that of any other country. A Mach. 3 machine is probably outside the immediate possibility of British resources, but may be the subject of a feasibility investigation with other countries, especially those in the Commonwealth. It is not merely political considerations that compel us to say that the very nature of the aircraft industry must ultimately make the British Government accept the function of ownership and management.

BUILDING THE STOCK EXCHANGE FOR A.D. 2000

The great danger is that discussion about the rebuilding of the Stock Exchange will be far too concerned with mere technical details. The significant question to be decided is what sort of functions the Stock Exchange can be expected to perform in the conditions of A.D. 2000.

(The Times, May 24, 1962.)

NEGRO EMANCIPATION

[This is an abridged extract from Illustrated London News of February 7, 1863, describing the demonstration of January 29, 1863, in London, of which we printed a picture in the January Labour Monthly. On this 80th Anniversary of the death of Karl Marx, it is interesting to see how this vivid eyewitness account strikingly confirms the analysis he made at the time. Marx himself wrote of another such demonstration: 'I attended the meeting held by Bright at the head of the Trade Unions. He looked quite like an Independent and every time he said, "In the United States no kings, no bishops", there was a burst of applause. The workers themselves spoke excellently, with a complete absence of bourgeois rhetoric and without in the least concealing their opposition to the capitalists (whom Father Bright, by the way, also attacked). How soon the English workers will free themselves from their apparent bourgeois infection one must wait and see'.—Ed., L.M.]

HERE WE HAVE BEEN for many months past pretty well all of one mind as to the American question, that is to say, convinced the North is fighting for 'empire', and the South for 'independence'; convinced that if the latter did not exactly behave well in the outbreak of the war, it has fought so splendidly since that it cannot be subjugated, and must, therefore, in the end succeed; convinced, finally, that it would be best on the whole to leave slavery at present where it is, in the hands of the masters, and trust to the progress of humanity, of knowledge of economical laws, and of the absence of irritation through abolition attacks, to do away ultimately with so great an evil. That, we believe, is a fair statement of the opinions predominant generally through society, in accordance with the ceaseless teaching of nine-tenths of the whole English press.

But of late a new element has begun to be dimly visible. As the Northern Legislation and Administration have become of a more decidedly anti-slavery cast we have

heard of small local meetings rising like bubbles to the surface of public opinion, and evaporating with a feeble breath in favour of the North. Then it undoubtedly excited surprise when the Lancashire operatives were so quiet under all their sufferings as to render it impossible to rouse them into an active agitation for blockade-breaking; and somehow it began to be whispered about that the explanation of their conduct was that they didn't feel quite satisfied about slavery not being at the bottom of the whole business of Southern revolt. But when Mr. Lincoln's proclamation of September last, offering emancipation with compensation up to Jan. 1, and threatening emancipation without compensation on and after that day if his offer were not accepted — when this broke like a thunder-clap upon the world we entered upon a new and difficult, and anxious period. For, while on the one hand there were but few persons who did not still loudly denounce slavery, there were still fewer who did not see that Mr.

Lincoln's Government had taken that tremendous step not because it was advisable or right in itself, but because he found the North could not beat the South without doing so. Of course, in saying this we do not say or suggest that Mr. Lincoln was a hypocrite, or that he acted in opposition to his known character, antecedents, or wishes. We only say, as a matter of fact which cannot be disputed, that while the previous anti-slavery measures, such as (among others) the abolition of slavery in Columbia, the anti-slave trade treaty with England, the permanent exclusion of slavery from the territories, and the offer of Congress to assist the work of abolition by compensation, all obviously sprang from a genuine anti-slavery sentiment, this particular proclamation, the last of the series, as obviously did not, but from the military failures of the North. No wonder, then, that the general current of opinion (having been previously such as we have described it) still remained on the whole friendly to the South and unfriendly to the North, or that it became generally believed that Mr. Lincoln's 'military measure' would prove in its working a very inhuman measure, as leading to a servile war . . .

Then suddenly Manchester burst out with an assemblage several thousand strong in the Free Trade Hall. Liverpool merchants and others assembled to prepare for the renewal in their town of the former anti-slavery agitation, and decided, by an 'overwhelming majority', to do so, . . .

The Emancipation Society ventured at last to issue its challenge to universal London, and 'respectfully' to invite 'all parties' to the great room of Exeter Hall on the night of Thursday the 29th of January, 1863

. . . Having tickets for reserved seats we did not present ourselves till about ten minutes before the time specified on them—seven o'clock; but as we ascend the steps of the portico, we are warned by the streams of people that we are, perhaps, taking the matter too leisurely . . . Everywhere we find dense masses of people; we are about to make the Englishman's last confession and acknowledge ourselves beaten, when, happily, we come across one of the speakers of the night floundering in the same difficult strait, but who obviously *must* get in. That fact gives us new hope. We appeal to him. He gallantly takes us in tow, shouts 'Reporter!' when advance is otherwise impossible, and so we get at last into a sort of little black hole of Calcutta, where we grow at once hopeless of further progress and certain of being stifled if we stay where we are. Here, however, to our immense relief, a door opens; some half dozen of us are shot suddenly forwards and luckily do not fall; another instant and we are running up the stairs of the little box or covered way that admits us to the platform, and there find breathing space and full opportunity to drink in, in one wondering, awe-stricken glance, the sublime spectacle of a vast sea of upturned faces, looking up towards another sea scarcely less large, that in defiance of all the laws of gravity, has ascended and overflowed every nook and corner of the upraised expanse of the orchestra, leaving only the organ in the centre calmly above the excited and sloping tide of life . . .

Yet it is especially worthy of note (whatever the use made of the fact) that none of the ordinary attractions helped to bring together this wonderful gathering. It was quite true what has been said, that no eminent

statesmen or politicians were here; that few or none of the old and famous anti-slavery families were represented; that none of the speakers were men of genius; that commerce sent none of its merchant princes; the aristocracy and gentry none of their conspicuous members. But for that very reason we were driven to confess how great must have been the 'ground-swell' of public opinion before it could thus burst upon our astonished eyes with all the suddenness and fury of the maelstrom and the waterspout, unless, indeed, we accept the solution since offered—that Federal money was the mainspring!

The speakers of the evening were the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel; Mr. Hughes, the well-known author of 'Tom Brown', the Rev. Mr. Newman Hall; Mr. Taylor, the member for Leicester; and Mr. Ludlow, a well-known contributor to *Macmillan's Magazine* . . .

If it had been possible, after watching the reception, given to the first sentences of the chairman, the Rev. Mr. Evans, to doubt the tone and temper of the assembled multitude, it was clearly impossible to do so when he referred in a perfectly dispassionate manner to those who wished to see America divided into two confederacies. He was interrupted by a single voice that cried out 'Emancipation and union!' and then, as if that phrase had been a kind of electric shock that went to every heart, there broke forth the most tremendous popular enthusiasm it has ever been our fortune to witness. It could not stop, but went on and on, the whole audience having leaped to their feet with hats and handkerchiefs waving, having apparently only waited for some such signal to relieve themselves from the almost painful,

because suspended, enthusiasm with which they overflowed. This incident told all that any one could have needed to know as to the feelings and views of the meeting. These interruptions, with those arising from the constant re-echoing of cheers from the other two meetings below and outside, gave quite a tone to the evening.

We shall not attempt to describe the speeches. We desire only to note those passages in them which helped to bring out into strong relief the state of opinion that prevailed in the meeting. Mr. Noel's speech was studded with such points. His narrative of recent happenings in the South with regard to the cruel punishment of the slaves; his assertion, founded on the testimony of Mr. Jay, that at least one negro had been burned annually for twenty years for rising against their masters; his characterisation of the Southern leaders as men of powerful intellect and energy; his demand to know the meaning of Mr. Davis's statement that the proclamation has doomed millions of beings of an inferior race to extermination — all these were caught up so rapturously as to convey the impression that the speaker must have expressed the views of his auditory even more perfectly than his own . . .

Decidedly the crowning speech of the evening was Mr. Newman Hall's. His voice alone of all the speakers' voices filled easily and perfectly the enormous space. His slight physique, earnest face, and self-possessed yet impressive manner, must have given to many, as it did to us, an idea of the strength of the Puritan element yet existing among us, but not allied, as so often it was of old, to fanaticism or to spiritual blindness towards everything grand or beautiful that is not directly and obviously religious

Lancashire Cotton

A hundred years ago, Karl Marx wrote of the struggle taken by the Lancashire cotton workers over Negro slavery and the American Civil War: 'This is a new a

Here is a contemporary dr



2

3

4

6

8

5

7

1, Knocker-up. 2, Reeler. 3, Hotwater Winder. 7, Scavenger. 8, Over-looker to weaver. 11, Carder. 12, Self-acting mind

Operatives, 1863

illiant proof of the indestructible excellence of the English popular masses, of that excellence which is the secret of England's greatness'.

of the cotton operatives:



10

11

12

13

14

15

4, Hand-mule spinner. 5, Half-timer. 6, mules. 9, Throstle-spinner. 10, Power-loom weaver. 14, Power-loom weaver. 15, Throstle-

. . . We quote the peroration of his speech, with its magnificent invective against slavery, where he asserts:—

That 'God has made of one blood all nations to dwell upon the face of all the earth (cheers); that there is no right so sacred as that which a man has to himself, no wrong so flagrant as that of robbing a man of himself (cheers); that it is an abomination to steal a man and to sell him (loud cheers); that it is no less an abomination to breed a man and to sell him (Hear, hear) than for man to barter away his own offspring for gold (loud cheers); that it is an abomination to expose men and women on the auction-block and feel their muscles and hand them over to the highest bidder as you would cattle (Shame!); that it is an abomination to deny to a woman the rights of chastity and maternity (Hear, hear); that it is an abomination judicially to declare that a coloured man has no rights that a white man need not respect (Hear, hear); that it is an abomination to flog a naked woman, whether she be a Hungarian Countess or an African slave (hear, hear); that it is an abomination to fine, imprison, flog, and, on a repetition of the act, hang a man for teaching another man to read the Bible (Hear, hear); that it is hideous blasphemy to cite that Bible of a God of love in defence of such abominations (Hear, hear); that a confederacy of men fighting in order to commit these abominations should be regarded as engaged in portentous piracy rather than in legitimate warfare (cheers); that the conscience and heart of free

England can never wish to recognise an empire avowing as its cornerstone the right to maintain and extend these abominations (cheers); and, lastly, as the recognition of an empire involves reception of its Ambassador, that the loyalty of Great Britain loathes the very idea of such an indignity being offered to the Royal Lady we delight to venerate as that her pure, matronly, and widowed hand, which wields only the sceptre of love over the free, should ever be contaminated by the kiss of any representative of so foul a conspiracy against civilisation, humanity and God!' We should despair of any attempt to give an adequate notion of the feeling called forth towards our Queen or against slavery by the last sentence . . .

And then, on once more reaching the open air, we heard that a second meeting had been held in Exeter Street, larger than the first one, in order to draw off the crowds from some unhappy Southern sympathisers who had been too freely expressing their sentiments. No less, therefore, than four distinct meetings had been developed out of the one intended meeting, each with its own chairman and speakers, among whom were Mr. Noel, Mr. Shaen, and several gentlemen who had been in America, including the chaplain of General Burnside.

We conclude, as we began, with no intention to express here our own views. But this one remark may be permitted. Whatever the result as regards North and South — the permanent rupture or the reunion of the States—it is impossible to doubt that the Divine hand is so fashioning things as to destroy slavery.

BATTLE FOR JOBS: THE LOBBIES

W. Morgan Williams*

[With close on a million without work in the United Kingdom, immense significance attaches to actions by unemployed and employed alike now developing on a large scale. On March 26 a remarkable Lobby of Parliament will take place, organised by all the Federations of Trades Councils of England's industrial North, with massive support from hard-hit Scotland and Belfast. A special feature is the combination of local demonstrations with those converging on the metropolis. Last month the spirited and impressive Lobby jointly led by Welsh miners and railwaymen set the pace. A picture of what is involved is given by the following contributions from Wales, Scotland and the North West.—Ed., L.M.]

THE great Lobby of Parliament from the Principality of Wales, organised jointly by the miners and us railwaymen—a portent in itself—was by no means the first step in the campaign. And neither, indeed, will it be the last. Vast as the interest is which has been aroused, we saw the Lobby as only a step on the way to winning for every worker in Wales, and in all Britain, the right to a secure job in the place where he was born.

These Lobbies should make it clear to all that the present Tory policies must be ended. The vast majority of the people have to understand, for example, that with present Government policies, further closures are inevitable. That is why both railwaymen and miners looked upon the Lobby from Wales as one of the major steps towards bringing about different policies in two major nationalised industries.

Before it is too late, what must be brought home is this; as in other parts of Britain, today it is the traditional industries in Wales which are in danger. Coal, agriculture, tinplate, Government services and railways have lost 100,000 jobs since 1948, whilst 107 pits have gone and nearly 34,000 jobs in the mines. Many branch lines and approximately 8,000 positions on railways have gone. It is as though a great

'natural disaster' had hit our country. It is true that up until recently the worst feature, total unemployment, was largely avoided, either by men getting into neighbouring pits and by wholesale transfers on the railways or by men leaving these industries. But the situation now is that with every closure it is ever more difficult to place those who are 'redundant'. Railwaymen have to uproot themselves from their house,

*As many of our readers will know, Mr. Morgan Williams, who is of course writing this article in his personal capacity, is Organiser of District No. 6 (Cardiff) of the National Union of Railwaymen.

retire early, or seek employment in areas where no house is available.

A continuation of present Tory policies means death to many of our rural communities in our lovely hinterland and to certain valley townships where coal is the only industry, whilst other valleys will be simply dormitory towns for the coastal strip. Welsh industry is more diversified than pre-war. Along the south coastal strip, there have been built steel giants, like Llanwern, the Margam, Velindre and Trostre works of the Steel Company of Wales; oil refineries; chemical works; car plants and light engineering. But these have not absorbed the labour available in spite of the fact that 26,000 men and 15,000 women left Wales between 1951 and 1961. This means that four per cent of our working population has gone, all of them young people, to more fortunate areas of Britain, or have emigrated overseas. Big firms like I.C.I., B.S.A., and Murphy's Radios who came to Wales when they had plenty of work, have closed or are closing down here with a hard core of 5.7% (in January) of our labour force unemployed. Is it any wonder that the fear of a return to the black days of the 1930's is being expressed in our valleys? Under the age of 18 there are over 3,000 who are without jobs, over half of these without their first job. The young will naturally get attracted to more fortunate areas, particularly if both work and travel facilities disappear in their own. With them depart the future of our heritage and culture. We have experienced this before; we do not intend to let it happen again.

Over the past eighteen months considerable concern has been expressed in Wales about rail closures and their effect on rural and valley

communities. Objections were registered by county and local authorities through the Transport Users Consultative Committee. Two major all-Welsh conferences of local authorities were held and their working committee saw the Minister of Transport. Members of Parliament used the Grand Committee in the House of Commons to raise the problem. All this was to no avail. Mass working class action was then stepped up. The strike of railwaymen on October 3, 1962 was followed by the Joint Conference called by miners and railwaymen on October 27, at Cardiff, with many joint local meetings held since. This rally brought it home to thousands what continuing present Tory policies mean for our land and people. That is why there was so much interest aroused within the Principality and support from outside it when we went to Parliament to insist to the Tory Members in particular on certain demands. We insisted that they should call an immediate halt to closures of lines and workshops and transport be looked on as a whole; that railways should be given what road users get free; and the industry should be co-ordinated and integrated to serve the nation. We insisted that there must be a national fuel policy to give a planned and guaranteed future for coal, oil, gas and electricity. We insisted that the coal and rail industries should be freed from the burden of interest and compensation charges. Finally we insisted that suitable alternative industries should be *directed* to *all* areas where closures are unavoidable.

These demands of the Lobby are supported in whole, or part, by the vast majority of the cross section of the people of Wales and their elected representatives in the House of Commons, the trade unions, local

authorities and bodies like chambers of commerce, the churches, those representative of farmers and tourist trades and so on. These Lobbies from different parts of Britain are a first step, a long stride forward. A halt cannot be called to them now.

On Clydeside

UNEMPLOYMENT is on the tip of everyone's tongue here in Glasgow. Alongside unemployment in the people's mind are the Tory myths and right-wing social democrat ideas: they are on trial for their life. In the Battle for Jobs on Clydeside, take a look first at the plight of those already out of work; then at the grim prospects in shipbuilding, the railways, mines and engineering; and finally at the sort of fight the Scottish working class is putting up.

With this creeping paralysis in our industry, Glasgow's growing unemployment figure is reaching the twenty-five thousand mark. It is all very well for the economist to look at the unemployed as a line on a piece of paper, or, as the Tory Cabinet Ministers would say, as part of a 'healthy 4 per cent pool of unemployment'. But what about the individual who is unemployed? I think that what hits you when you are first unemployed is the loneliness, the feeling you are on your own. The very next day you are pounding the street from factory to factory looking for work. You try everywhere and everyone you know; sooner or later you get that feeling you are going to be out of work for a long time. Then, when the last few shillings of your lying-time dwindle away, that is when you are faced with the idea of trying to exist on dole money. From the £4 12s. 6d. a married man can get from the Labour Exchange he must pay: the rent,

electricity bill, gas, coal for a start; and nearly every young couple who are trying to build a home have some kind of hire purchase agreement. After he has paid for those he can think of buying some food. A suit? That's out; and if he does not want to starve, he will not buy many cigarettes or any refreshments. The people who have been 'made redundant' were earning, at an average, between £14 and £15 a week; now they must find it harder to live than the old age pensioner. Who could disagree that the majority must find unemployment a form of mental torture?

Amongst the unemployed in Glasgow there are four thousand under the age of 18; some are coming straight from school on the dole. What a deplorable state of affairs that the youth, the future of Britain, is compelled to stand in the demoralising queues at the Labour Exchange. Those who know the youth through the Young Communist League, the Young Socialists, the Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament or any other youth organisation, will undoubtedly agree that the vast majority are a credit to their day and age. Who more than the youth deserve the right to work, learn a trade and live a different life? But because they are born into this antiquated system of capitalism they must suffer for crimes they have not committed. What's their prospects?

The outlook in heavy engineering is anything but bright, with Babcock and Wilcox laying off men and Parkhead Forge having a handful of men left. Light engineering is not much better: Rolls-Royce are on a four-day week and in Remington Rand there is redundancy. Everywhere you go there, it is 'redundancy' or 'no vacancies'.

The Tory plans for the mines and

now for the railway workshops have been announced. In Glasgow alone over a thousand men will lose their jobs on the railways. But nowhere is the Tory policy going to be taken without a fight. In St. Rollox, Cowlairs, Colmadie and other shops, the men are demonstrating against it.

It is said by the best authorities on shipbuilding, that to keep the present world fleets supplied with ships and repairs, would take less than half the world's shipbuilding industry. In Scotland 464,000 tons of new ships were built last year, but only 170,000 tons new orders have been obtained. On the Clyde some yards have been closed; others which employed over a thousand men are now employing less than a hundred. Only one or two can safely say they have enough work to last them through the year.

The shop stewards from the upper reaches of the Clyde got together. These meetings led the Boilermakers' and Blacksmiths' shop stewards to adopt a five-point programme, which was previously endorsed by the Boilermakers' Society. They favour nationalisation of the industry, but in the meantime, that a Minister of Shipping should be set up, to deal with shipping and its servicing industries, shipbuilding and ship repair. At present, control of the industry is in private hands with Mr. Marples, Minister of Transport as the Government Minister dealing with shipping affairs. When you look at the state of the sections of transport he is responsible for you can judge how much he will do for the shipbuilding industry. The shop stewards support a scrap-and-build policy, allowing a ship the life of twenty years; all British ships should be built in British shipyards; and more research and development in the industry. The shop stewards arranged a meet-

ing through the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions with Jean Roberts, Glasgow's Lord Provost. Putting forward their proposals, they made it clear that 1,115,000 tons of new ships every year would be needed for a secure base for the industry, whose total output was 1,169,700 tons in 1962.

The Lord Provost decided to call a meeting of all the local authorities on the Clyde. Up here in Scotland the railwaymen, miners, engineers and shipbuilders are demonstrating against redundancy, and in their demonstrations, have made it clear that they are not prepared to wait until the Tories have their General Election; they are demanding one now. In recent meetings outside the Labour Exchanges, a big percentage of the unemployed has shown their willingness to fight for work or better benefits: the army of unemployed is moving towards being more organised; like they were in the 'thirties. But as well as a proper organised movement of unemployed, we need more trade union special Conferences, not only to lay down a more positive line of action but to knit a closer pattern of unity. Now is the time, too, for every branch of the Communist Party to hold meetings, at the street corners, factory gates and labour exchanges, and to put an end to any undue fear of communists and communism, and rouse the people against this Government.

I read with admiration about the movement in Liverpool, of the Welsh Lobby in February, of how the North East are going to descend on London in March: we shall be there. That only leaves me to say: roll on Socialism.

CHARLES MAXWELL,

Glasgow

In the North-East

PROBLEMS of the North-East are essentially common to British capitalist economy as a whole, aggravated as they have been by government policy. Adding 'redundancy' on the railways to pit closures, by policies restricting capital development, the Tories have created a depression in steel, while undermining shipbuilding over the years by putting barriers in the way of orders from Socialist countries.

It is our basic industries which need development: if the sole cure is to be the panacea of 'new industries', it can become a myth and a delusion. For the North-East it would mean a prospect of the women being the mainstay and the men on the dole, with mines, steel works and shipyards closing down. Any new industrial development to be healthy must be dependent on expansion in basic industries. Again, we must challenge any idea that 'war means work'. What spelt trouble was the war work, with tanks at Vickers in Newcastle, and Sea Slug destroyers at Wallsend. For it meant money and resources used up in what proves to be scrap iron which could have been put to building and selling tractors and cargo vessels. This would have opened up further economic ex-

pansion and more work ahead, not less. Arms expenditure led only to tax burdens and even further economic difficulties.

Lord Hailsham is not the first Minister in recent years to be sent on a trip to the North-East to 'investigate' unemployment (65,000 here even before the vast increase to 932,939 nationally was admitted in February). When Maudling, as President of the Board of Trade, came to Jarrow two years ago, he was met by a demonstration which told him to 'stop dawdling'. Then Hare came through Darlington and Newcastle with sunshine talk about 'jobs in the pipeline'; that was more a pipe-dream, since with more unemployment the 'jobs in the pipeline' dry up too. And now, the Bell-ringer Hailsham is sent 'to investigate'. What the trade union and labour movement is demanding is a total 'change of Tory Government policy'. And that is in the interests of the British people as a whole; for the problems, aggravated in the North-East, are common to British capitalist economy as a whole. The vast Lobby to Parliament at the end of the month by all the Federations of Trades Councils of the North underline this in striking fashion.

HORACE GREEN,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne

TWO STEPS BACK

The British economy is sounder today than at any time since the first world war. . . . We have now stabilised the cost of living while maintaining full employment.

The Next Five Years (Conservative Election Manifesto), 1959.

BLACK AND YELLOW

Wilfred Macartney

QUEUEING for the cashier at a bank in Cairo in September 1917, I glanced at the large sum of money being drawn by a tall cavalry Major before me. I was going to have a day at the races before rejoining my Division, the 52nd Lowland, a month or so before Allenby's Gaza attack. I had been seconded to Greece a year before.

'Good Luck, Your Grace; they say so and so is going to win', and the cashier mentioned a horse's name to the tall Major.

I remarked: 'Are you going to the races, Sir?'

He said: 'Yes'.

'I hope you do not lose all that money', I replied.

He laughed and we fell into conversation and walked towards Groppi's, a famous cafe. As we entered, I made the usual facetious remark of an infantry subaltern about 'Groppi's Lancers, the Westminster Dragoons', a Yeomanry Regiment doing guard duty in Cairo, whose officers frequented Groppi.

'Don't be too hard on them, they are very bored', said the Major. We spent a pleasant day at the races and that was the only time I met the Second Duke of Westminster,* who owned several acres of gold and diamond studded land in Mayfair, where embassies and private palaces vied with each other in opulence and grandeur.

Between the wars, my amiable racing companion became embittered by racial passions and prejudice. Lady Norwich in her *Memoirs* says that 'Bendor' (a chestnut colt of his grandfather's which won the Derby—hence Westminster's nickname) was barmy in his hostility to the Jews and Negroes; and she tells us how on the eve of the declaration of war, at the Savoy Hotel, the Duke was excoriated by Duff Cooper, not a good tempered man at the best of times and unlikely to stand any nonsense at that particular moment about wicked Jews and nice Nazis. The Grosvenor Estate always had many embassies and legations, maybe as many as 80 per cent of the diplomatic missions to the Court of St. James had Grosvenor leaseholds. The problem of colour and race discrimination did not arise till after the World Wars for the simple reason that there were few coloured sovereign states (and, of course, Israel was merely a dream); hence there *were* no coloured ambassadors,

*The late Hugh Richard Arthur Grosvenor, Baronet; Baron Grosvenor; Earl Grosvenor and Viscount Belgrave; Marquess of Westminster; Duke of Westminster. Owned 'about 30,000 acres in Cheshire and Flintshire, besides an estate in Scotland and 600 acres in London'. (*Who's Who*.)

ministers nor high commissioners. Since 1945 with the fragmentation of the Colonial powers, the situation has altered and there are many more diplomatic missions. These have been further increased by the American stars and stripes flying over more Embassy buildings on the Grosvenor Estate than there are states in the Union; including one up-to-date private prison on the top of a modern building.

In 1947 Ceylon became an independent member of the British Commonwealth. The first High Commissioner, Sir Oliver Goonetilleke, K.C.M.G., K.B.E., began looking for a residence and chancellery at a fair price. Lady Baillie, sister of Miss Dorothy Paget, the race-horse owner, held an 87-year lease of 25, Grosvenor Square. Just before the war, Lady Baillie, a woman of great taste, great discrimination and, above all, great wealth, had practically rebuilt 25, Grosvenor Square. As an embassy it was a natural; magnificent Italian marble staircase, great state rooms leading to a flagged garden where the suspension of a marquee gave space for hundreds of guests. The ballroom could dance as many couples as were likely to be found outside a Palais de Dance. There were lifts, bathrooms and sun-traps; and what was more, a bomb had blown away the house next door, so that No. 25, Grosvenor Square became a corner site and likely to remain so for some time. (And indeed it did, till the Americans bought for £2 million all the leases of the west side of Grosvenor Square, pulled down the twenty or so houses and put up what appears to be a box of reinforced glass and metal, looking something like a modern military prison.) As the High Commissioner and Lady Baillie dealt direct without estate agents, the matter went with dispatch and without publicity. The High Commissioner paid £50,000 for an 87-year lease, a bargain if ever there was one.

It was about this time that 'The U.S. Office of Property Operations in Europe' became aware that 25, Grosvenor Square housed a capable and charming but nevertheless coloured High Commissioner and that his pleasant staff were all Asians.

The Americans in Grosvenor Square were horrified, especially when carrying parcels from their PX in North Audley Street, they wandered past No. 25. The White Man's Burden should not be a big parcel of goodies and gum-chum. This dark stain must be erased. The United States Ambassador offered his colleague a profit to get out and transfer the lease to the U.S.A. The immediate reaction of the High Commissioner was a kind of headlong transi-

tion from thought to action which made one think that we would have a hot war before the cold one had even started. Through the bleak channels of diplomatic indignation, the offer and the profit were refused.

With the imperishable impudence of outsiders and bounders who think all the world is the loot of persistence, the U.S. Government went behind the High Commissioner's back to his Prime Minister, D. S. Senanayake, a subtle and experienced politician, who was somewhat of a rugged character, and was not thinking of letting down his loyal High Commissioner; so he brusquely refused to quit this most sacred of squares.

About this time Cripps was entering his dollar obsessional phase and the Americans aware of this began to pressure Cripps to persuade the Ceylon Government to take the profit and, what is more, promised to pay in New Dollars. Up to this time people thought that the almighty dollar was the same all the world over, but now they learnt that there was a division in the God-head. A New Dollar was one that was actually sent directly to London from the U.S.A. and not one that had been lying about the place for some time. The witch-doctors at the Treasury and their acolytes in the City had smelt out all the old dollars and knew exactly how many there were in the country and when the opportunity arose of squeezing some New Ones out of the Federal Reserve Deity, they welcomed it; in short, dollars held on account in England were augmented. Cripps imagined that it would be good business for the new dominions, apparently being ignorant that Ceylon, with its rubber, tea and graphite, were not in need of dollars; so the matter rested.

King George VI and Queen Elizabeth with much ceremony inaugurated the new Embassy, and although the American Ambassador gamely walked across the square to the grand reception, his visage was solemn. While this was going on, the Indonesian Ambassador, again acting without an agent, or publicity, took a lease and moved into the other side of the square. This was too much for the Americans, who started all over again the same tactic, with even less success. Now, the Coat of Arms of the U.S.A. and the Indonesian Republic are similar and, when the shield is set up high over the portico, almost indistinguishable from the Bald-Headed Eagle; this led to a number of long Yankee cars obstructing the entrance and visitors cluttering up the Indonesian waiting-rooms; the visitors were puzzled and the American drivers became rude

and insolent. However, the Indonesians had engaged through the usual channels (the Foreign Office), a number of cockney chauffeurs; these stood no nonsense and a *modus vivendi* was only reached after the tyres of all the American cars in Grosvenor Square were repeatedly deflated, along with their racial ego.

In 1950 the work of the Ceylon High Commissioner had grown and the Mission was considering extending its premises, so it became a practical proposition to sell to the Americans. Office space was becoming rare. This time negotiations were opened by an estate agent, who, after much coming and going, justified his occupation by selling No. 25, Grosvenor Square for about £100,000, just double what Lady Baillie had received and Ceylon had paid.

To digress, the estate agent was Howard Samuel, who in the years to come became, through inflation in land and property, a multi-millionaire, and through this and the Titmus dispensation, turned into a kind of patron of some sections of the Left. This tycoon subsidised *The Tribune* to the extent of £30,000 a year. He bought McGibbon & Kee, the publishers, and had a one-third holding in the *New Statesman*. He perished tragically engulfed in the Aegean outside Athens, when he had nearly completed the purchase of the controlling interest in Associated Book Publishers, who own Methuen, Chapman & Hall, Eyre and Spottiswoode and E. & F. N. Spon. But for his early death, he might have become the biggest publisher in the country, rivalling Hutchinson, for he left nearly £5 million and up to now there seems to be no deflation of property values; this loathsome frog which swells over the green countryside refuses to blow itself up.

After the exchange of contracts, the Americans began to smart and sought to balm their wounds by redressing the balance in favour of the new world by delaying completion, a thing unknown of in diplomatic property transactions. In fact, they practically refused to complete. The Ceylon Government was furious at the inconvenience and amazed at their behaviour.

Round about this time there was a great hoo-hah in the United Nations about voting strength: for example, the British Commonwealth had New Zealand, Canada, Australia, South Africa and some others voting pro-American, while the Soviet Union had one vote; so that reasonable people suggested that some of the great states of the Union such as the Ukraine, with a population of 40 million, should equate New Zealand with 1½ millions. The Americans opposed, saying that as these states did not have separate

diplomatic representation, they were not justified in voting; and so the wrangle continued. At this moment a press lord, and what was more helpful, his editor-in-chief, were enjoying an embittered squabble with the American State Department (or more accurately the Federal Reserve Bank) about money, something to do with cable rates, a very expensive item in a daily newspaper. Someone told the editor the story of the delay in Grosvenor Square. The editor flew a *canard* and printed in his great national daily that the Ukrainian Government were negotiating to purchase 25, Grosvenor Square from the Ceylon Government. A couple of hours after this item was printed in the first edition, the estate agent rushed the cutting to the Yankees who, although they had felt uncomfortable with coloured neighbours, were so frightened at the idea of having Communists in their darling square, that they completed within two hours; and, what was more, promptly bought the twenty neighbouring houses aforementioned.

Of course, there were a few Asian Legations and Embassies who were established on some freehold *enclave* within the Grosvenor Empire's borders; others already had leases on the Grosvenor Estate: these could not be disturbed. (Incidentally, the Israeli Government do not have their Embassy on the Grosvenor Estate.)

A few years ago, there was in South Audley Street a most magnificently appointed mansion housing the International Music Club, sponsored by a rich American lady interested in music far beyond the call of duty. After some years her indulgence of musical temperament, and perhaps the expense, became too heavy and the property and its contents were put on the market. Not since the war, or indeed before, had there been so lavishly equipped a club in London, so that a buyer was soon found and a deposit of nearly £10,000 paid to an estate agent. Negotiations went swimmingly, till the Superior Landlords were asked for the usual permission to assign. It was then discovered that the new tenants would be the Japanese Mission.

Now, at that time, no matter how close was MacArthur's friendship for the sons of Nippon, the U.S.A. certainly were not going to have them thronging Grosvenor Square; so the poor agent had to return the deposit and wait several months and then, with envy and exasperation, watch another agent sell the property to an Anglo-American store, Selfridges, for its staff.

Then there was Forbes House, behind St. George's Hospital, which came on the market seven years ago. It had been the resi-

dence of Lord Granard. Before the war some forty servants maintained the marble halls and great staircases in order and decency. During the war the building was used by the Army and bombed about a bit. The place was most suitable for an embassy. A double-carriage drive and nearly three-quarters of an acre of grounds were just the thing for diplomatic receptions, where parking is so restricted in London's traffic. The People's Republic of China considered leasing the property and negotiations were begun. They lasted a long time. The property had been vacant for nearly ten years; but nevertheless obstacles were not overcome and the property is still empty to this day.

The late Duke of Westminster's racing colours were Black and Yellow; but they are no longer carried on race-horses and his Executors are bleating about death duties. What with the ghost of 'Bendor' and the prejudice of the United States and others, we find that more than half-way through the twentieth century, when man has reached out and grasped the stars, the golden square mile of Mayfair has anachronisms and prejudices hard to believe.

VOTING IN UNITED NATIONS

[In December, 1960, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted without a dissenting vote a 'Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples', in which it proclaimed the necessity to bring colonialism—in all its forms and manifestations—to a speedy and unconditional end. By December, 1962, the Assembly was deploring the refusal of certain administering powers to co-operate in its implementation. In this context too, resolutions were passed bearing on Central, South-West and South Africa, and all these have been given only limited attention in our national press. It was felt that our readers might like to have available for reference, the texts of some of the key resolutions. We are therefore pleased to print them, together with the voting figures, and as a further guide, we show in each case what countries the United Kingdom voted with and how their vote was cast.—Ed., L.M.]

December 14, 1960

THE SUBJECTION OF PEOPLES to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations

and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation.

All peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their econo-

mic, social and cultural development.

Inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence.

All armed action or repressive measures of all kinds directed against dependent peoples shall cease in order to enable them to exercise peacefully and freely their right to complete independence, and the integrity of their national territory shall be respected.

Immediate steps shall be taken in trust and non-self-governing territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom.

Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

All states should observe faithfully and strictly the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the present Declaration on the basis of equality, non-interference in the internal affairs of all states and respect for the sovereign rights of all peoples and their territorial integrity.

(*Voting:* Adopted unanimously.)

December 17, 1962

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY recalling its resolution of December 14, 1960 and resolution of November 27, 1961, by which it established the Special Committee of seventeen for the imple-

mentation of this Declaration . . . notes with profound regret that, in spite of the efforts of the United Nations the provisions of the Declaration have not been fully implemented in a large number of territories, and that in certain cases even preliminary measures have not yet been taken to realise its objectives . . .

The Assembly *declares* that it solemnly reiterates and reaffirms the objective and principles enshrined in the Declaration; *deplores* the refusal of certain administering powers to co-operate in the implementation of the Declaration in territories under their administration; *calls upon* the administering powers concerned to cease forthwith all armed action and repressive measures directed against peoples who have not yet attained their independence, and particularly against the political activities of their rightful leaders; and *urges* all administering powers to take immediate steps in order that all colonial territories and peoples may accede to independence without delay.

(*Voting:* 101 in favour; none against; 4 abstentions. UNITED KINGDOM abstained together with FRANCE, SOUTH AFRICA, and SPAIN. Portugal did not attend.)

November 6, 1962

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, recalling its previous resolutions on the question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the government of the Republic of South Africa, *deplores* the failure of that government to comply with the repeated requests and demands of the General Assembly and of the Security Council and its flouting of world public opinion by refusing to abandon its racial policies; *strongly deprecates* the con-

tinued and total disregard by the government of South Africa of its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, and furthermore, its determined aggravation of racial issues by enforcing measures of increasing ruthlessness involving violence and bloodshed; *requests* Member States to take the following measures, separately or collectively, in conformity with the Charter, to bring about the abandonment of those policies:—

Breaking off diplomatic relations with the government of the Republic of South Africa or refraining from establishing such relations;

Closing their ports to all vessels flying the South African flag;

Enacting legislation prohibiting their ships from entering South African ports;

Boycotting all South African goods and refraining from exporting goods, including all arms and ammunition to South Africa; and

Refusing landing and passage facilities to all aircraft belonging to the government and companies registered under the laws of South Africa.

(*Voting*: 67 in favour; 16 against; 23 abstentions. UNITED KINGDOM voted against together with: CANADA, FRANCE, GREECE, IRELAND, JAPAN, LUXEMBOURG, NETHERLANDS, NEW ZEALAND, PORTUGAL, SOUTH AFRICA, SPAIN, TURKEY, UNITED STATES.)

TRADE UNION GROWTH

Jim Gardner

AT the present time a wide discussion is developing on the future of trade union organisation. The last Trades Union Congress instructed the General Council to prepare a full report. The Communist Party has published for its coming Easter Congress a draft resolution on 'The Future of Trade Unionism', which represents the first attempt to make a comprehensive examination of the problems and present concrete proposals.

In the light of current discussion on trade union organisation, it is interesting to read Professor Turner's book *Trade Union Growth, Structure and Policy** which although primarily a study of cotton trade unionism, has a much wider interest in that it embraces comparisons with trade union developments in other occupations and industries from the early stages of the industrial revolution until modern times. It traces the continuing (ephemeral in early stages) development of cotton trade unionism from the mid-eighteenth century and its functions and ability to protect and improve living standards. The author disclaims it as an 'historian's study' although 'favouring history', but it does bring out the 'militancy of the cotton workers in action' before and after the mid-nineteenth century when

**Trade Union Growth, Structure and Policy*, H. A. Turner. Allen & Unwin, 414 pp. 45s.

the existing Cotton Unions were firmly established. In their earliest formations the combinations of cotton workers had an occupational basis (spinners, weavers and the various ancillary trades in separate unions) and were local in character, features retained in the cotton union amalgamations of today and which corresponded with the early trade union formations in other industries.

The early stages of the cotton unions are associated with the break-through of science in providing new technologies and new sources of motive power which spelt the ultimate demise of cottage manufacture and the development of factory production. He compares the Spinners Union, a closed union with a controlled intake of membership although not with an apprenticeship qualification, with the new model Craft Unions of the 1850s. The Weavers Union, an open union to all textile workers, is assessed as the forerunner of the non-craft general unions of the 1890s. The Spinners' exclusiveness is estimated as having a stifling effect on collective organisation, an assessment that has application to craft unions in other industries. On the other hand the open Union of Weavers is credited as actively encouraging the development of the broader labour organisation a half century before their reappearance in the 1890s.

The evolution of trade unionism is traced against the background of a changing and expanding economy with its cycles of boom and slump; the development of new industries and new motive power resources; an increasingly rapid change in technology; the growing concentration of capital and centralisation of production. Through different stages the trade unions have developed from local occupational combinations to the Consolidated National Craft Union of the 1850s. Their exclusiveness paved the way to the rise of the non-craft General Labour Unions. Both have had their impact on each other and on the general structure of trade unionism as we know it today.

In the thirty years 1890/1920 the mass labour unions developed alongside the craft unions and by various amalgamations and take-overs changed the character of both. The craft unions became less exclusive, accepting into membership the lesser skilled and unskilled workers working alongside or servicing the main occupational group, but still closed unions within these wider limits. On the other hand, the general labour unions absorbed the new semi-skilled workers and even skilled workers, some by amalgamation but mainly by greater organising resources, which enabled them to recruit more

effectively in the newer expanding industries and in the factories based on new advanced production techniques in which craft skills are minimal.

The degree to which trade union democracy in the mill, shop or other place of work has a direct influence on union policy is examined as is the extent to which a union's internal character is reflected in its constitutional development. There are relatively few unions in which the branch is situated at, or directly related to the place of work. A fair proportion make provision in their constitution for shop stewards but union administration is in most cases without direct influence from organised shop activity. Union elections or other voting, does not involve the shop steward in most unions and is done in the branch where attendance is meagre and results in poor returns.

A differentiation is made between the modern descendants of the new unions and of the craft unions, the former clearly adapted to a popular bossdom and the latter having an exclusive democracy by opening its ranks to a sort of second class citizen. There is an element of truth in this assessment although some of the descendants of the craft unions come very near to the bossdom status. A more direct link with the grass roots at place of work in trade union administration would repair some of the deficiencies in trade union democracy.

Of particular interest are the chapters on trade union 'democracy' and 'organisation and leadership'. These subjects form part of the draft resolution of the Communist Party of Great Britain on 'The Future of Trade Unionism' which has created so much interest in the national press. Structure of individual unions is conditioned by occupational coverage and scope of recruitment, varying from the craft unions to the mass multi-industrial unions and subject to internal and external pressures.

New sectionalisms (occupational groups) form and crystallise and existing sectionalisms yield to technical, economic and institutional change. This leads in the natural course of structural evolution to the splitting off of new occupational identities from membership of the mass unions and also through regrouping, by way of merger and federation, of the new occupational groups into alliances for bargaining and other purposes.

This is a continuing process and substantially corresponds to the reforms envisaged in the T.U.C. 1924 report on structure which

recommended that sectional associations be permitted within existing unions and be allowed to federate with other similar interests. Such a development is, however, inhibited since it is in conflict with the views of the leaders of the mass unions on the need of their own union stability. The 1924 recommendations were not repeated in the T.U.C. 1946 report on structure. New occupational groups are unable to form a new union within the organisational sphere of a major union, however ineffectively it has organised the section concerned, without committing the major sin (and a breach of the Bridlington Congress decisions) of a breakaway.

It is clear from the Communist Party's draft resolution that Communists are concerned with trade union unity. They will examine every development by that standard, opposing splits, however well intentioned, if they weaken unity in the struggle for decent living standards. Communists oppose bureaucracy and the class collaborationist leadership of the trade union movement.

With regard to the foregoing it is interesting that it is in the mass unions that the lay member is considered to be more detached from the leadership and more prone to bureaucracy. Significant also—attention is given to the fact that it was the two large labour unions, or their powerful leaders, that were the most solid supporters of the 1945/57 Labour Government's attempt to impose wage restraint.

In his conclusion, Professor Turner brings out the weakness of multi-unionism at the industrial and workplace levels in the formulation of national economic and industrial policies through the T.U.C. he sees the concentration of union power in the great and relatively centralised organisations, as inhibiting agreement on effective programmes to deal with contemporary labour issues at the level of individual industries. This he considers paradoxical, since the many amalgamations that produced these concentrations were often advocated on the ground that they would promote concerted action at industrial level. This is all too true.

There is much more in this book than can possibly be dealt with in a short article. It should be read as a background to the current discussions on trade union organisation, purpose and policy initiated at the Blackpool T.U.C. 1962 and carried forward in the Communist Party's draft resolution. Their purpose is clear and needs no redefining. In defending and advancing the living and working standards of their members, the trade unions exist as a challenge to established 'profit' motives of production. This challenge can only be finally implemented when ownership of industry is brought

into harmony with the social forces of production. Inadequate as Clause 4 of the Labour Party Constitution and Rule 4 of the T.U.C. may be, they show the socialist way forward and express the basic traditional aims of the trade union movement. That there is need to define trade union policy and strengthen trade union organisation for the realisation of these aims is only common sense at this time, when ownership of industry is so firmly entrenched within the framework of monopoly state capitalism. Professor Turner does not say this but the logic of his study of trade union structure and policy is inescapable. He has made a useful contribution to this discussion.

BOOKS

Income Distribution and Social Change

Prof. R. M. Titmuss

George Allen & Unwin. 1962.
25s. 240 pp.

Takeover

William Mennell

Lawrence & Wishart. 1962.
25s. 212 pp.

IT IS now some seventy years since the Trades Union Congress came out in favour of public ownership of the means of production, and over forty years since socialism in this sense became the official policy of the Labour Party. However, throughout these years the Labour movement has witnessed an unceasing struggle about the 'meaning of socialism', in which the reformist right-wing has been trying to steer the movement away from the aim of taking ownership and control of the means of production out of the hands of the capitalist class. Recently—since Keynes—the line of the attack has been: 'The slogan of public ownership is now old-fashioned and out of date. Ownership—whether public or private—is a matter of convenience and should not be made a matter of principle.

We have now learned—thanks largely to Keynes—how to manage capitalism. So let us be "modern", drop Clause Four and cease worrying about private ownership.'

These right-wing attacks have made some headway but thanks largely to the sound instincts of the working-class rank and file, so far the right-wing onslaught on public ownership has failed in its objective. Socialism (in the Dictionary sense of the word 'ownership and control of the means of production . . . by the community as a whole' O.E.D.) still is the policy of the Labour Party. But I think it must be admitted that the arguments on which socialists have relied have too often been 'good old truths' and not often enough 'good new truths'. One never can take the present for granted; it is essential to study its particularities. The enemies of socialism have used superficialities derived from contemporary experience for attacking socialism; and socialists to rebut these attacks need constantly to arm themselves with fresh understanding of the contemporary reality. That is why these are two invaluable books. They delve deeply and truthfully into British monopoly capitalism ■ it is today. They should be widely read

and constantly consulted by socialists and active trade unionists. They should be readily available in all the libraries that workers use.

A review such as this cannot be a substitute for reading the books themselves and the best it can do is to give some idea of their contents. *Takeover* deals with the growth of monopoly in Britain in a well informed, thorough and factual way. As its title suggests its central theme is the scramble by millionaire interests, during the last decade particularly, to buy themselves controlling interests in new spheres. An excellent chapter ('The Bargain Basement') explains the specific historical setting in which particular contradictions within capitalist society fanned the flames of stock and property speculation. High taxation encouraged 'the frantic search for capital gains in the Stock Exchange and elsewhere in recent years, which has made its own special contribution to the inflationary process, which taxation has been increased to combat—and so *ad infinitum*'. All sorts of devices were used for raising capital and countless anomalies showed themselves; these in turn opened new possibilities for sharp manipulators, and this in turn encouraged the biggest established monopolies to tighten their ranks, to effect mergers and become still bigger. The excellent introductory chapters are followed by careful surveys of particular fields (backed by comprehensive detail in the appendices). These include food, drink and tobacco; monopolies in trade; chemicals and man-made fibres; the press; insurance and investment trusts. Concluding chapters deal with anti-monopoly legislation and the facts about share ownership.

Professor Titmuss is already well-known for his recent booklet *The*

Irresponsible Society and also as an expert over many years on social conditions in Britain. He is an academic with two rare qualities—a penetrating instinct in his choice of subjects to investigate and courage in following the evidence of truth wherever it leads. His latest book *Income Distribution and Social Change* is sub-titled 'A Study in Criticism'—criticism that probes the complacent myths of a 'reformed capitalism' down to their deepest foundations. He does a real Perry Mason on the star witnesses against socialism, the learned authorities who have been so repeatedly testifying in recent years that this 'reformed capitalism' has been progressively eliminating the inequalities between the classes. He probes by asking accurate, pertinent, well-informed questions and thereby revealing that the authorities, that is, both the public authorities who provide the statistical raw material and the academic authorities who use it, do not know—very literally—what they are talking, or writing, about. For example, when they make statements about the distribution of income they do not show, or know, what income covers and does not cover, nor what the income receiving units are. Basic ideas such as these are pursued down to the last detail; and in the course of pursuit Professor Titmuss unearths innumerable devices by which the rich avoid tax or find means of living as they choose within the structure of existing legislation—legislation by which it is generally supposed that wealth is distributed away from them to the workers and poorer sections of the population.

It is because this book is so rich in its detail and so realistic in its understanding of the actual goings on in modern capitalist society, that every Labour organisation should be

sure that they have it and use it as a constant source of reference. By way of illustration I will refer to just one section of the professor's argumentation. He takes Mr. Lydall's hitherto widely accepted statement based on Inland Revenue statistics, that the top 1% of incomes accounted in 1938 for 16.2% of all allocated income before tax as against 8.0% in 1957—apparently a catastrophic turn for the worse in the fortunes of the very rich. (The British monopoly capitalist class is virtually comprised within this one per cent). He then proceeds to list eleven factors which have been neglected in the interpretation of these figures. These include (p. 51): 'More units reduced in value as a result of the operation of irrevocable settlements, discretionary trusts, family and educational trusts and gifts *inter vivos* in favour of children, grandchildren or other kin and "life tenants" by parents, grandparents and other relatives by blood and marriage; . . . More units reduced in value as a result of deliberate reductions of high salaries to spread income into retirement and pay less tax over the life span as a whole; More units reduced in value so as to acquire the right to tax-free lump sums of up to £40,000 or more on actual or nominal retirement; and more incomes reduced in value as a result of higher expense accounts'.

No review can do justice to these and the many similar points with which Professor Titmuss deals with searching precision but if socialists use this book and William Mennell's *Takeover* as a quarry for information and ideas, the conviction will soon spread to more and more people that our short-term policies for improving social services, assuaging the effects of poverty, stimulating production and so forth, will lead

nowhere unless they bring us at the same time closer to the day when the hands of private wealth and class interest can be removed altogether from the thousand or so multi-millionaire firms that dominate our economic life. About three-quarters of our national wealth flows through the private precincts of these concerns before reaching the people it should be sustaining and too many private hands dip into the passing stream. Only when these establishments can carry the notice 'Public Property—no pilfering', will social authority be able surely to control the flow and direction of social income and expenditure.

JOHN EATON.

To Katanga and Back

Conor Cruise O'Brien

Hutchinson. 372 pp. 35s.

EVERY ACUTE CRISIS point today becomes a kind of microcosm of world politics. Nowhere was this more so than in the Congo during the period from the murder of Lumumba to the death of Hammerskjold. Hence this is a fascinating book. A civil servant representing the exactest norm of Ireland's radical bourgeoisie was seconded to the United Nations service, sent to the crucial hot-spot to do a job, did it, and was promptly and unceremoniously sacked amid obloquy and oburgations. In the process he uncovered a seething cauldron of violence and intrigue. His narrative *To Katanga and Back* should be read by everybody anxious to know how imperialism really works. Written with a dry wit which revels in understatement, it has been described as a 'cynical book'. It is about as cynical as Swift's *Modest Proposal* for mitigating the poverty of the Irish peasants by fattening

their children for the tables of the landlords. O'Brien's anti-imperialism also (like Swift's anti-landlordism but with less excuse), though thoroughly committed, does not push through to the point where its social alternative is fully grasped.

O'Brien was Hammerskjold's personal choice for the difficult task of securing the application of the Security Council resolution of February 21, 1961. Passed just after the 'killing' of Lumumba, it urged the U.N. to 'take immediately all appropriate measures to prevent the occurrence of civil war in the Congo, including arrangements for cease-fires, the halting of military operations, the prevention of clashes, and the use of force, if necessary, in the last resource'. Mr. Zorin, who abstained, warned that the resolution could mean all things to all men. British delegate Sir Patrick Dean confirmed this view by stating an interesting reservation that force should only be used to prevent clashes 'between hostile Congolese forces'. O'Brien held the view that Hammerskjold had selected him as the best representative of an alternative 'Americo-Afro-Asian' interpretation, which he at once set about putting into effect. Although he notes and criticises the deliberate withholding of information from the Soviet staff at the U.N., and recognises that Soviet strictures were 'not unreasonable', he does not seem to have suspected that American imperialism, robbed by events of its automatic majority in the Assembly, might think of enlisting Afro-Asian sentiment in a crusade, the object of which was not the freedom of the Congo, but a financially satisfactory adjustment with other imperialisms.

His first task in Katanga was to ensure the withdrawal of the Belgian

and other mercenaries. His experiences convinced him that the true rulers of Katanga were the ~~business-~~men of the Union Minière, who for their own purposes required the 'black façade'. Tshombe, the successful grocer, is not unsympathetically drawn as a kind of cork surviving thanks to a capacity to bob up after every immersion. It was typical of him that moments of crisis took him either to the British consulate or to Rhodesia. Munongo he sees as a political heavyweight in his own right, allied to imperialism for the sake of the auld lang syne of tribalism and the slave trade. The politics of Katanga, he clearly demonstrates, are copper, copper and copper—with a few pounds of cobalt and uranium thrown in. The complex intertwining of economic and political interests is well shown. Particularly valuable is O'Brien's scathing, factual exposure of imperialist humbug, the 'spontaneous native demonstrations' which 'indicated a surprisingly accurate appreciation of the alignment of the Powers', the 'beautiful friendship between black and white' (that is, Tshombe doing the Union Minière's work for it), and the campaign of slander against the Baluba whose 'backwardness', imposed by the colonial régime, became a justification for slaughtering them as soon as they showed signs of wishing to end it. Incidentally, O'Brien shows clearly enough that if 'top people' read what they are supposed to read, quite important items of Congo news must have failed to reach them.

O'Brien came to grief through his part in operation 'Morthor', aimed, as he says, at ending the secession of Katanga. He had been told that Hammerskjold was aware of it and had given consent. Though reflection has modified his early admiration of that enigmatic gentleman, O'Brien

does not suggest that his subsequent disowning of 'Morthor' arose merely from its military failure. He believes Hammerskjold retreated under British pressure. This is, however, to let the American administration off scot free. What seems to show through is that O'Brien, the Irishman who saw the resemblance of Katanga to Northern Ireland, was drawn into applying a purely 'Afro-Asian' interpretation of the February resolution, but it was the British who forced the re-incorporation of the 'American' element. The conclusion? Afro-Asian alone will not suffice, much less Americo-Afro-Asian. The world contains socialist states also. To attempt to solve the international aspects of the Congo question without them is the parallel to tackling the internal aspects without Lumumba, that is, without the Congolese people.

Many people believe Irish neutrality died in the Congo. When O'Brien went there British papers were declaring that Irish neutrality could be a useful façade for rallying the Afro-Asians behind imperialist policies. Whether it is yet dead is a matter of opinion. Mercifully it refuses to lie down. Mr. O'Brien's courageous stand won universal support among the Irish people and his frank 'case history' perhaps also serves to warn that no matter how assiduously the rulers of small

countries curry favour with imperialism, the facts of life, through the agency of ordinary people, will inevitably force them back into conflict with it—or send them away down the river of history.

C. DESMOND GREAVES.

Goering

Roger Manvell & Heinrich Fraenkel
Heinemann. 430 pp. 35s.

THIS BIOGRAPHY is somewhat uneven. A minor fault is that it falls a little between two stools over the difficulty of writing a life of a man, who was as actively and prominently involved as Goering was in the running of Nazism throughout its existence, without at the same time writing the history of Nazism itself; and a more serious defect is that it gives an almost favourable and friendly picture of the truly abominable blackguard of whom the Nuremberg tribunal so rightly wrote: 'His guilt is unique in its enormity The record discloses no excuse for this man'. It is not easy to understand how the writers, who carried out very full research, can have found it possible to say so much in the man's favour; they may have been caught by his superficial charm, or they have been 'leaning over backwards' in an effort to be objective. Whatever their reasons, the fault—as I see it—is there; it can be said in mitigation that they record faithfully and fully the innumerable matters and events which go to establish how vile Goering really was.

The book has two clear merits; firstly, it gives one more correct overall picture of Nazi rottenness and of the practice and technique of its leading figures in stabbing each other in the back for their own advantage; and secondly, it quotes some

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. ■ line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class Ads.', *Labour Monthly*, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

DUPLICATING, Verbatim Shorthand, Typing (tapes, etc.), Translating. Mabel Eyles, 10, Beaconsfield Road, London, N.11. ENT 3324.

VETERAN L.M. readers: your early copies and pamphlets may be invaluable to others. Send details to: L.M. Exchange Service, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

WE BUY books-pamphlets: Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: RIV 6807. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6.

URGENTLY REQUIRED—All back numbers of *Labour Monthly* from 1921-1930 inclusive and 1939.

examples of the apparent gullibility of Chamberlain and his ministers, particularly Halifax, in swallowing any story the Nazis told them. (I say 'apparent' gullibility, for they were only too willing to swallow anything that would enable them to avoid action and favour the Nazis).

The book is curiously defective in dealing with the responsibility for the burning of the Reichstag. The writers deal with this at some length, but ignore a substantial part of the cogent evidence now available, to an extent which tends to shake faith in the thoroughness of the rest of their research. One particular failure is in respect of the Reichstag Fire Enquiry Commission, consisting of seven lawyers from seven different countries, which sat in London in September, 1933, heard a large body of evidence, and arrived at important conclusions which were well received

by the Press and the public. The writers totally ignore these conclusions, and one might suspect that they had never even heard of the Commission, if they had not mentioned that one of them attended its sittings. The degree of attention he paid to it may be judged by his statement that Sir Stafford Cripps 'played a prominent part' in it; the truth is that Cripps took no part whatever in its work, but merely attended on the opening day and made a five-minute speech of introduction and welcome. The statement in the book that the Enquiry *was taking place* when Goering was giving evidence at Leipzig is also curiously inaccurate; the Commission finished its work and published its conclusions before the Leipzig trial began.

D. N. PRITT, Q.C.

[Mr. Pritt was, of course, the President of the famous Reichstag Fire Enquiry Commission.—Ed., L.M.]

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

BOOKS

- Congo My Country. Patrice Lumumba. Pall Mall Press with Barrie and Rockliff. 196 pp. 22s. 6d.
 Collected Works. Vol. 5. V. I. Lenin. Lawrence and Wishart. 568 pp. 7s. 6d.
 Destination: Amaltheia. Edited by Richard Dixon. Central Books and F.L.P.H. 420 pp. 5s.
 A Key to Soviet Politics. Roger Pethybridge. Allen and Unwin. 208 pp. 21s.
 The Road to Sharpeville. Bernard Sachs. Dennis Dobson. 190 pp. 25s.
 Boys Will be Boys. E. S. Turner. Background Books, Daimon Press. 210 pp. 10s. 6d.
 Genghis Khan. Ralph Fox. Background Books, Daimon Press. 178 pp. 10s. 6d.
 The God of the Witches. Margaret A. Murray. Background Books, Daimon Press. 168 pp. 9s. 6s.
 The Conservative Enemy. C. A. R. Crosland. Jonathan Cape. 252 pp. 30s.
 My Old Man. Max Cohen. Hargreaves. 182 pp. 16s.
 The Land of Foam. Ivan Yefremov. Central Books. 340 pp. 6s.
 Let the Blood of Man Not Flow. M. Stelmalch. Central Books. 326 pp. 6s.
 The Shop Stewards. G. W. Target. Gerald Duckworth. 304 pp. 18s.
 John Brown. W. E. B. Du Bois. International Publishers (N.Y.). 414 pp. \$2.25.
 Militarism and Industry. Victor Perlo. International Publishers (N.Y.). 208 pp. \$1.65.
 Outside the Right. Fenner Brockway. Allen & Unwin. 232 pp. 25s.

BOOKLETS

- Towns for Our Times. Labour Party. 40 pp. 2s.
 Congo—Prelude to Independence. African Research & Publications. 120 pp. 2s. 6d.
 General Strike in the North-East. History Group of the Communist Party. 20 pp. 1s. 6d.
 Eight Steps to Peace in Kamerun. One Kamerun Party. 24 pp. 2s.
 Science and The Future of Britain. Labour Party. 46 pp. 2s.
 Report at Coimbatore. S. A. Dange. All India Trades Union Congress. 71 pp. Rs. 1.25.
 Strategy of Revenge. Ernst Henri. Communist Party. 36 pp. 1s.
 The Case of the Tearful Tycoon. Emil Bjarnason. T.U. Research Bureau, Vancouver. 16 pp. 25 cents.
 Dr. Verwoerd of South Africa. Martin Burger. Christian Action. 30 pp. 1s.
 Liberty in Chains. D. N. Pritt. Committee for Democratic Rights in U.S.A. 28 pp. 6d.
 Music and Life. Music Group of Communist Party. 16 pp. 1s.
 Diary of Ernest Jones, 1839-47. History Group of Communist Party. 22 pp. 1s. 6d.

Published by the proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

NEW SUBSCRIPTION RATES

SPECIAL CONCESSION.....

AND DELIVERED TO YOUR DOOR!

(All Post Free)

Second Class Mail (Unsealed Envelope)

Great Britain	One year 21s., six months 10s. 6d.
Overseas	One year 24s., six months 12s.
Canada	One year \$3.50
U.S.A.	One year \$3.50

First Class Mail (Sealed Envelope)

Great Britain	One year 23s., six months 11s. 6d.
Commonwealth Countries	One year 27s. (Canada \$4.50)
Outside Commonwealth.....	One year 35s. (U.S.A. \$5.50)

Airmail

(To those many readers throughout the world, who may wish to have their copy by the speediest mail possible, we quote below some examples of airmail rates for both First Class (sealed envelope) and Second Class (unsealed envelope) airmail. We name but a few countries here, and we shall be pleased to quote rates, on enquiry, for any other country.)

Iraq, Israel	One year 49s.	(2nd Class)	69s.	(1st Class)
India, Hong Kong	One year 54s.	„	99s.	„
Australia, China	One year 59s.	„	114s.	„
Canada	One year \$8.50	„	\$15	„
U.S.A.	One year \$7.50	„	\$14	„

Fabian Socialism and English Politics, 1884-1918

A. M. MCBRIAR

A critical exposition of the doctrines of Fabian Socialism and their influence in different civic and political organisations, such as the L.C.C., the I.L.P., and the Liberal and Labour Parties. 'The most important analysis of Fabianism before 1914 that has yet been published'. *Times Literary Supplement*. 'The great merit of this work is that it enables us to see the historical edifice of Fabianism as it was'. *Economist*. 50s. net

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Labour Monthly

Bound Volume, 1962

*It's a history of the year
and a permanent record*

ORDER NOW

From your usual newsagents,
price £1.5.0d., or send
10s. 6d., plus 1s. 6d. postage and
your loose copies as soon as
possible to:

**THE MANAGER,
134, Ballards Lane,
LONDON, N.3**

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating
by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

For all interested in the fight for Peace and
Progress in the Countryside and the problems
of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.

Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or

Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

27, Bedford St. Strand, London, W.C.2.

NEW L.R.D. PAMPHLET

**That Was The Promise That Was
Tory Words and Tory Deeds**

6d. (8½d. post free)

Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor : R. Palme Dutt

ARMS AND THE MAN

The Editor

★

THE BEECHING PLAN

Dave Bowman

★

‘VULCAN’

What are we here for, Mr. Woodcock?

★

A Message for Aldermaston, Diana Collins
Boyle or Burnham, M. Robinson

APRIL 1963

Two Shillings

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL. XLV

No. 4

APRIL . 1963

CONTENTS

- Notes of the Month: Arms and The Man.** *'Slithering into Ruin'—Britain and France—Law of Uneven Development—Shift in International Relations—West German Militarist Menace—Relations with the Soviet Union—U.S. Dilemma—Multilateral Confusion—Economic Clouds on the Horizon—Britain's Hour of Opportunity—Labour's Testing Time.....***R.P.D.** 147
- The Beeching Plan.** An executive member of the N.U.R. criticises the Report on Britain's Railways.....**Dave Bowman** 161
- Boyle or Burnham.** The teachers' fight against Government interference with negotiating machinery.....**Michael Robinson** 165
- A Message for Aldermaston.** A constructive alternative to nuclear policies.....**Diana Collins** 168
- Battle for Jobs: 'Prosperous Areas'.** The united fight by unemployed and employed in the Midlands and Yorkshire.....
W. Warman, Jack Maude 170
- What Are We Here For, Mr. Woodcock?** The problems of streamlining trade unions to meet modern industrial conditions
'Vulcan' 174
- Planning For What?** A look at Neddy's progress.....**Alan Brown** 180
- Stand By Iraq.** A call for action against mass murder.....**Iraqi Students** 184
- Document of the Month: Afro-Asian Solidarity.** The full text of the resolution adopted at Moshi. 185
- From the Halls of Montezuma.** America's history of aggression
Wilfred Macartney 187
- Dear Readers: No Longer Angerless.....****Angela Tuckett** 145
- Illustration: Survival of the Fittest?.....****Stan Warren** 169
- Book Reviews: 'The Age of Revolution',** by Eric Hobsbawm: *Lionel Munby.* *'Politics and Society in India',* edited by C. H. Philips: *William Ash* 191

DEAR READERS :

No Longer Angerless

*For woe had grown into will and wrath was bared of its sheath,
And stark in the streets of London stood the crop of dragon's teeth.*

WHEN A READER SAID that our last number was 'a real March wind, instinct with reality', I thought of 'The Message of the March Wind', which opens William Morris's great poem about Communism, *The Pilgrims of Hope* (1885-6), whence this quotation comes. Morris is standing on the kerb 'in this grim net of London', sadly watching soldiers being marched off to war. Suddenly he sees the street in the years to come, when at last 'Hope is awake in the faces, angerless now no more'. With the Lobbies of employed and unemployed to Parliament these past two months, the Aldermaston March and the demonstrations against Polaris at Holy Loch, how many hundreds of thousands watching them from the kerb, could also glimpse the gleam of Socialism that Morris saw? And how urgent it is that in deep anger they should step down off that kerb? Miners, railwaymen, engineers, and textile workers march to save their jobs, young people because they hate the bomb. Those marches should converge and merge. The only guarantee of lasting success in either case is the victory—soon—of Peace and Socialism. The more of those on the kerb, as well as those who march, who understand all it means, and take their fight further, the sooner we shall reach the time when 'the new peace dawns on the world'; it is desperately overdue. All marchers should be given the chance to read progressive literature,

so that the discussion goes on, long after their march is over and they are home again, at the old humdrum, preparing for the next step. To every old timer on these marches I would say: 'Remember what it was like, your first march, and how eager you were to learn more and to carry exultation in the strength of unity into your daily life'. To each first-time marcher, I would say: 'You are making history today: *don't stop!*'

It is time to learn fast and to teach fast. That is what we try to do in *L.M.* Today's events prove us right over and over again. A *Lincolnshire* reader, 'one of the 900,000', said of his dole queue: 'What a lesson in political economy, and what an opportunity to present our views!' A *Surrey* reader writes: '*L.M.* must be a tremendous help to the grave-diggers of capitalism the world over'. Letters from two *Nottinghamshire miners*, one young and one not so young: '*L.M.*'s real value must be priceless to all who seek enlightenment at whatever stage of growth they may have reached'. And the other: 'What readers have to understand is that you could get a million from the capitalist exploiters if you would just shut up and never print another word; but luckily for me and my class you are not in business for profit or personal gain, but for the liberation of mankind. And whatever the difficulties, you must feel that money just can't buy the knowledge that you are working for

peace and socialism'. Yes! *L.M.* is the magazine that Money can't buy; but *you* can. We have got out an attractive folder called 'In Times Like These You Need the Labour Monthly', pointing out why the active worker for Peace and Socialism cannot afford to be without it, and showing who reads it and who writes it. It can help in winning new readers, and also when writing to the Library Committee if *L.M.* is not in your local library. It includes a form for a free sample copy to be sent to someone you think can be won. Write for copies of the leaflet to use, even if only two or three. In times like these, indeed, we have to spread wide the influence of such people as write in this issue, for example.

An unusual letter, from an *Australian* reader. During the recent

series of cricket Test Matches, some English types, sporting the old school tie, flew out to see the game (£750 per head). 'One was quoted as saying he had also come to look at his Australian investments, which were "doing bloody badly"—nothing about the toilers sweating under the hot Australian sun to produce his dividends. There and then I decided to start with a small investment towards socialism in our time, through your—and our—indispensable *L.M.*'. And he 'invested' £5. From *Essex*, a new reader ('since last January only') sends a gift to our 'good and honest cause. You are planting the seeds of knowledge that will be responsible for the inevitable uprooting of the Tory weeds grown from our society'. Welcome to you all.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

London.

Unlike many price rises the need for this one is apparent, and there never was a greater need for the clear firm direction the journal provides for the working class.

NELLIE USHER.

£83 1s. 4d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: 'Windfall', £10; 'Daisy Bell', £10; E. Strachan Rogers, £3 3s; 'The Humphreys family', 10s; G. C. Fitt, 2s; D. Sandwell, 7s 7d; B. Ainley, 10s; 'G.I.', 13s; 'Backslider', 10s; R. McLeod, 10s; 'A Highgate Reader', £6; 'S. Mill', £1; M. Illing, £1; 'D. H. Strathern and friends', 19s; R.F.B., £3; Marie Philibert, 10s; L. Bates, 5s; H. Brindle, 5s; Oldham Branch, 2s; Blackburn, 1s; S. Townsend, 10s; 'Butcher family', 10s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; E.J.B., 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; 'In Memory of Joe Brien', 3s; 'Oliver Twist and Friends', 15s; 'L'Humanite', 4s; N. Usher, 2s 6d; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; R. Dodd, £1; F.G.A. (Canada), 10s; J. A. Smith, 6s; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal), 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: P. J. Gallop, 9s; M. Johnstone, 2s; R. Ward, 3s; Jane Wyatt, 2s; G. B. Pollock, 7s; G. Chambers, £1; F. Hughes, 5s; J. Ponsonby, £5 2s; K. Clayton, 4s; A. McMillan, 3s; T. Foran, 4s; E. J. Evans, 14s; 'Anon', Southgate, £1; W. Gallacher, £1; F. Lister, 10s; J. Davidson, 5s; D. Smith, £1; 'Claret and Blue', 8s; B. Foster, 5s; Miss D. K. Flinn, 9s; N. L. Dodsworth, 9s; R. Winstone, 4s; W.McB. (Australia), £7 6s; J. Graham, 10s; T. Gittins, £1 1s; A. W. Elliott, 2s 6d; Max Hopkins, 8s; G.B. (U.S.A.), £2 2s; J. Lipetz, £1 18s; G. S. Robertson, 6s; A. Jordan, 3s 9d; S. Champ, 4s; 'Anon-gift', £2; L. R. Borsley, 5s; T. Southern, £6; D.E.T. (Australia), £1; Donation at Demo., 1s.

Our thanks to you all.
Co-op. No. L.99482.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

ARMS AND THE MAN

We have made a successful start. When the tests are completed, as they soon will be, we shall be in the same position as the United States or Soviet Russia. We shall have made and tested the massive weapon. It will be possible then to discuss on equal terms.

Rt. Hon. Harold Macmillan, speech to Conservative Women's Conference, Albert Hall, May 22, 1957.

SUCH were the illusions of the rulers of Britain only a few years ago. All those illusions are vanished now. The veriest Tory booby no longer dare offer them. The Conservative Women must find other comfort than the sweet dream of 'equality' through possession of 'the massive weapon'. Nassau ended that. Even those uppish West European powers have the insolence to blackball Britain's grovelling request to be accepted as an equal. We have reached a stage when the old Munichite *Times*, champing the fruits of its own past follies, has to warn its readers to remember that Britain is no longer a first class power, and that 'there is no divine right whether she will without exertion automatically stay a leading second class power'. True, dear Thunderer, whose one-time thunder has now become a hesitant falsetto squeak. The towering opium-cloud of Tory illusions, from the myth of 'independent nuclear power' establishing an imaginary 'equality' with the United States or the Soviet Union, down to the strutting boasts of magical permanent prosperity and full employment, has vanished in smoke. All that remains is to pay the bill—until such time as others take over the bankrupt inheritance to end these shameful conditions and build anew Britain's true place in the modern advancing world.

Unholy Grail

But has the lesson been learned? This is the question of questions—and it applies also to the present stage of official Labour policy. The problems of Britain's reconstruction cannot be separated from the reassessment of Britain's position in the new changing world situation. The cardinal problems of foreign policy and arms policy, govern the resources for the ever more urgent economic reconstruction at home. Undeterred by previous fiascoes, the Tory rulers of Britain still pursue their Unholy Grail. They still clutch at their elusive mirage of the 'independent nuclear deterrent' which vanishes

over the horizon every time they try to grasp it. One nuclear 'wonder weapon' succeeds another, in more rapid succession than the changes in ladies' fashions, each to be thrown aside after vast expenditure as obsolete before it is completed, and each more costly than the last. Ministers of Defence replace one another in a kaleidoscopic series even more rapidly than Chancellors of the Exchequer.

'Slithering Into Ruin'

Thorneycroft, after resigning five years ago in protest against Britain 'slithering into ruin' under a burden of arms costs of £1,450 million crippling the already overstrained economic structure, returns as Minister of Defence to put through a record arms budget of £1,900 million or £450 million more than at the time of his 'slithering into ruin' resignation. Maudling is given the job of putting through a so-called 'expansionist' budget of electoral gimmicks and tax reductions, imitating Kennedy's deficit budget, to give a boost to the ailing economy, only to discover that sterling begins to wobble, involving an initial cost of £30-£40 million to prop up, while forecasts of an impending devaluation of the pound extend. Devaluation would mean a general cut in all real wages, salaries, pensions and benefits, alongside fat profits for the monopolists and speculators. This battle over sterling is only one expression of the sharpening free-for-all battle which is developing between all the Western imperialist powers. The Franco-German Axis through De Gaulle defies the United States, while Adenauer plays up both ends to blackmail the United States into more concessions, and Kennedy talks darkly of impending economic 'disaster'. The post-war 'stabilisation' of Western capitalism under American overlordship is over. In this new cut-throat conflict, with no holds barred, between the Western imperialist powers the hapless Macmillan-Heath Tory Government, which had staked all its cards on entering into the Common Market, has no longer a clue what policy to follow. It is time to take the helm from their hands, in order to enter on the new policy which can alone offer a future for Britain in the new world situation.

A Prediction Fulfilled

Eleven years ago a leading Marxist theorist, in his last book a year before his death, published in 1952, in the year of the height of American Nato domination, Marshall Plan control and the Korean War dragging in armed levies from the satellites, prophesied

the future revolt of the Western European capitalist powers against the domination of the United States :

Outwardly, everything would seem to be 'going well'; the U.S.A. has put Western Europe, Japan and other capitalist countries on rations; Germany (Western), Britain, France, Italy and Japan have fallen into the clutches of the U.S.A. and are meekly obeying its commands. But it would be mistaken to think that things can continue to 'go well' for 'all eternity'; that these countries will tolerate the domination and oppression of the United States endlessly; that they will not endeavour to tear loose from American bondage and take the path of independent development.

Take, first of all, Britain and France. Undoubtedly, they are imperialist countries. Undoubtedly, cheap raw materials and secure markets are of paramount importance to them. Can it be assumed that they will endlessly tolerate the present situation in which, under the guise of 'Marshall Plan aid', Americans are penetrating into the economies of Britain and France and trying to convert them into adjuncts of the United States economy, and American capital is seizing raw materials and markets in the British and French colonies and thereby plotting disaster for the high profits of the British and French capitalists. Would it not be truer to say that capitalist Britain, and, after her, capitalist France, will be compelled in the end to break from the embrace of the U.S.A. and enter into conflict with it in order to secure an independent position and, of course, high profits.

(J. V. Stalin, 'Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.')

Presage of De Gaulle.

Britain and France

A Marxist prediction differs from Old Moore's Almanac most characteristically in this respect, that, while Old Moore offers future events and dates with engaging impudence, in the case of a Marxist prediction it is the general principle and trend of future development which is painstakingly and accurately diagnosed, and in the outcome is proved by the event and subsequent fulfilment, but the form and detail of fulfilment is always far more complicated and shows variations which could not be anticipated at the time. Eleven years ago it was understandable to assume that capitalist Britain, as the second capitalist power, would lead the way, when the change came, to resist American domination, and that capitalist France would follow. The event has reversed this order. In the Suez War in 1956 British and French imperialism did combine in opposition to American imperialism, with Britain playing the leading role, but went down in ignominious defeat before the strength of the new world of socialism and national liberation. Friction between the British and American imperialists has been ceaseless in every sphere (Congo, Middle East, shipping, tariffs, nuclear control). But

Britain under Tory rule has sunk lower and lower throughout this decade in economic weakening and international humiliation, and has in consequence for the moment fallen to the degrading role of trying to curry favour as the American servitor and jackal against the resurgent capitalism in Western Europe. It is the France of De Gaulle, on the other hand, which has during these years participated with the stronger West German monopolists in a temporary economic boom, and which has at the moment taken the lead in openly defying the United States. While the deeper contradiction of interests, not only of the British people, but also of the British national capitalists (those not yet Americanised, like Churchill) and world imperialist interests against American domination is inescapable, and will further develop, the immediate venom of the British capitalists is directed against the rival French capitalists and specifically De Gaulle—even to the extent of giving public encouragement to any leader of gangsters pledged to liquidate him by physical means.*

Law of Uneven Development

Once again the law of uneven development of capitalism is being demonstrated in the present shift of relations within the Western imperialist camp. During the decade and a half since the second world war the United States held the unchallenged dominant position in the imperialist world. The structure of alliances corresponded to this. This period was characterised by the 'cold war' diplomatic-strategic system of alliances organised by the United States through Nato, Cento, Seato and OAS, and embracing the other powers within this orbit as satellite powers. International relationships found expression almost entirely in the direct confrontation of the American-controlled Nato system and the socialist world. During this period even the claim to 'non-alignment' of newly independent states was condemned by American statesmen of the Dulles school as unacceptable and equivalent to anti-Western orientation. In its open proclaimed aim and formal character the 'cold war' alliance system was directed against the new world of socialism and national liberation. But, just as the 'Anti-Comintern' Axis of Nazi Germany, Italy and Japan covered in reality, not

*The familiar hand of the British Secret Service has been discerned by the French press in the curious episode of Bidault's 'illegal' visit to London, parading the central streets and restaurants, meeting the press and being interviewed by the B.B.C. before the millions of a television audience—all the time of course with complete bland innocence and professions of ignorance by the Home Secretary and the police authorities. Let us hope that this time James Bond does not get his man. The question of the replacement of personal dictatorship by democracy in France is a question for the French people to decide; and the French miners and railwaymen are showing the way forward for the whole people.

merely the expansionist aims against the Soviet Union and China, but also the expansionist aims against the dominant possessing imperialist powers, the United States, Britain and France, so the U.S.-controlled Nato 'cold war' system against 'the menace of communism' has covered also the expansionist aims of United States imperialism to penetrate and dominate the rest of the capitalist world.

Era of the American Empire

During this first period after the second world war the other imperialist powers, the defeated German and Japanese imperialism, the in fact defeated Italy, and the former Vichy France, and the weaker joint victor, Britain, all in practice accepted this satellite position in relation to the United States, despite considerable anti-American currents and frequent contradictions mainly kept below the surface. This was because they were all prostrate from the war, while the United States had suffered no direct war damage, but had accumulated gigantic profits and enlarged its productive machinery to overwhelming superiority. German imperialism required the lavish economic and financial aid of the American monopolies and American diplomatic backing for the repudiation of Potsdam, formation of the West German State and rearmament to emerge anew as a challenging imperialist power. France was economically and financially dependent, once its rulers had accepted the Marshall Plan, and precariously holding on to a very weak position as one of the 'Big Four'. British imperialism, though hard hit by the war, was still exercising an active world role as a rival imperialist power to the United States, but recognised that the hard fact of American economic, financial and strategic superiority made it necessary for Britain to operate within the framework of American overlordship in order to try to hold together the remains of the old Empire in the new conditions. As Churchill had frankly recognised to Roosevelt in 1941: 'You know that we know that without America the Empire won't stand'. Hence the aim of Britain's leaders not to challenge directly American imperialism, despite the ceaseless actual conflicts, but to maintain the 'special relationship' as the recognised second power and privileged ally. A vanished memory today in the era of Kennedy.

Shift in International Relations

All this pattern of international relationships has begun to change in the recent period. The United States, though still the strongest

economically and financially, has no longer the same overwhelming economic and financial superiority. The West European and Japanese imperialist powers have in general recovered from the wounds of the war and advanced rapidly in economic and financial strength during the past decade, while the United States and Britain have relatively lost ground. This change in the balance of international economic relations within the capitalist world may be measured by the change in the totals of the gold and foreign exchange reserves of the main imperialist powers between 1951 and 1962.

GOLD AND FOREIGN EXCHANGE RESERVES 1951-1962
(in million dollars)

	1951	1962 (<i>third quarter</i>)
United States	22,873	16,532
Continental Western Europe ...	7,445	24,420
Britain	2,374	2,798

Thus a decade ago the United States held three times the reserves of Continental Western Europe. Today the latter holds one and a half times the amount held by the United States. Britain, on the other hand, has remained stagnant, and by today has fallen behind the level, not only of the United States, but also of West Germany, France and Italy. This characteristic example of the law of unequal development of capitalism has found its reflection in the moves towards a shift in international political relations. The West European powers, and especially France and West Germany, have moved to a new self-confidence and independent action in the international sphere, with a measure of challenge (in the case of France, openly expressed) to the domination of the United States. Britain, on the other hand, has weakened in standing equally in relation to the United States and to Western Europe, and is confronted with the most critical problems of reappraisal of policy for the future.

Franco-German Axis

What of the new De Gaulle-Adenauer Axis? Certainly the French-German Military Pact, signed immediately after the abrupt ending of the Common Market negotiations with Britain, pointedly ignores the Nato military structure and in that sense defies the United States domination of Western Europe. But the new Axis also reveals that the Six represent no harmonious 'integration' of supra-national capitalism, as the dreamers imagine, but that here also, as Lenin showed in respect of all the strivings of each imperialism to expand towards ultra-imperialism, the only rule is the

domination of the stronger over the weaker. Nor are contradictions lacking between the two 'partners' of the Axis, as well as between the Axis and the other Four. On the face of it, we have here a resurrection of the Hitlerite 'New Order in Europe', based on the collaboration of Nazi Germany with Fascist Italy and Vichy France, and proclaiming the economic, political and military 'integration' of Continental Western Europe against the Soviet Union on the East and against Britain and the United States on the West (confronting a 'common threat' on their borders equally from the East and from the West, as De Gaulle put it in his famous broadcast of January 14), similarly the moves to draw in Franco Spain. Certainly the form is changed. The Hitlerite 'New Order' was reached by the military victory of Nazi Germany. However, the capitulation of Vichy France was a deliberate choice of the French ruling class to prefer co-operation with Nazi Germany rather than popular anti-fascist resistance. The main economic-political basis of the support which established the personal dictatorship of De Gaulle supplanting democracy in France is the same as supported Vichy, representing the closely interlocking cartel interests of the big coal, iron and steel monopolies and the reactionary circles associated with them.

Contradictions of the Axis

But within the revived Axis there is no question where the decisive power finally lies. In economic and military strength West Germany is in reality the predominant partner, though willing for the moment to concede the role of public leader and spokesman to De Gaulle, so long as West Germany is still building up its position and manoeuvring to secure nuclear arms. And it is here that the real conflict of interests within the Axis becomes visible. West Germany still requires American support for its aims in Europe, and especially for its illegal position in West Berlin. West Germany desires the retention of American troops, not for defence, but as a deposit to ensure the entanglement of the United States in any West German military adventures. De Gaulle, on the other hand, has made clear his desire to see the last of the American troops in Europe, and has already expelled the American nuclear bases and bombers (transferred of course to docile Britain). West Germany officially proclaims expansionist aims in Eastern Europe. De Gaulle, on the other hand, is aware of the menace of the stronger military power of German imperialism, and has no wish to see France dragged

behind a German Eastern adventure. Hence De Gaulle has officially proclaimed French recognition of the Oder-Neisse frontier—a recognition which is anathema to West Germany.

West German Militarist Menace

Both partners in this 'indissoluble' alliance, proclaimed at the moment of signing to be 'for eternity', are in fact playing a double game with one another. Adenauer is playing a double game simultaneously with France and with the United States, vowing eternal friendship with De Gaulle and his anti-American proclamations, and sending parallel messages of reassurance to the Kennedy Administration. Above all, West Germany is manoeuvring to secure nuclear arms through either of the two channels. Either through participation in the French nuclear arms development (possibly a far more direct participation than has been published; it may be noted that De Gaulle, when questioned in his press interview after the signing of the Military Treaty about West German access to nuclear arms, replied that that was entirely a matter for the West German Government to decide). Or through the United States offers of participation in a Nato 'multilateral' nuclear force.

Relations with the Soviet Union

On the other hand, De Gaulle is playing his double game in relation to West Germany and Eastern Europe. We have already noted his recognition of the Oder-Neisse frontier as a barrier against the expansionist aims of West Germany in Eastern Europe. Immediately after the rupture of the Common Market negotiations with Britain De Gaulle held a prolonged interview with the Soviet Ambassador, and followed this up by signing a new Franco-Soviet Trade Treaty, expanding trade by 10 per cent. The entourage of De Gaulle has skilfully spread panic in Anglo-American circles by circulating unofficial hints that the 'Grand Design' will include a settlement with the Soviet Union. 'There is a growing belief', warned the *Sunday Times* on February 3, 'that De Gaulle's thinking has worked out a blueprint for a "grand European settlement" to include Soviet acceptance of a French-led Third Force in Europe in return for the exclusion of American influence'. Similarly the *Economist* on January 26 noted French 'reports of General De Gaulle's reputed Grand Design in foreign policy, to include an entente of some kind with Moscow to follow the American withdrawal from Europe, which seems to be his next aim'. It would be unwise to treat these inspired rumours as solid currency, although the immediate Anglo-

American alarm at the possibility of a settlement is worthy of note. De Gaulle has concealed his ambiguous aims behind the characteristically oracular slogan 'Unity of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals'—which was also the slogan of the Hitlerite anti-Soviet campaign, but could be reinterpreted to imply a European security settlement to replace the division of Nato and the Warsaw Pact. However, the real menace in the situation is the advancing challenge of the West German neo-Nazi militarists, utilising equally the Axis and the American connection, to press their way forward to secure their supreme immediate objective of nuclear armament as the indispensable condition for their further offensive aims.

United States Fury

The fury of the United States Administration and spokesmen as they have seen their former West European satellites slipping from their grasp has not been concealed; nor have they found adequate consolation in the continuing servile role of Tory Britain. Just as the former Secretary of State and architect of Nato, Dean Acheson, had been chosen in December as the unofficial spokesman to let loose the offensive on Britain in his famous 'Britain is played out' speech in preparation for Nassau, so in March Acheson was let loose again to denounce De Gaulle. It is significant that he singled out for his main attack, not the exclusion of Britain from the Common Market (though this was also a check to the American Grand Design), but the possibility of a settlement with the Soviet Union such as would mean the liquidation of Nato. Declaring that 'the conception of a Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals is wholly at variance with the North Atlantic Treaty', he warned that 'a Gaullist Europe would mean a Europe under Soviet hegemony'—thereby revealing the aim of American policy to keep Europe divided in the same way as to 'make Asians fight Asians'. Already after the famous De Gaulle broadcast in January the Washington correspondent of the *Observer* was reporting the 'ill-concealed anger' and 'great bitterness' in the State Department and the feeling of American officials that 'their whole policy towards Europe will face ruin'. On February 7 President Kennedy in his press interview stated that it would be 'a disaster' if Europe and the United States were divided. On February 8 Walter Lippmann lamented:

General De Gaulle has shattered the post-war structure of United States foreign policy, and we are launched on seas for which the old charts do not show us the way.

That lesson applies also for Britain.

United States Dilemma

But what to do? Here the United States policy-makers, accustomed to giving orders and receiving instant obedience, are now finding themselves in a dilemma. Once the dollar was all-powerful. No longer. What threats, pressure or inducement can be effective in the new world situation? Lippmann tried threatening a return to isolationism:

There could be no greater illusion than for Bonn and Paris to assume that they can act while the other Western nations will not react. If they now disrupt the alliance, they may well find that they have started a movement towards isolationism which they themselves will not like at all.

Ferocious Senators demanded the withdrawal of American troops from Europe. Indeed, a beginning was made, and with ostentatious publicity some 15,000 were withdrawn from the additional contingents which had been sent in the autumn of 1961. But then it was discovered that not only did this terrible threat arouse joy in the hearts of all the peoples of Europe, but it fitted in exactly with the Grand Design of General De Gaulle. Speedily President Kennedy issued an announcement that the American 400,000 troops would definitely remain in Europe so long as they were needed for 'the defence of Europe'. Perhaps the old methods of financial and economic pressure might prove more effective? But the dollar is now more shaky than the franc or the mark. A grandiose proposal was mooted for an alternative market combination of the rest of the 'free world' against the Common Market. President De Gaulle met the threat with elaborate contempt:

'America, using the United Kingdom, is trying to set up a huge free trade affair, including Ireland and Iceland', General De Gaulle said to members of the National Assembly at an Elysée reception. The French News Agency quotes him as saying: 'The Americans can no longer sell anything—or else they are selling for practically nothing—to the Africans, the South Americans, even the Arabs. So they are forced to try to sell to Europe which is in a position to pay.'

(The Times, February 6, 1963.)

What expedient remains? The last alternative is dug out to try to offer a nuclear bribe.

Multilateral Façade

Cuba last October had shown that the decision of Western nuclear action lay in the sole hands of the American President, while the West European 'allies', including Britain, were in fact only on-lookers who could be blown up at a moment's notice by an American

decision in an American quarrel over an island in the American hemisphere where the American monopolists objected to a people maintaining a government of their own choice which nationalised assets of American monopolies. This experience had undoubtedly helped to precipitate the formation of the separate West European Axis (excluding the American bootlicker, Britain). To meet this situation, President Kennedy sought to offer a façade of West European nuclear participation in the shape of a proposal for a 'Nato multilateral nuclear force', consisting of surface ships with Polaris missiles and mixed crews under West European commanders, so that a West German might, for example, command a vessel armed with nuclear missiles. The final command of the force as a whole, and therefore decision for action, would of course be in the hands of the Nato Supreme Commander, that is, in American hands under control of the President.

Multilateral Confusion

The West Germans jumped at this proposition as another step towards getting their hands on nuclear weapons. Britain opposed it as a plan to wipe out the last remains of Britain's tattered claim to 'independent nuclear power', and proposed instead a 'Nato multinational nuclear force', to which the Nato powers would assign contingents, while retaining command of them and the right to withdraw them for separate use if so desired. This was stated to be in accord with the Nassau Agreement, although the published text of that Agreement, so far as published, is obscure on the point (on all other points the document states that 'the President and Prime Minister agreed', but on the question of the right of withdrawal of a force assigned to Nato the document only records that 'the Prime Minister pointed out' he wished to make this reservation). President Kennedy's envoy, Livingston Merchant, travelled from Bonn to Paris to Brussels to London to negotiate the plan. The longer the debate went on, the more confused the scheme became. From British sources an 'agreement in principle' was announced for 'a multinational force' (the British plan), pending preparation for 'a multilateral force' (the American plan). This was promptly denied by Washington. Behind all this flummery two practical issues stand out. The first is that the final decision of Western or 'Nato' nuclear action is in fact in the hands of the United States Supreme Commander and President, and that in consequence, so long as Britain and the other Nato European countries remain in Nato and accept

the American nuclear bases and arms, they can be destroyed at a moment's notice by an American decision. This is a situation which it is obviously urgent to end. The second is that through all these complexities the West German militarists are steadily edging their way forward to the possession and control of nuclear weapons and warheads. The fight to prevent this outcome, which would be likely to mean the rapid launching of war in Europe, is urgent, and is bound up with the fight for a German Peace Treaty and a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe.

Economic Clouds on the Horizon

These sharpening conflicts within the Western imperialist camp are closely connected with the worsening economic situation which has gathered in varying degree over all the countries of Western capitalism—'miracles' and all. The trade battle grows more intense. President Kennedy has sounded the alarm that the successive 'recessions' since the war have come at shorter intervals, while the periods of 'recovery' or 'expansion' diminish:

We cannot escape the fact that the period of expansion between the first and second post-war recessions lasted 45 months; the period between the second and third lasted 35 months; the period between the third and fourth lasted 25 months; and the American economy is now in its twenty-fourth month of recovery from the fourth post-war recession.

(President Kennedy, speech to the American Bankers' Association, February 25, 1963.)

It should be borne in mind that what he calls 'recovery' includes an officially recorded total of five million unemployed. On March 13 President Kennedy returned to his theme in his message to Congress on his Budget proposing a record arms expenditure of £19,800 million, exceeding even the 1945 war-time peak, and a deficit of £4,249 million, and conjured up a spectre of impending 'disaster' for the American economy if his proposals were not adopted. In Western Germany Chancellor Adenauer stated in the Bundesrat on February 6 that 'the economic miracle has come to an end'. In Britain the fate of the million unemployed and the stagnation of the economy is now the centre of the political situation.

Britain's Hour of Opportunity

This is the situation which makes imperative a new policy for Britain. The Tory Government is bankrupt for a policy; having spent their time proving that no alternative to the Common Market could be satisfactory, they now find their tongues tied when they

try to advocate their supposed 'alternative'. Yet the way forward is open. So far from being bankrupt for policy, Britain under a Government willing to pursue an independent line could hold the trump cards in the present international situation. In the present fluid international situation; as the old rigidity of the Nato structure has begun to crack; as the insanity of the nuclear strategy is becoming more and more manifest to all; as the problems of the economic situation and trade loom in the forefront: Britain can lead the way to a new orientation of policy; to peaceful co-existence; to the development of socialism and national liberation; to the vast expansion of trade which along these lines could give full scope to British industry; and on this basis open the way to the necessary economic and social reconstruction at home.

Labour's Testing Time

Will the opportunity be taken? The people are looking for a change. The latest 50 per cent Gallup Poll for Labour is a record. The prospect of a Labour Government draws within reach. But it will depend on the strength of the fight of the whole labour movement to ensure that such a change will bring at least the beginning of the real change in policy which is needed. It can be recognised that during his first weeks of leadership Harold Wilson, within the limits of acceptance of the inherited right-wing official policy, has taken certain fruitful initiatives, such as the emphasis on de facto recognition of the German Democratic Republic and participation in the Trafalgar Square rally against the supplying of arms to South Africa. Along traditional lines the projected visit to Moscow is preceded by a visit to Kennedy. But the official Labour policy is still tied to all the assumptions and fetters of Nato and American nuclear strategy which have proved so disastrous. Labour's official foreign policy spokesman, Gordon-Walker, can still declare in Parliament on March 5 that the only thing which 'deters Russia from making an attack on Britain' is the American 'first-strike' nuclear weapon. Indeed, the official Labour criticism of the Tory Government strategy is that it falls short in fulfilling the obligations of Nato, and that Britain should obey the behests of the Pentagon and leave the nuclear weapons to the United States and concentrate on supplying more foot-soldiers for Germany. No wonder *The Times* political correspondent on March 11 commented that 'Washington prefers Labour's defence policy' and that 'Transport House and the White House are more in unison'. This is certainly no way to solve

Britain's problems, or even to diminish arms expenditure, especially when it is accompanied by tenderness for the big monopolies and devious plans for wage restraint. If the fourth Labour Government is not to lead to the same disillusionment and swing-back to Toryism as the third, then the battle of policy will have to be fought within the labour movement, alongside the battle against Toryism, in order to ensure that the present popular upsurge and prospective change of Government will open the way to the real change of policy which is essential.

Easter's Call to Action

Easter is the traditional season of trade union, co-operative and labour conferences. It is also now the time of the Aldermaston March. Let the fight for the new policy which is today so essential, equally for Britain's future and for the peace of the world, inspire alike the marchers of Aldermaston and the delegates of the conferences of the trade unions which will be meeting, of the Co-Operative Party, and the Congress of the Communist Party, so as to speed forward the advance of the people which can now be won.

Commune Day, 1963.

R.P.D.

LABOUR MONTHLY

FORTY YEARS AGO

GROWTH OF FASCISM

Fascism is now a recognised organisation in Austria, and the Austrian adherents of Mussolini have taken the title of 'Hakenkreuzler' (an anti-Semitic emblem) . . . the recent murder of a workman, a Social Democrat, by a man named Szabo, a leading 'Hakenkreuzler', shows that the movement is, as it has been declared, not an anti-Semitic one, but directed chiefly against the working class. The method of agitation at present adopted is to break up public meetings or workers' reunions. Pacifist meetings are also attacked. the attitude of the police seems to be one of connivance, as shown by the seizure of the edition of the journal *Der Abend*, which contained an article criticising the 'Hakenkreuzler'.

Unemployment is on the increase; over 140,000 were unemployed in February; those on short time numbered 210,000. In view of these conditions, and the impotence of the Socialists to oppose the tutelage of the League of Nations, which is bound to react on the workers, the ground would seem to be ready for the advent of Fascism as in Italy.

(From 'The World of Labour', *Labour Monthly*, April, 1923)

THE BEECHING PLAN

Dave Bowman*

IN the British Transport Commission Report, June, 1962, Dr. Beeching, Chairman of the Commission, claimed the whole British railway system must be drastically re-shaped; there must be wholesale closing of rail services and lines and a huge reduction in manpower. Whilst it was stated immediate closures would be effected, Dr. Beeching also said an investigation had started and would be continued into such aspects of railway working as:

Profitability of railway lines and services.

Volume of passenger and freight traffic flow.

Methods of handling traffic, size of consignments and length and speed of transit.

Pattern of flow of all forms of British Transport.

For many months this country has awaited the outcome of these investigations but in good railway style they have been shunted backwards all along the line. First expected in October of last year, they are now complete and in the hands of the Government. There seems little doubt that the above four points will form the main basis of the Beeching Report and this, plus the general line of policy many times expressed by Dr. Beeching, enables a fair forecast to be made of the general content of the Report and the general line of policy suggested arising from the investigations.

Profitability and volume of traffic will form a large part and much play will be made with volume of traffic figures. In passenger traffic, 50 per cent of British Railway route miles (9,000 miles) carry only 4 per cent of the passengers, and in freight, 50 per cent of the goods are carried on 5 per cent of the route mileage. These seem formidable figures but this does not only apply to railways. In the Ministry of Transport document 'The Transport Needs of Great Britain in the Next Twenty Years' published a few weeks ago, it appears British Roads are in precisely the same position.

Both on Road and Rail, demand is very heavily concentrated on a relatively small part of the network. . . . In railways 95 per cent of total traffic is carried on 50 per cent of the system . . . a similar degree of concentration on the main roads with 95 per cent of all road traffic on only 50 per cent of the roads.

If the profitability and volume of rail traffic argument is continued in the Report, as it has in a number of the Beeching speeches, it

*As many of our readers will know, Mr. Bowman is an executive member of the National Union of Railwaymen.

will raise a very black future for many areas in rail passenger transport.

Investigations have been made on the basis of 'Thousands of Passengers per week'. If it were suggested that all lines carrying five thousand passengers and less per week were to close, the result would be to close almost every Branch line in Britain. If the next highest figure, ten thousand a week, is taken (this was the figure Scottish closures were based on and one much quoted in the national press) it would result in: no railways in Wales, except in the Cardiff-Swansea area; no railways in Scotland, north of Perth and Aberdeen; one main line only in Devon and Cornwall, the same in East Anglia; and one main line would serve the East Coast north of York and the West Coast, north of Manchester and Leeds. That certainly would be re-shaping the railways.

No doubt also, financial results will be produced to endorse the suggestion that smaller lines must close. In 1960 passenger traffic failed to cover costs by £4.3 million. Fast and semi-fast trains gave an excess of receipts over costs of £24.6 million; suburban trains £3.4 million, but stopping services had a loss of £32.3 million. (Note: 40 per cent of total passenger mileage is run by stopping trains.)

Closures may also be argued for, because of the much larger volume of alternative means of public and personal travel. The rise in road traffic is very great already, but note must be taken of the Ministry of Transport Document 'Transport Needs of Great Britain in the Next Twenty Years' which estimates by reliable methods that the British 'car fleet may be in the range of 12-13 million' by 1970, rising to 16-18 million by 1980. (Is there a future for the pedestrian?) The passenger closures pill will be well sugared and while suggesting thousands of services and lines close, suggestions for increased trains on the more profitable routes will be made. More Pullman trains (with of course supplementary fares), more sleeping car trains and more 'crack' expresses between the densely populated centres. The total effect of this line of argument to re-shape passenger travel, can only mean more services for the people in large towns. Between large towns, for those living in rural areas and smaller towns and for people who wish to travel there, railways will disappear as a form of transport.

In an effort to allay the fears of millions of people in areas where railways will close, it will be stated that discussions with omnibus groups have already taken place and will continue, in all regions, regarding alternative transport. (It will not add that should the

winter of 1962-63 be repeated in the future, the people who will depend entirely on road services should be wished the best of luck.)

On freight carrying, the railway's share is declining fast and very fast in relation to its percentage of total inland transport. There is no doubt where the real cause lies—traffic flow from rail to roads. The following table shows the great upward trend in road motor vehicles for goods transport :

Road Licences	'A'	'B'	'C'
1948	99,000	55,000	591,000
1954	94,000	65,000	942,000
1961	115,000	70,000	1,254,000

This really phenomenal rise in 'C' Licences (firms who carry their own goods) plus the private car rise is the reason for the road blocks and the colossal death and accident figures on British roads. But what really worries Dr. Beeching, and even more dangerous on the roads, is the loss of heavy traffic from rail to road. The heaviest flow of railway freight is in basic commodities: coal and coke, iron and steel and associated raw materials:

	Coke and Coal	Mineral	General Merchandise
1948	158,000,000	59,000,000	56,000,000
1954	173,000,000	63,000,000	47,000,000
1961	146,000,000	54,000,000	38,000,000

In livestock there has been a catastrophic fall (due in some measure to closures already effected in rural districts). In 1948, 259,165 wagons of livestock were handled and in 1961, this dropped to 73,578. As in passenger traffic, so in freight. Receipts in real values have fallen.

The freight closures pill will also be sugared with suggestions of new freight carrying methods. *In coal traffic*, concentration at both colliery and destination area ends will be based on full train loads from collieries to terminal points, and then from the terminal points radial road transport, thus cutting out literally thousands of stations for coal distribution. (It is to be hoped the weather keeps fine.) *More 'Condor' trains*, based on the payment for a full truck load between densely populated centres. (Already 'Condors' run between Glasgow and London, Glasgow and Birmingham.) *Liner trains* by which firms can hire a whole train and even paint it in their own colours.

The main principle in railway freight working will follow the passenger pattern. Concentration will be in the big population centres and based on profit. Rural areas and smaller towns will rely almost exclusively on the road radial system from rail terminal points. I

have no doubt the freight transport lessons of January and February of this year, where hundreds of roads all over the country were blocked for days, will be passed over with scarcely a comment.

If Dr. Beeching tries to blame the Government, who brought him from Imperial Chemical Industries to the British Transport Commission, to do just this job, such a shunting of responsibility will deceive no one. The investigations from the start, as has been pointed out many times by leading railway trade union officials such as Sidney Greene, General Secretary of the N.U.R., have been conducted on the basis that all railways must be profitable; closures and redundancy accepted; a higher rate of exploitation (single-manned locomotives and dual working by traffic men) of railway workers necessary! Contraction of the railway system and the transfer of traffic from railways to roads is taken for granted and only what parts of the railways to be kept open is being considered. This whole conception is diametrically opposed to the principle of the transport resolutions unanimously carried at the last Labour Party Conference and the Trades Union Congress: the principle of an integrated transport system taking into consideration the best methods of transport for all areas and not one based entirely on the profit motive.

For months now the national newspapers have played a 'guessing game' on the Beeching Report. Frightening figures of the extent of the closures and the size of railway redundancies have been published. This period has ended. It is now clear what is at stake is the survival of the British railway system as we know it, providing a service for the nation. No one would disagree for a moment with the Beeching proposals for extension of passenger and freight traffic. The new 'crack' expresses and fast 'Condor' freights will be welcome, but not at the expense of mass railway closures.

Now is the time for the Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress to act on their stated transport policy. Can the Labour Party call for a mass lobby of Parliament to press the Government to repudiate the closure principles of the Beeching Report? Can the T.U.C. organise mass demonstrations of the nine million members in defence of nationalised railways? These are the key questions for the labour movement. No doubt the rail unions to whom this is a bread and butter question will react quickly. Spontaneous action may arise in the Districts and national action may be taken. But it is the nation's railways that are at stake and the fight is not of the railway workers alone.

BOYLE OR BURNHAM

Michael Robinson

THREE hundred years ago Robert Boyle discovered that if you increased the pressure on a gas you decreased its volume. Today Edward Boyle is trying to do precisely that to our educational system, for the Tory Government is desperately concerned at the increased volume of supply and demand for education. Anyone who does not accept dialectical explanations of changes or who pretends that class struggle does not exist, would be hard put to it to explain the present situation in which the country finds itself. We lick productivity stamps and read of lords and bishops addressing mass meetings of the 1963 Education Year Campaign, and now we face walk-outs in schools and a hostile confrontation of the Tory Government and the teachers and local education authorities.

To judge from the press one might conclude that the Rates rise was entirely the teachers' responsibility, and that the Minister was backing them up in their total salary award, while trying to get the older and more experienced teachers a fairer deal. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact the Government, having just committed itself to an increase in the defence bill, is using the teachers as a test block for the imposition of such salary and wage awards as will allow for the new weapons. We have seen it all before. Since 1919, the Burnham Committee, a national committee representing teachers and local education authorities, has determined the salaries of teachers. The hundred and forty-six education authorities of England and Wales are represented by their organisations. The teachers were, until these negotiations, represented on the teachers' panel by a majority of National Union of Teachers representatives, Association of Teachers in Technical Institutes members (Affiliated to N.U.T.), and the Grammar School Joint Four (masters, mistresses, headmasters and head mistresses). After the collapse of the N.U.T. in the 1961 salary battle which was followed by David Eccles' departure to the lords and Boyle's induction as Minister, Boyle placed the National Association of Schoolmasters and the National Association of Head Teachers upon the committee. As the N.A.S. opposes equal pay, and some head teachers have recently called for salaries to be decided by Lady Albemarle and Sir Harry Pilkington, it is clear this addition is scarcely helpful to the smooth working of the committee.

The post second world war Act of 1944 established unified

national scales regardless of type of school or area, and 1956 saw equal pay established in principle even though it was 1961 before it was established in practice. Just as the inter-war period brought the loss of a non-contributory pension scheme, the imposition of a 10 per cent salary cut in 1931 and unemployment among teachers—graduate and non-graduate—so the post-war period has seen the raising of superannuation contributions from 5 to 6 per cent, the loss of more than 10 per cent of the effective purchasing power of salaries due to inflation, and the steady increase of above-scale payments at the expense of the primary schools and the basic scale. In spite of all this the teachers, and the local authorities, achieved big improvements in the schools both before and after the war. They reorganised the system to provide secondary schools for all; pioneered better buildings, comprehensive schools and new teaching methods, in spite of the tremendous problems of the post-war bulge; so that every year the number of children voluntarily staying over 15 years of age rises and the number gaining the raised standards of 'O' and 'A' level of the General Certificate of Education grows. It is true to say that every progressive development has originated among teachers or local authority personnel and has at first faced hostility from the Ministry whose influence has been to inhibit progress. Since Ministry sponsorship of the Combined Local Authority School Planning Committee, the Minister has savagely cut all school building programmes. The situation is slightly different in salary affairs. Special allowances were introduced for teachers taking advanced level work, and since then there has been a steady increase in these above-scale payments, until some teachers can receive more in such payments than other teachers are receiving as a basic minimum. In practice the bulk of these payments go to teachers in secondary schools, so that the primary schools have found staffing increasingly difficult, as men have left to get allowances and the loss of women teachers through early marriage has increased. In fact, the present recommended award by the Burnham Committee is the first award to give equal all-round increases to the basic scale since 1955. The amount involved, £22 million, was so small that only equal distribution would give even recognisable increases to the basic scale. The increases were agreed after nine months of negotiation on the Burnham Committee and are to run for two years, until 1965! The Ministry's representative sat in on all meetings and said nothing at all; then announced his rejection of the scales and asked the Burnham Committee to redistribute the amount in favour of other and more experienced teachers. The Committee refused

'to rob Peter to pay Paul', particularly as young teachers at 21 were taking home under £10 a week. The Minister now threatens to pay the increases, distributed as he sees fit, by law, and abolish the present negotiating machinery. Eccles' threat to do this led the teachers to give up their struggle in 1961 and the threat to give the matter to the National Incomes Commission in January led them to accept £22 million. So we move from blackmail to dictation.

There is talk of a major review of salary structure following legislation and this will attempt to turn back any advances made in the history of Burnham. To undermine equal pay, to separate primary and secondary teachers, to separate class teachers from heads of departments and Head Teachers. These trends will hold back the educational advance which is essential if we are to expand. The ending of the 11 plus, primary classes of 30, full secondary education of all to 16, demand a great increase in teachers and the terrible truth is that in spite of expansion of training colleges, the conditions in schools are such that recruitment only just exceeds losses. We need 100,000 teachers to achieve the targets of the 1944 Act which the labour movement fought so hard to get on to the statute book. The Tories do not want this Act implemented. They want a class policy more naked than at present. And they intend to make the people pay in full. The Block Grant to local authorities, which replaced the percentage grant system is now beginning to take its toll. The costs of education are shared about 60:40 between central government and local authorities. While taxation yields higher returns with increased national wealth, rateable values do not rise annually (this year they are making up for it!), so that the rate in the pound must be raised annually. It is estimated that increases of 7s. in the pound are required if the necessary education expansion is to go forward to 1965. It is clear that the central government must pay more and it has been calculated that a 6 per cent rise is necessary annually. 'Neddy' is only reckoning on a 4 per cent annual productivity rise, so teachers are singled out as the first section to have a dose of Tory planning. Other public employees may well follow. The right to negotiate salaries with your employers without government dictation is a fundamental right which must be defended. Its loss is economic fascism. The teachers must fight with every weapons to maintain this right. They need help from every section of the labour movement to fight for a democratic educational system; an education worthy of the new world we are struggling to attain for our children.

A MESSAGE FOR ALDERMASTON

Diana Collins

SOME of us who have done the Aldermaston March for many years, may be wondering whether it really gets us anywhere. I am absolutely convinced that it is more important than ever; it is the one opportunity we have of demonstrating the determination and growing strength of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. During one of the earlier marches I stood with an M.P. watching the march go by, and he turned and said 'Whenever I see all those feet going down the road, I think "there go so many votes"'. A General Election is near and all M.P.s are watching out for votes; they should be made more conscious than ever of the strength of C.N.D.

I have just completed a tour of America and Canada, and wherever I went, from one side of the Continent to the other, I met groups of people who had heard of and been inspired by the Aldermaston marches; it has become, along with our badge, the most widespread world symbol of peace. This year there are marches taking place all over Europe, all over the North American continent, and in many other countries. Aldermaston has been and is their inspiration. There is a real hope in this growing international movement of ordinary people who loathe nuclear weapons, the Cold War and the arms race, and who only ask for peace to get on with all the exciting and constructive tasks that wait for Homo Sapiens.

Our increased emphasis upon constructive alternatives to nuclear policies; our support for the attack upon world hunger, which are such a feature of this year's march, are signposts along the road that can lead to a tolerable future for mankind.

'In ■ world contemplating ■ future in which the expansion of its population may outrange its food supplies . . . two possible effects of over-exposure to radiation, namely diminished fertility and shortening of the lifespan, might not be altogether to be deplored.'

(Sir Ernest Rock-Carling, *Atom*)

SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST



'To the non-geneticist it appears that for the benefit of the race as a whole in the future, one mutation which results in an Aristotle, a Leonardo, a Newton, a Pasteur, an Einstein, might well outweigh ninety-nine that led to mental defectives.'

Conference, Geneva, August, 1955)

BATTLE FOR JOBS: 'PROSPEROUS' AREAS

W. Warman*

[Amongst the many thousands who decided to visit Parliament for the vast mass Lobby on March 26, were not only delegates from the slump-ridden North but also from the so-called 'prosperous areas'. Hence the motor workers, electrical industry workers, railwaymen and aircraft workers from the Midlands, described below, together with a glimpse of the battle in Yorkshire.—Ed., L.M.]

The press has been talking of the 'prosperous' South and Midlands and of the slump-ridden North. True, the North has been more seriously affected up to the present, but these last few months have seen a serious worsening in the Midlands. Places like Coventry and Smethwick now have an unemployment figure higher than the national average, and if it were not for the continuous fight waged against redundancy, the position would be very much worse. Thousands of workers on short time throughout the district would have been sacked if it had not been for the opposition put up by them against dismissals.

The list of closures and bankruptcies in the Midlands shows the worst economic situation since the end of the war. In the last eighteen months some twenty-two factories and depots have closed down or announced large-scale redundancies.† Over 15,000 workers at such plants alone have been declared redundant, with few weeks' pay at best to compensate men and women for the loss of years of livelihood.

The latest report of the Midlands Regional Board for Industry shows that there were 17,238 vacancies compared with 37,650 unemployed—two men for every job, some of them extremely low-paid jobs at that. The chairman of the Board, Major C. R. Dibben, saw 'no indication, and little grounds for hope, that the trends that have persisted through most of this year, will be reversed.

In the absence of Government action to stimulate demand, the lack of confidence is likely to persist'. In a recent speech, Mr. C. E. Harrison, president of the Federation of British Industries at a Conference in Birmingham, said: 'If we are to achieve the rate of growth of which our economy is capable, it will not be sufficient merely to rely upon the effect of a slowly expanding export trade and a reversal of the de-stocking movement'. Both are of course

*As many of our readers will know, W. Warman is District Secretary of the Sheet Metal Workers and Coppersmiths.

†For example, *Birmingham Area*: Mulliners, Singers, Eccles Caravans, Ariel Motors, Norton Motors, R. T. Shelley, Bellis & Morcom, Excelsior Motors, Birmingham Carr. & Wagon Co., Metropolitan-Cammell, G.E.C. Lando Street, Birmingham Rail Depot, Bromsgrove Railshops, Deloro Stellite. *Coventry Area*: Gloster Whitworth, G.E.C. Communications, Lea Francis. *Wolverhampton and Black Country Area*: Jensens, Hills West Bromwich, British Cycle, Smethwick & Wolverhampton Railshops. *Stoke Area*: British Aluminium—Minton.

expressing merely the concern of Big Business interests and are careful not to challenge or criticise the Tory Government. The facts are that it has long been a definite policy of the Tories to create a pool of unemployment, and which has been endorsed by the Federation of British Industries themselves. The object is two-fold; firstly, to enable them to keep prices down; to stop any demands for wage increases, and make the workers compete with one another for fewer and less well-paid jobs. Secondly, they hope that the fact of large numbers of unemployed at the factory gates will put a damper on militancy inside.

In the battle now being waged at Whitworth-Gloucester by the sheet metal workers against redundancy, the company were forced to concede short time after a struggle; but they claimed that it was uneconomic, and would only agree to it being in operation for twelve weeks, and then issued redundancy notices. The sheet metal workers, who had never accepted such a claim, stopped work. Only one week later it was announced that the Whitworth-Gloucester had secured a new contract from the government for transport planes. Had the company no inkling that there was a strong possibility of the contract in the offing? It would be hard to find a worker who would believe that.

Right-wing theorists of the labour movement have been trying to justify their arguments that capitalism is no longer what it used to be and socialism is 'out-of-date' by the myth of the 'Welfare State' or 'Affluent Society'. With this argument they have consistently tried to destroy the socialist basis of the labour movement, and have therefore weakened sections of workers in their struggles

against Tory Policy. What happens to their phoney solutions now? The 'stable labour force', and 'guaranteed wage' disappear as soon as stagnation sets in and unemployment grows.

The time has come for us to tell these people, who under the guise of a 'free enterprise society' have, by their selfish manoeuvres, led our country to the brink of disaster, that we shall not allow them to go on with this sort of thing. They tell us that our economic problems are the result of happenings over which they have no control, and that we must consider them as 'Acts of God', like floods, earthquakes and hurricanes. This is a lie and they know it. The Tory Government and Big Business, because of their remorseless drive for bigger and bigger profits, are the reasons for the present situation, nothing else. The millions spent on armaments each year for the defence of private enterprise—they call it the 'free world'—is just one contributing factor to our country's economic problems, leading to a one-sided, unbalanced economy; it is rapidly destroying the myth that 'war means work'. More millions spent than ever before, and unemployment on the increase. Affluence, indeed!

All the struggles taking place up and down the country need to be linked up; and it is urgent. Motor workers, aircraft workers, must join with the railwaymen against the government's policy. We need the biggest mass demonstrations that this country has ever seen, and the widest possible unity of the people, in opposition to Tory and Big Business interests. In the forefront we should demand the resignation of this government and a General Election without delay. We need nationalisation of motors, steel and road transport. We need a fully integrated policy for all transport, designed to

make the best possible use of our railways to serve, not Mr. Marples and Mr. Beeching, but the interests of the people, to relieve chaos and overcrowding of our roads. A shorter working week is even more urgent.

Important demands were put forward by the Midland Regional Advisory Committee of the Trades Union Congress, at the end of February, that the T.U.C. should investigate automation, mergers in industry and the 35-hour week. Their spokesman, Mr. J. L. Jones, regional secretary of the Transport and General Workers Union, said: 'Unemployment has gone up by 25,000, a 50 per cent increase in the last month, largely due to mergers and technical developments'. He went on to point out that in the motor industry in the past five years, production had doubled with the same labour force. In one engine assembly plant in Coventry, 300 men were producing what 900 would have done previously. A car paint plant in Birmingham employed twelve men and coped with work previously done by a hundred. He said that the chemical industry could increase its output by 20 per cent without increasing its labour force; and it was similar in steel, rubber, rayon, building, gas and transport. The Advisory Committee felt a solution lay in a shorter working week, without loss of pay, and urged a 35-hour week.

Increased wages are an absolute essential to maintain the purchasing power of the home market sufficiently to keep the factories working. We must also insist on the restriction of all unnecessary overtime and the employment of people who are now signing on at the Labour Exchanges. All restrictions of trade with the socialist countries

should be ended and credit assistance given to the newly developed countries. Britain should aim for a market of 2,000 million people, not merely the 200 million in Europe. Finally, we need immediate cuts in the huge armaments policy, and a production not for war but for lasting peace.

From Yorkshire

Nero fiddled whilst Rome burned. There is no evidence that he fanned the flames. The Tory Government, however, are more modern than he, using policies to spread the fire of economic crisis, a condition endemic to capitalism. That is why there needs to be built the widest most effective force, to turn these policies aside and ensure the sacking of the modern Nero lot.

Yorkshire is not only the largest county in England, it is also one of diversified industries; but not in all the county. In West Yorkshire, the county. In West Yorkshire, the wool industry is still dominant with many ancillary industries resting on it. Here sections have been in the doldrums for a long time, as, for example 'my own' industry, machine card tenting, which has been suffering from short-time working for over three years. Rotherham is predominantly a steel town, Sheffield of steel and heavy engineering. Steel has been in trouble for many months with short-time working and redundancy. Now that heavy engineering has also entered into trouble, memories of the dread days of the 'thirties are very keen in these two heavy industrial cities. Doncaster is the centre of one of Britain's most productive coalfields and not threatened by closures on any large scale; rather it is thought of as an expanding field. But the surplus labour force created

by the operation of the Robens' policy in other coalfields is undoubtedly a great additional pressure of which the Coal Board is not unmindful in negotiations; and 1,000 school leavers at Christmas were unable to find jobs. Leeds is reputedly a city with ninety-nine industries. Yet well over 6,000 unemployed are signing on there from all industries.

Wool textiles and clothing are preponderately women's industries, employing thousands of women in Leeds, Bradford, Huddersfield, Halifax and the Spenn Valley Areas. Though the Labour Exchanges are now amongst the busiest industries, one wonders how much busier they would be if all women not able to find 'gainful employment' had been paying their full insurance contributions whilst working and so entitled to present themselves for unemployment pay now. We have also to note that many hundreds of coloured people have made their home amongst us during recent years. A most cursory glance at the growing queues at the Exchanges impresses one with the fact that a very much larger proportion of these workers are unemployed than others.

In this situation the great national lobby and demonstration on March 26 needed to be a great focal point of as wide a section of people as it was humanly possible to make it. The Yorkshire Federation of Trades Councils was the leading and co-ordinating body in Yorkshire seeking to bring this about. Some examples: in Sheffield, every major factory decided to send representatives, as did many trade union organisations; Leeds Trades Council officially decided to send fourteen delegates, eight of them Council members, the remaining six unemployed; this apart from as many others as money could be raised for their journey. The

unemployed delegates were elected at a meeting of unemployed called by the Trades Council, after distributing leaflets at Labour Exchanges. Cable Covers (Leeds) workers elected two delegates whose expenses were met by the management. Leeds University students not only sent two delegates but also collected money for the Trades Council to finance other delegates. Huddersfield Trades Council elected ten delegates straight away and aimed to fill a double decker bus. Rotherham Trades Council chose to be represented by its president, secretary and the prospective Labour parliamentary candidate. Scarborough elected six railwaymen; and the first three delegates chosen in Barnsley were railwaymen.

A very significant point. In many areas, in addition to electing delegates from the labour movement and the factories, attention was paid to ensuring that finance was raised for unemployed workers to be on the march. Thus the living and so necessary unity between employed and unemployed, with the labour movement as the core, could be visible on the demonstration to all who see it. Above all, it must be made visible to the Tory Government, to teach them that their disastrous policies will not be tolerated; that their tenure of office is short; and that, unlike their predecessors, they are not dealing with the unemployed alone, but with a united force led by the mighty labour movement. This can, should and must become one, embracing the whole people.

JACK MAUDE, *Halifax.*

(Writing of course in a personal capacity, he is a member of the Executive of the Yorkshire Federation of Trades Councils, and also a member of the Yorkshire District Committee of the Communist Party).

WHAT ARE WE HERE FOR, MR. WOODCOCK?

'Vulcan'

HALF a year onward from the Blackpool Trades Union Congress, with its approval of participating in 'Neddy' and of reviewing trade union structure, is also half a year onward to the next T.U.C. at Brighton. Here we are then, at the half year mark, and have we progressed towards 'planning economic development'? Towards 'streamlining trade union structure to meet modern needs'?

As always, the heart of the question in a class society is: what sort of planning and on whose behalf? To meet exactly what, and whose, modern needs is the structure of the workers' organisations to be streamlined? The promises and performances of 'Neddy' (National Economic Development Council) are dealt with elsewhere in this number. Here we look at what progress, if any, has been made by the General Council to prepare some sort of report for the 1963 T.U.C. on the trade unions.

The terms of reference, within which the Finance and General Purposes Committee of the General Council have begun gingerly to examine the question, were those of the resolution moved at Blackpool by the Union of Post Office Workers stating that

it is time the British trade union movement adapted its structure to modern conditions. It instructs the General Council to examine and report to the 1963 Congress on the possibility of reorganising the structure of both the T.U.C. and the British trade union movement with a view to making it better fitted to meet modern industrial conditions.

In recommending Congress to accept this resolution, its Secretary, Mr. George Woodcock, expressed the view, with demonstrative caution, that it would take a long time. He thought that in the first year they would be able only to report on the results 'of enquiring among ourselves into the purpose of trade unions and the effect of changes in circumstances upon trade union purpose and function'. He said, with perfect truth, 'Structure, particularly in the trade union movement, is a function of purpose . . . when we know what we are here for, then we can talk about the kind of structure that will enable us to do what we are here for'. Now, that is putting first things first; there is a lot more in it than meets the eye, and it is by

no means generally accepted as the truism that it would appear. When the Finance and General Purposes got themselves finally sitting round the table, they did well to ask themselves, in the words with which Woodcock made the headlines at Blackpool: 'What are we here for?' Having barked their shins on the skeleton of opposed purposes not to be brought into the light of day, it was inevitable that they should turn aside to the more familiar topic of whether problems of amalgamation were insuperable or not.

That is not new. A tendency to narrow it down only to for and against amalgamation, has always bedevilled discussion of the main issue: democracy, leadership and the destination towards which the movement should travel. The giants who are benevolently in favour of others amalgamating with them, but horrified at the thought of sharing out their own sections with other societies, are over-sensitive on the subject of amalgamation. So also are those midgets who are more easily led to amalgamate their overdrafts than others their bank balances, as Ernest Bevin used to say cheerfully, from the security of his giant's castle at the Transport and General Workers. Preoccupation with how instead of whither has come in the past from the extreme right wing, whose main concern is to resist pressure from any quarter and at all costs to go nowhere at all; their criterion is whether amalgamation, or any proposal, at a particular moment would tend to shore up the private profit system of moribund monopoly to ensure that it lasts their time. On the other hand, sometimes the progressive left-wing society, impatient for socialism in their time, favouring the strength of numbers, and cutting out overlapping, may concentrate on methods and take destination all too much for granted. Thus it is that defenders and opposers of 'streamlining' may be found side by side and face to face, prepared to concentrate on structure, and how essential it is to change or preserve it.

It is more difficult to get frank discussion in the Higher Regions on the delicate question of purpose posed by Woodcock. He may aim to be the tactician which Bevin claimed to be and Citrine undoubtedly succeeded in being whilst still on the workers' side of the table, but what Woodcock may be keeping under his hat is less important than the question he has posed.

To illustrate what the Finance and General Purposes Committee would be up against when they seriously got down to the job, take a look first at the practical problems of purpose, before turning to problems of changing structure. To answer, innocently or not so

innocently, 'We are here to defend our members' interests', does not take us far. For example, it would have to be considered whether it would be more to the engineers' interests to sit on productivity councils or fight to lift artificially created obstacles to trade with expanding economies, like those of the socialist countries. Whether to allow public services to be destroyed and whole areas laid derelict, confining leadership to the function of inducing members to accept mobility and redundancy payments on the plea that any other course is 'uneconomic'. Whether to negotiate national wage agreements and at the same time discipline works' shop stewards, and for leading action to get enhanced workshop rates. Whether to accept wage restraint on the grounds that it might win foreign markets and keep going the balance of payments, unbalanced by vast arms expenditure. Whether to work for fullest confidence and closest working between the lads on the workshop floor and the national officials, or to keep them at arm's length, on the plea of it being more efficient to 'leave it to the leaders'. Whether to have frequent and democratic conferences, elected officials, full democratic rights to vote and be voted for if in good standing, or to maintain bans and proscriptions. And finally, to decide whether it advances the interests of members to make unions 'schools of socialism' and seek every opportunity to end, not to patch up, the capitalist economic and social system.

All these are real life questions of purpose. If these and similar questions were not in the minds of the members of the Finance and General Purposes Committee, they should have been. The plain truth is, that progress towards unifying the sections of the working-class movement can only be on class lines, with a class purpose of early defeat of this system and rapid achievement of socialism. Suppose that were agreed and accepted as the main purpose; the membership roused to campaign for it; and those with one hand on the brake and the other signing contracts for television appearances and services rendered to the press, removed from office. Would there still be practical problems in streamlining the structure? Yes, and they would be formidable still, but not insurmountable. Take only one aspect of structure, increasing amalgamations.

It must of course be remembered that quite a lot has already been found possible and more is under way. It depends upon historical factors and also on technical changes, as well as similarity of purpose. Changes in technique, however, can create differences as well as remove distinctions between crafts and sections. Yet the

boilermakers, blacksmiths and shipwrights now moving towards organisational unity—possibly only just before the storm, in the teeth of which the most stubborn might well make for the nearest port—had tried and failed forty years ago when times were bad. There are moves in Print; in Building, where changes in technique make many distinctions between old crafts meaningless; and Engineering, if you can call it a single industry, is another immensely tricky flashpoint. As indeed are Transport, Railways and Others.

Again, the problem of democratic control, relations between leadership and members, and between one section and another, obviously will vary between federations of craftsmen and groupings of widely diversified general workers ('from midwives to grave-diggers', to quote Bevin again). Amalgamations will have, for a long time, important effects on relations with outside bodies. With the loss of identity must go the loss inevitably of a number of skilled and experienced negotiators, disregarding the question of the numbers and ambitions, legitimate and otherwise, of officials, not all of which will be solvable by 'natural wastage'. Again, there is almost infinite variety in levels of benefit, contributions, finances, strike pay, wages policy, the degree of democracy in constitutions, and other practical problems.

Glancing at the effect of streamlining on the T.U.C. and the General Council, it is plain that although present anomalies are bad enough, major changes of rules would be required unless these anomalies are to be accentuated beyond all reason. A few examples. Under present Standing Orders, each affiliated society has a right to put forward two resolutions, and two amendments (Rules 23 (c) and (d)). Two societies amalgamating would forfeit half these rights, unless the principle of affiliation by sections was accepted (as has been privately canvassed), which would set several cats among the pigeons. Representation by one delegate per 5,000 members and voting rights of 1 per 1,000 would again mean considerable dislocation and the disappearance of many 'well kent' faces.

When we come to representation on the General Council, we enter the field where anomalies already have reached scandal dimensions. At present the 35 seats are supplied from 19 groups of industries, five of which have three seats each, six being entitled to two seats and eight to one seat only. Group 2 covering Railways, entitled to three seats, includes a smaller total membership than Building or Civil Servants, for example, which are each only entitled to two seats; whilst Group 6, Iron and Steel Trades, and Group 9,

'industrial peace' conferences with employers in terms so similar at points to Woodcock's defence of joining 'Neddy' that it would be hard indeed to say who was speaking when. Only the champion gamester in 'Round Britain Quiz' or 'Does the Team Think?' could sort these:

- (a) 'A courageous facing up to the responsibilities and realities of modern trade unionism'.
- (b) 'Are you so scared that you are not prepared to stand by your experience, by your competence and your ability? Are you so modest in all these things that you reject every challenge and reject every opportunity?'
- (c) 'I ask you to allow the General Council . . . to exhibit a capacity to discuss any subject within the industrial arena on equal terms and . . . with ability equal to any one of the so-called captains of industry on the other side'.

(a) and (c) Citrine and Bevin defending Mond-Turner, (b) Woodcock defending 'Neddy'.

It would be wrong to suggest that there are no differences: there are many, great and small. Today the proposal for class collaboration does not appear to emanate from the Employers' Confederation, with a certain prompting from the President of the T.U.C., as in the 'twenties. It is the direct proposal of the Tory Government on this occasion, with employers modestly waiting in the wings. The Mond-Turner conferences were buried in the grave of the world economic crisis and mass unemployment. But as for the manipulators behind 'Neddy',

*Alas, alas for England
They have no graves—as yet.*

The two conceptions of trade unionism which are in conflict today have been clearly analysed thus:*

The right-wing conception is based on acceptance of capitalism, of co-operation with employers and the government, of the unions exercising disciplinary powers on their members in the interests of industrial peace and of the smooth functioning of the capitalist system and would in effect make the unions pillars of capitalism.

The progressive conception is that the unions are instruments of working class strength and that the aim must be to preserve their independence from all forms of state regulation and from entangling alliances with the employers . . . as one of the most important levers for the transformation of society.

And the latter, Mr. Woodcock, is what *we* are here for.

*Draft Resolution on The Future of Trade Unionism to be submitted to the 28th National Congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain, April 12-15.

PLANNING FOR WHAT?

Alan Brown

IF we take the 'Neddy 5-year Plan 1961-66' to run from April to April, we shall be halfway through it in October this year. And there is still no guarantee that by then we shall have been told what major policies it advocates to achieve its aim—an average 4 per cent growth in the economy each year during that period. Progress so far is illuminating. In April, 1961, when there was still no Neddy, the production index (1958=100) stood at 115 (unemployment was 340,000). Eleven months later the National Economic Development Council was set up: production was at 115 (unemployment had risen to 441,790). After another eleven months the 'target' report was published—but still no plan. The latest production figure (December, 1962) was 115, and unemployment had risen to 878,356. The two-part report, published on February 28, gave the results of the Council's inquiry into seventeen selected industries, and discussed the implication for the economy as a whole of a national annual growth rate of 4 per cent ('the 4 per cent case'). No proposals were given, though eight days previously the *Guardian* had jumped the gun, giving not only the targets but some of the back-room boys' proposals as well.

Responsibility for the stagnating production and soaring unemployment during the first years of the 'plan' cannot, of course, be laid at the door of the Council. The villain of the piece was the Government, which had set it up. All the 'planners' could do was to take account of the unpalatable facts. Section K of the report—'Phasing of the Programme'—therefore says that 'Between 1961 and 1962 output increased at less than 2 per cent, so that the annual increase between 1962 and 1966 will have to be rather more than 4½ per cent if the 1966 target is to be achieved'. And if the stagnation continues, the target for the later years will go up again.

In so far as the tasks given to the Council are at all possible under capitalism—to make the full use of the nation's resources and to keep wage increases down to a level acceptable to the employers—they are no pushovers. The first report is thus largely given over to a mass of target figures, pious hopes, and general prognostications. Now comes the rub. The Council has to pronounce the policy measures which can be agreed between the Government, employer and trade union representatives to attain the '4 per cent case'.

To be effective at all, they would have to deal with the basic

problems which beset Britain's economy at present—such as the depressed areas, the stagnation of production, the failure of exports to rise, and the balance of payments problems. (As regards incomes we are so far told that balance of payments problems 'should prove manageable provided the rise in money incomes and prices can be sufficiently restrained'). What of the problems of depressed areas which *The Times* (March 4, 1963) described as 'among Britain's costliest weaknesses'? They suffer from high unemployment, and blatant under-use of basic industries on which their living depends.

The Council has so far made no attempt to describe how the problem of unemployment is to be solved, although it believes that there must be a reduction (Sir Robert Shone, the chairman, told the press that a 1½ per cent rate—or about 375,000—had figured in their calculations). Mr. Maudling, Chancellor of the Exchequer, has said that a figure of 300,000 would 'lead us back into the difficulties of inflation and balance of payment which we have seen in the past', and the Association of British Chambers of Commerce (January 14, 1963) tells us that the major stimulus needed to bring the total down to that by June 'would create the risk of a sharp rise in labour costs per unit of output . . . and could result in the throwing away of all the fruits of 1962'. Neddy will hardly fly in the face of such august advice. But on the basic industries it gets nearer in its report to current Tory thinking. Paragraph 142 tells us that 'six of the seventeen industries covered by the industrial survey show contractions of manpower *and substantial contractions are expected in other industries such as railways, shipbuilding, aircraft and cotton during the period*' (Emphasis added). In his 1963 New Year Message, Harold Macmillan had spoken about the 'declining' world markets for the products of the coalmining, shipbuilding, heavy engineering and textile industries; while *The Times* (January 31, 1963) declared: 'if traditional industries, shipbuilding, steel, textiles, etc., have surplus capacity, it is no use trying to shore them up needlessly'. But the question is, can we solve the problems of unemployment and the depressed areas by standing back and looking upon the basic industries as 'dying' and not worth 'shoring up'. Do all the trade union members of the Council accept this approach? Do they accept that the problem is 'to assist mobility and to tackle the problems to which redundancy gives rise'? (para. 144). Is that the order of priorities? Or do they believe that there is sufficient need for textiles, steel, heavy engineering products, coal, aircraft and shops so that far from dying, the industries could be thriving?

Macmillan's line was that 'Today world demand for their products is contracting, partly because of the arrival of new products, partly because developing countries overseas make what they used to buy from us'. Does our labour movement believe that the British people's need for new hospitals, schools, roads, ships, aircraft, fuel and clothing are anywhere near being satisfied—quite apart from the needs of countries overseas? If we are able to export engineering goods to Europe, are Asia and Africa supposed to be self-sufficient? Even the Government cannot say that there is no demand for ships, at least from the Socialist, planned-economy countries.

But to seize the opportunities for supplying increased amounts of goods of all kinds to the British people and to the peoples of the world, means policies which will help make that a fact.

At home it will not happen with the sort of 'incomes policy' the Tories have in mind. It would mean raising living standards—incomes, pensions and other incomes—lowering taxation, and particularly indirect taxation which hits the poorest most. They would need to be planned increases, designed to provide a flourishing home market and full employment to allow the greatest use of our industrial potential. The report says (para. 144) that 'The fear of redundancy acts as a brake on industrial expansion, whether it causes strikes, restrictions, or resistance to change'. The workers will not be fooled—a genuine policy of full employment and rising standards would see them enthusiastic about raising production.

The problems of exports and overseas trade generally would also need new policies, which broke loose from those applied hitherto, and so beloved of the State Department. Trade barriers against the Socialist countries would have to go, and long-term agreements signed with them as also with the underdeveloped countries of the world. Moves among British manufacturers, particularly since the breakdown of the Common Market negotiations, show that many of them have a healthy appreciation of the value of East-West trade. But a greater volume of opinion is needed to build up the necessary pressure. Can we expect the Council to weigh in here, thus attacking one root cause of the problem of the unemployed?

The report deals in some detail with saving in the economy, but it appears satisfied to say that a round figure of £2,000 million for (so-called) defence expenditure in 1966 'must inevitably be an uncertain and controversial figure'. A halved arms bill would be necessary to provide finance for those things which give Britain real strength.

Loans and credits would have to be made available to many of the countries who are in great need of Britain's industrial products.

Money would be needed for that purpose. And there seems no reason why such credits should be feared, for credits to overseas countries—unlike the provision of arms—helps them to establish industrial economies which in the future would provide the basis for normal two-way trade. So far as home industries are concerned, credits act as a form of Government subsidy to industry, keeping wheels turning and helping end the dole queues.

It will be seen that genuine planning in Britain cannot be of the variety which we have seen previously from Tory stables—dove-tailing in with the needs of the monopolists and Tory electoral fortunes. Genuine planning must go to the heart of the problems facing Britain, ignoring the demands of the Cold War and looking to those of the people. If one thing is certain, it is that this was not the reason why the Tories set up the National Economic Development Council. They did not have in mind an independent body which would take a fresh look at the old problems, but rather a body with a veneer of 'impartiality' which would provide a cover under which the Government could continue its old basic policies.

We must wait still further to find just what concrete measures are to be taken to achieve the '4 per cent case', which in itself would be an excellent thing for the British people. Apart from some comparatively minor questions, it does not look as though there will be much in its findings to support the policies of the labour movement.

A journalist commented, at the Press Conference given to launch the February 'target' report that 'We shall have to wait until later to write up the Minority Report'. Perhaps, but is it the role of the British trade union movement to write even Minority Reports on the end of Government-employer policy statements?

Before very long we shall have a General Election, when the Labour Party, with trade union support, ought to be returned to power after 11 years in the wings. Of crucial importance will be how far the left wing, including the growing Communist movement, will be represented in the new majority. Policies will be needed which owe nothing to Tory-employer 'plans', but are based on working class solutions (including further nationalisation to advance towards democratic control over Britain's resources), and formulated by the major organisations of the Labour movement.

If the second course is to be carried out, should not the trade unions be giving all their planning energies to working towards a situation where the final say in determining Britain's future rests not with Macmillan but with the working people?

STAND BY IRAQ

IRAQ has been turned into a bloodbath since the military coup d'état in February. Within the first three days over 5,000 men, women and children were killed. Hospitals were overflowing with the thousands wounded. Schools were turned into concentration camps to house the thousands upon thousands of political prisoners whom the existing jails could not possibly accommodate. (Clare Hollingworth of the *Guardian* estimated the prisoners at 15,000.) It is like a modern picture of Hitler's terrorism. How did all this happen?

The new, already discredited, junta could not tolerate the slightest form of opposition. They set out from the start to meet such opposition by mass murder. Within the first few hours they issued their orders to murder over the radio and television—an act unprecedented in history. The 'Order No. 13' said:

. . . permission is given to commanders of Army units, the police forces and National Guards (*civilians and mostly teenagers*) to annihilate everybody who disturbs the peace (*italics L.M.*).

The order ends by calling on its blood-thirsty supporters to 'help' by informing about these criminals (meaning those who do not support the régime) and to destroy them. The *Sunday Times*, February 14, 1963, commented:

This sounds like an open incitement to a massacre which would make St. Bartholomew's Day look like a Sunday School picnic.

This is exactly what happened. A reign of terror fell upon Baghdad. Since February 8, reports about the situation smell of nothing but blood and gunpowder. The *New York Herald Tribune* reported on February 16, 1963:

A correspondent watched troops smash in windows poking sten guns through shattered frames, while others broke down doors and entered buildings to ferret out enemies of the regime.

The *Guardian* in its editorial on February 20, said:

In the oversimplified terms generally used, 'nationalists' have been killing off 'Communists' by the score or the hundred: the fortunate are those who have been shut up.

One can only add that the killing is by the thousand. Those shut up are not so fortunate: some are murdered and tortured to death.

The new clique is hated by the people, who do not want to replace a dictator by a more brutal one. *Le Monde* (February 16) exposed the unpopularity of the new régime very clearly when it said:

The new Iraqi revolution is an event without a precedent in the Middle East, in that not a single popular demonstration, however small it may be, has appeared to show support for the new leaders of Iraq.

Mass murder in Iraq is your concern, since human dignity and decency is in danger. Humanity cannot let these crimes pass unopposed in this day and age. The massacres are still in full swing and our people are fighting for their lives. 'The turmoil is likely to go on for some time. I have left behind many hundreds of people for whom the future holds only the firing squad'. This is what Keith Davis reported in the *Express* when he left Baghdad.

You can help. Send telegrams and petitions to the Baghdad Government or to the Chargé d'Affairs, Iraqi Embassy, 21, Queens Gate, S.W.7. Make the facts known to your friends, and ask them to act, but act fast.

IRAQI STUDENTS SOCIETY

DOCUMENT OF THE MONTH

AFRO-ASIAN SOLIDARITY

[At Moshi, in Tanganyika, the third Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Conference was held on February 4-11, 1963. There were present over 400 delegates and observers from nearly 60 countries. (28 were African, 18 Asian, together with Cuba, Malta, and others).

The Conference discussed the development of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Movement, the problems that confront their peoples and the international situation; decided to convene a Three-Continent Conference of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America; and adopted this Declaration.—Ed., L.M.]

WE HAVE BEEN IMPRESSED with the genuine desire of our peoples to strengthen Afro-Asian solidarity and co-operation on the basis of equality and in the noble spirit of Bandung, in the interests of the struggle for national liberation against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. We have every reason to believe that our great movement is soaring from success to success and from victory to victory. At the same time, however, we are of the firm opinion

that more than ever before we need to be vigilant and alert to manoeuvres of the imperialists and colonialists, who seek to sow seeds of discord among us, and to be on our guard against neo-colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

Having reviewed the political, economic, social and cultural problems of our peoples, we are convinced that the most urgent tasks for all our peoples in the coming year are: intensification of the struggle against

colonialism, imperialism and neo-colonialism; maximum contribution towards the speedy liberation of the unliberated areas in Africa and Asia and the formation of a united national front in each country that is not yet liberated and co-ordination of action amongst these different national fronts to make their struggle for independence more effective.

Liberation

Since the convocation of the second Conference in Conakry, a great many events have taken place in the Afro-Asian countries and in the world. The Afro-Asian and Latin American peoples have scored many victories, both at home and on the international field. Independent countries have gained their freedom. Imperialism is being defeated in all parts of the world and, thanks to the continuous struggle of the peoples of Africa and Asia and all peace- and freedom-loving peoples in the world, its end is now in sight. The battle for national liberation and sovereignty has gained momentum and reached such a stage that the imperialists have been forced into fighting last ditch battles.

We declare that we regard it as the duty of our governments, our peoples, and liberation movements to render all possible moral and material support to the heroic peoples of those countries which are assailing the bastion of colonialism and imperialism, and struggling for the liquidation of white domination and racial discrimination, and we call upon these freedom fighters and all peace-loving people of the world to see to it that the year 1963 will witness the final and complete collapse of colonialism which has afflicted Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Economic Emancipation

We unanimously declare that opposition to imperialists and colonialists does not lie only in the political field. Political independence is not an end in itself but a beginning. It is the beginning of a further and more difficult battle, namely, the battle for economic emancipation and construction. Great wealth lies at the disposal of our people, riches that have so far been exploited by the imperialists, not for our benefit but for their own purposes. We are now becoming the masters of our own house and we must see to it that it is put in order. We must also see to it that wealth, instead of being used to satisfy desire for power and prestige, should be directed towards the banishment of poverty.

In this respect we call upon the peoples of Africa and Asia to co-operate and to put into practice many resolutions passed by Afro-Asian conferences for economic co-operation and exchange.

Peaceful Co-Existence

We, the peoples of Africa and Asia, believe deeply in peace and are struggling against the imperialist policies of war and aggression and for independence and peace among nations. The struggle for national liberation and national sovereignty is the mighty force for the realisation of peace and disarmament. We are for the banning of testing, manufacturing, stock-piling and using of nuclear weapons and for the total destruction of existing nuclear arms. For the sake of reducing the present dangerous international tension and avoiding a general war, we support the principle of general and controlled disarmament and peaceful co-existence among states of different social systems.

FROM THE HALLS OF MONTEZUMA

Wilfred Macartney

Along with intensified raiding operations throughout South Vietnam, the United States has repeatedly sprayed noxious chemicals on such a large, densely populated area as Ben Tre province, in an attempt to terrorise the people and force them into concentration camps disguised as 'strategic hamlets'.
Vietnam Bulletin, March 1963.

GENERAL MARK CLARK's lead into his memoirs, after describing his appointment as Commander-in-Chief of United States forces in Korea and the Truce signature, ends with a lament—'It capped my career but it was a cap without a feather in it. In carrying out the instructions of my Government I gained the unenviable distinction of being the first United States Army Commander in history to sign an armistice without victory'. However, the next sentence breathes a hope which, sinister as it may be, is sincere enough. 'I was thankful the bloodshed had stopped but like millions of other Americans I more than suspected that it all came under the heading of unfinished business. One day the Marines will land again'!

Greedy peoples must have long arms and the skinny arms of Uncle Sam lengthened early in the Republic's history, for Korea was not the first Asian adventure of this so-called Occidental country. 'Peace', said Jefferson, 'is our passion'; but even Napoleon did not covet his neighbour's property more eagerly. Indeed, there is no long-range American policy which is as definitely Jeffersonian as Manifest Destiny. Even before Jefferson, Washington had written a note which will be read wryly today. On December 7, 1796, he wrote to Congress: 'To secure respect to a neutral flag requires a Naval force organised and ready to vindicate it from insult or aggression'. Long before Dulles had made 'neutral' a wall writing word, Washington himself and his immediate and more distant successors showed that for the United States neutrality must be on its own terms and its own definition; or in the words of Stephen Decatur 'May my country in dealing with foreign nations be always in the right, but my country right or wrong'. It was this speech and Decatur's bombardment of the Barbary towns of Tunis and Tripoli which inspired L. K. Phillips to write the hymn of the United States Corps of Marines with its second line 'To the Shores of Tripoli'.

The Barbary states were nominally under the suzerainty of Turkey and being neutral meant for them capturing and holding to ransom any ships which were blown into or entered their territorial waters. Some United States ships suffered for either their presumption or ill fortune in this way, so several Naval expeditions blew across the Atlantic and down the blue Mediterranean fluttering the stars and stripes on their way to release the ships and crew. It flutters there today from the masthead of the Sixth Fleet; the numbers of stars have considerably increased and the stripes made more severe by Polaris, another desperate weapon.

Recently another Tripoli, this time in the Lebanon, was visited by the United States Marines, who landed, turned round and came back again. General Mark Clark's lament about the Korean armistice is not quite true, but one can understand Mark Clark's groan when you think of the luxurious way in which the Americans wage war. Frank Owen* recalls that he became a little uneasy whilst in Korea when he saw the American divisions moving up to the front with an ice-cream parlour followed by a pants-pressing unit, and when a week later this American position was ironed out by a Chinese volunteer division, Owen, fortunately, was not there!

Nearer home the craving, demanding, howling, hungry infant Republic colonised or settled Texas, which was an integral part of Mexico, demanded compensation for alleged damage to United States property, offered to write off the claims if the Mexicans would cede all the territory north of the Rio Grande and sell California to the U.S.A. The Mexicans refused, so President Polk invaded Mexico. Soon 'The Halls of Montezuma' resounded to the heavy tread and heavier curses of the Marines. Unfortunately, for the Mexicans, there was no P.X. in those days, so the invaders had to feed the invaders and, what is more, pay an indemnity. Texas, New Mexico, California and all the rest of the undeveloped West became a part of the land of the free. These adventures were justified by U.S. soldiers and writers, e.g., W. G. Sims to Senator Hammond in 1847: 'You should not protest against military glory, war is the greatest element of modern civilisation and our own destiny is conquest. In fact, the moment a nation ceases to expand its power it falls a victim to a more energetic neighbour. The Mexicans are in the position of those whom the Gods make mad; they seek destruction. They are doing their all to compel us to conquer them, it is now impossible that it should be otherwise'.

*Frank Owen was Editor of the *Evening Standard* 1938-41, Editor of the *Daily Mail* 1947-50, and author of 'Guilty Men'.

In his introduction to *Patriotic Gore*, the most scholarly and readable of American critics, Edmund Wilson,* comments savagely on these aspects of American history; but even Wilson's indignation at Yankee imperialism does not disclose the full horror of the Philippine annexation and the bloody four-year war that followed the insurrection of its eight million inhabitants, a war in which a quarter of a million U.S. troops and Filipinos died. The original Filipino revolt against Spain was primarily against the Catholic Church who, through its religious orders, owned everything in this heavenly archipelago. The Friars bossed everybody on two feet and owned everything on four, including the land on which both walked. General MacArthur, father of another MacArthur who lamentably is still with us, started concentration camps; at the same time Kitchener and Roberts did the same thing in South Africa. Clio does not tell us who copied who. For the inmates of these camps it was the same end, death from disease and hunger.

Apart from the horrors of the Philippine and South African wars, the years 1898-1902 are almost clinically Marxian. While Lord Lloyd George was being howled and hunted by the jingo mob in Birmingham, the anti-imperialist league in the United States was founded, financed and vigorously directed by, forsooth, Andrew Carnegie† and Mark Hanna, Republican boss. Carnegie spent millions to stop these ghastly adventures. Hanna called Teddy Roosevelt 'that mad cowboy', but Carnegie at this time was sweating his Pittsburg steel workers twelve hours a day, seven days a week, and Mark Hanna was further fouling the already sewer-like stream in United States politics. Why therefore this contradiction between the richest 'working millionaire' in the world and millionaire Randolph Hearst and the chauvinistic mob? In 1898 the United States economy was just working itself out of a crisis cycle slump and Carnegie and some of the rich Republicans thought that foreign adventures would jigger up the coming boom. McKinley, the President, appears from his private correspondence to have been against these forays but was forced by Roosevelt and the jingos to make publicly those ferocious speeches; meanwhile the war raged.

In an off half-hour the United States Marines with others, British and Germans, assaulted and sacked Peking, plundering the fabulous

*Most of the criticisms by the intelligenzia of U.S. policy come from native Americans; the British being more discreet.

†Round about this time Andrew Carnegie sold his steel interests to J. P. Morgan for 500,000,000 dollars (£100,000,000). Morgan commented to Carnegie 'What does it feel like to be the richest man in the world?' Carnegie replied somewhat sourly 'I think I sold it ■ wee bit cheaply'.

spoils of its ancient palaces; to this day the treasures are flaunted in museums and private palaces of the so-called Occident. Clio, a mischievous wench, always punning and larking about, found McKinley accepting ravished jades from China in his home town CANTON, Ohio! McKinley was not to enjoy these trophies for long. He, still anxious about war and Cuba, was assassinated by a demented Pole at the Buffalo Exhibition, and Clio, insatiable for the irony, saw to it that his war-like Secretary of State, Hey, should have been Lincoln's Private Secretary, Garfield's personal friend (both assassinated). He was, not unnaturally, known as 'the kiss of death', or more indulgently, 'Hey fever'. The incoming Roosevelt sacked him!

In Kennedy one may sense a similar contradiction between the private Kennedy and the public Jack, as historically appears in McKinley. At the time of the assassination of McKinley, the war continued in the Philippines, but their heroic leader, Emilio Aguinaldo, was captured by the murderous, mercenary Maccabebes. Aguinaldo is still alive, and one can say that in relation to American colonial history, this heroic figure, now over 90, has seen it all.

Today, vicious battles rage at Vietnam; nearly a million men were engaged last year with 55,000 casualties. Thirteen American Generals deploy the forces, including 11,000 troops with many Marine companies. According to *The Times*, January 21, 1963:

Theoretically these men are not combatants. In a hairsplitting effort to avoid the limit imposed by the 1954 Geneva Agreement on foreign military personnel, all but 160 American Service men are here on 'temporary duty'.

Of the Vietnamese themselves, 5½ million, or nearly 39 per cent of the population, are in concentration camps, so-called 'strategic' hamlets. *The Times* describes them as 'surrounded with bamboo fences and earth ramparts. Some of the larger communities have further refinements, such as a barbed wire fence on top of the rampart, or a moat, also filled with bamboo spikes'. For the construction of these hell-holes, the Americans called for advice from British experts in Malaya.

This almost ignored war could develop into something as ghastly as Korea, for while the United States sea marauders infest the seven seas, peace is likely to be a dim vision and maybe for years to come the last line of the hymn of the United States Marine Corps—'*We have fought in every clime and place where we could take a gun*'—will be sung loudly though discordantly. John Milton, not noticeably a cheek-turner and not wanting 'Paradise Lost' said 'To suffer us to do our strength is equal, nor the law unjust but so ordained'.

BOOKS

The Age of Revolution—Europe 1789-1848

E. J. Hobsbawm

Weidenfeld and Nicholson. 356 pp.
50s.

DR. HOBBSAWM has an even more exciting theme than that suggested in his title. His book is one in a series, a *History of Civilisation*, and so, while he writes of a 'dual revolution—the rather more political French and the industrial (British) revolution', his narrative is set in a world context: 'if its perspective is primarily European or more precisely Franco-British, it is because in this period the world—or at least a large part of it—was transformed from a European, or rather a Franco-British, base'. The traditional bounds of national or 'European' history are passed and we are never allowed to forget the impact of European revolution on the rest of the world, whether it be Mohammed Ali's Egypt, 'the first non-white state to seek the modern way out of economic backwardness', or the 'major landmark in world history', the systematic de-industrialisation of India to make 'a market for Lancashire cottons', by which the age-old trade relationship between Asia and Europe was reversed.

Dr. Hobsbawm is a Marxist and this is why he has been able to make the most of the opportunity which this theme offers him. Europe in the world is one aspect of the changes he narrates, but change within the change is another: 'the history of the dual revolution is not merely one of the triumph of the new bourgeois society. It is also the history of the emergence of the forces which were, within a century of 1848, to have

turned expansion into contraction—the historic period which begins with the construction of the first factory system of the modern world in Lancashire and the French Revolution of 1789, ends with the construction of its first railway network and the publication of the Communist Manifesto'. This idea illuminates the whole block; when economic or political developments are being discussed, the formation of the working-class, the growth of its organisations and its ideas is interwoven into the narrative; among the superbly chosen 102 illustrations there are dramatic pictures of working-class life and of class struggles; when ideology is being discussed, the dialectic of contemporary development is revealed. The chapter entitled 'Science' is a fascinating example.

Anyone who knows the Oxford History of England series of volumes can imagine what this book might have been like; a stodgy mass of facts about political history with tacked on complications of more facts about the economic and 'cultural' aspects. Dr. Hobsbawm covers as wide a range, but he sparks off ideas on every page; theories, interpretations, explanations are mingled intelligently with familiar and with surprising facts; remarkable erudition is born lightly and disciplined to illuminate rather than bemuse the reader. No short review can begin to comment on the richness of ideas which marks this book. It is, perhaps, sufficient to say that the reader, learned or otherwise, will find stimulation and understanding; if he is not sometimes aggravated it will be surprising, for this is one of those rare historical works, which ought to develop fruitful controversy over years and in many directions.

LIONEL MUNBY.

Politics and Society in India

Edited by C. H. Philips.

George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.

190 pp. 25s.

THIS COLLECTION of articles is the first of a series of studies on modern Asia and Africa. The contributions to this volume on India fall into three categories. There are several articles on political thought in ancient India or in India under Muslim influence which, while historically interesting, give us very little assistance in understanding an India that has passed through the traumatic experience of several hundred years of ruthless exploitation by capitalistic imperialism. There are a few more articles on purely political developments before and after Independence which, by ignoring economic realities, give the reader the sensation of trying to guess what people are doing, from watching the play of their shadows on a wall.

The most useful contributions are those by anthropologists which draw on field studies to show what has happened to caste relationships over the last fifteen years and how the traditionally-organised India at the village level has reacted to the imposition from above of the forms of bourgeois democracy. The evidence seems to indicate that, in spite of liberal sentiments about the elimination of caste written into the Constitution, caste influences have actually been strengthened since Independence. The attempts of foreign rule to manipulate caste allegiances and animosities for its own ends had the effect of discrediting, to some extent, these social groupings. The Independence struggle, which was a genuine mass movement, brought about a further erosion of caste barriers; but in recent years Con-

gress has increasingly made use of caste organisation to bolster up its political fortunes in a period of waning popularity. In Kerala, caste was nakedly exploited as a weapon against a successful Communist administration relying for its support on the poorer peasants and workers. According to these anthropologists Western Bengal is the only state in the Union where caste today plays a minor role in politics.

These field studies also reveal the enormous social cleavage between the middle class who rule and the common people. The politician cannot reach his electorate: the voters cannot communicate with their politicians and administrators: the gap is bridged by political brokers and their network—that is, by the buying and selling of special privileges and benefits at the grass-roots level. As an example of what is happening in many parts of India, Orissa is quoted, where up to 1947 the State Assembly reflected a major division between the rentier class supporting British rule and the peasants led by Congress politicians. 'By 1956 . . . Congress leaders healed the breach between themselves and the rentier class and important individuals in the rentier class were given Congress tickets'.

This analysis throws particular light on the basic problems confronting the newly independent states, although the authors offer no solution. For such a solution can only be achieved by carrying forward the democratic revolution against imperialism and feudal survivals, for full economic and political independence from imperialism, and in this way prepare the advance, as the example of Cuba has shown, to the transition of socialism.

WILLIAM ASH.

NEW SUBSCRIPTION RATES

SPECIAL CONCESSION.....

AND DELIVERED TO YOUR DOOR!

(All Post Free)

Second Class Mail (Unsealed Envelope)

Great BritainOne year 21s., six months 10s. 6d.

OverseasOne year 24s., six months 12s.

CanadaOne year \$3.50

U.S.A.One year \$3.50

First Class Mail (Sealed Envelope)

Great BritainOne year 23s., six months 11s. 6d.

Commonwealth CountriesOne year 27s. (Canada \$4.50)

Outside Commonwealth.....One year 35s. (U.S.A. \$5.50)

THE CHALLENGE OF MARXISM

Ed. Brian Simon

Six essays on Marxism as applied to economics, politics, science and the arts in Britain today, by Brian Simon, J. R. Campbell, John Gollan, Arnold Kettle, A. L. Morton and E. V. Rowsell.

21s

LAWRENCE & WISHART

A HISTORY

of Twenty, Thirty and even Forty years ago!

We have a few
BOUND VOLUMES
of earlier years for sale.

Apply to:

THE MANAGER,
134, Ballards Lane, N.3.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

VETERAN L.M. readers: your early copies and pamphlets may be invaluable to others. Send details to: L.M. Exchange Service, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

WE BUY books-pamphlets: Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: RIV 6807, The Hammersmith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6.

URGENTLY REQUIRED—All back numbers of Labour Monthly from 1921-1930 inclusive and 1939.

TWENTIETH- CENTURY CAPITALISM

E. Varga

An eminent Soviet economist looks at the system which his country has set itself to outstrip in social and economic achievement.

7s 6d

LENIN COLLECTED WORKS

Volumes 12, 13, 14

A little over two years ago this first complete edition in English of the works of Lenin was launched, to be completed in 40 volumes; the appearance of Volumes 12, 13 and 14 means that over one-third of the edition is now out. Volumes 12 and 13 cover the period January 1907 to April 1908; Volume 14 contains Lenin's great polemical work against idealism in the natural sciences, *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*.

Each volume 7s 6d

LAWRENCE & WISHART

Labour Monthly

Bound Volume, 1962

*It's a history of the year
and a permanent record*

ORDER NOW

From your usual newsagents, price £1.5.0d., or send 10s. 6d., plus 1s. 6d. postage and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

**THE MANAGER,
134, Ballards Lane,
LONDON, N.3**

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating
by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

For all interested in the fight for Peace and Progress in the Countryside and the problems of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.

Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or

Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

27, Bedford St. Strand, London, W.C.2.

LABOUR RESEARCH

'Future of the Motor Industry'

'The Cost of Arms'

1s. (1s. 2½d.) post free

Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor : R. Palme Dutt

MAY DAY'S CALL TO ACTION

The Editor

★

DEFEND THE RAILWAYS

Arthur Leith

★

ARAB PROBLEMS

C. Enisah

★

Local Elections: Rates Crisis Examined—
Housing the Homeless. New Trade Policies.

MAY 1963

Two Shillings

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL. XLV

No. 5

MAY . 1963

CONTENTS

- Notes of the Month: May Day's Call to Action.** *Call for Unity—Against Beeching. Against Tory Ruin—Economic Somersaults—Government Tactics and the Trade Unions—A Gambler's Budget—After Us the Deluge—What is Labour's Alternative Policy?—Is Bi-partisanship Ended?—Danger Signals—U.S. Policy and Europe—May Day Calls to the Fight.....***R.P.D.** 195
- Defend the Railways.** A leading railwayman calls for action against the Beeching Plan.....**Arthur Leith** 210
- Battle for Jobs: The Forward March.** The rallying of united action against the Tories.....**Dick Beamish, P. Bannister** 213
- The Fight for New Trade Policies.** The need to improve East-West trade relations.....**John Eaton** 215
- England's Hut Tax.** A call to scrap the regressive rating system
Tom Vernon 222
- Housing the Homeless.** Description of the ruinous free-enterprise Tory housing policy.....**Katherine Hood** 225
- Arab Problems.** New features in the Middle-East situation.....
C. Enisah 229
- The Strikes in France.** An inside view of the French workers' united struggles.....**Leading French Railwayman** 233
- Dear Readers: *The Artificial Poverty of Civilisation*.....**
Angela Tuckett 193
- Illustration** 216-17
- Book Reviews.** 'Problems of Contemporary History', by R. Palme Dutt: *E. J. Hobsbawm* (Reader in History, Birkbeck College and author of 'Age of Revolution'). 'Africa in World Politics', by Vernon McKay: *Idris Cox* 238

DEAR READERS

The Artificial Poverty of Civilisation

'MAY DAY is above all days the most fitting for protest', wrote William Morris, 'when the promise of the year reproaches the waste inseparable from the society of inequality, the waste which produces our artificial poverty of civilisation.' He wrote that in *Justice* for the last May Day before his death, in 1896. It was never truer than today, when even at their present level the accumulated skill and technique of mankind, put to the service of human needs, could wipe out the very fear of poverty, disease and backwardness everywhere. Instead, the young are robbed of opportunity; the old are pinched and whittled down to fit economical graves; and—the ultimate idiocy—the fruit of each victory by mankind over nature serves only to make men and women 'redundant'. Instead of making even the deserts flourish, they explode H-bombs in them, and make an artificial waste of human lives. And all this under the lunatic shadow of a nuclear war threat to keep the system of private profit safe in dead men's hands. The brighter the returning spring the greater our sense of outrage at such a system of artificial poverty, which teaches as the height of ambition the most 'efficient' steering of social wealth into private pockets.

This May Day, in demonstrations great and small, there will be many marching who never dreamed of doing so before—including teachers, railwaymen, shipyard workers, school-leavers, suddenly awakened to the artificial waste in which they have been living. What is needed to

meet this quickening pace of events is to break through the fog of press lies and distortions of reality and bring home 'the facts of life,' as an *Essex teacher* writes. A *Kent* reader says: 'In Britain today, with increasing class struggles, never was there a time more opportune to propagate Marxist ideas. In this *Labour Monthly* deserves the utmost support, particularly from the Labour movement. Best wishes in your very valuable Socialist work.' I have heard recently from readers in two islands off the *Scottish coast*, where the islanders were the first to feel the economic blows 'now being dealt out to all Scotland.' He describes what a fight it meant to bring 'confidence and direction and provide positive leadership—*L.M.* helps a lot with arguments to counter BBC propaganda, which is so important in isolated places.' From another *island reader*: 'It's the most convincing and consistent advocate for peace in this country and America.' A reader who sends all her copies to a friend in the *U.S.* quotes his comment: 'We have nothing at all like it here, either for the well-written English or the clarity of viewpoint. We look forward to it every month and I am the most popular man in town when it arrives.' From *Wales*, the editor of a socialist magazine writes that *L.M.* 'is one of the best magazines propagating socialism I know. I wish I could give more than this to the fund, but as a Minister of Religion I am one of the lowest paid members of this affluent community.' An old friend from *Kent* remarks that the

increased price should *increase* circulation, 'by reminding readers that a gold-mine of Socialist nuggets is cheap at two bob.' A younger reader from *London*, brought up as a Tory, wonders what were the contents in the 'thirties of this 'good companion, guide, educator and friend.' It is always a pleasure to hear from the younger and newer readers, and none the less because of late we have had our losses.

There is *H.G.B.*, who figured in the fund list for many years. We shall not see the handwriting again of this talented, gay, spirited Socialist sailor, who gave us a picture he had himself painted of his first ship, in which he had sailed in the early 'nineties on an Arctic Exploration. We must also say farewell to a remarkable reader from Surrey, *George Fitt*, who started his political life over 60 years ago at 15, giving out leaflets for the Social Democratic Federation. I had hoped to quote this month a letter received

from him describing how a new reader he had won was 'more than pleased and states what good reading *L.M.* is.' For despite delicate health, *George Fitt* was always looking for new converts as well as faithfully contributing his extra shilling a month to the fund. Below you will see, for March and April, his last contribution, which Mrs. Fitt yet found time to send when he was taken to hospital, because she knew he would wish it. Such steady, persistent, life-long fighters for socialism, whom long fighters for socialism, whom nothing can dismay, are the heart, sinews and backbone of the movement. They have built themselves into the foundations of our new world of socialism; they will long be remembered in that future life. We salute them, and all stalwart fighters for peace and socialism the world over this May Day.

ANGELA TUCKETT

*O valiant Earth, O happy year
That mocks the threat of winter
near,
And hangs aloft from tree to tree
The banners of the Spring to be.*

Remembering *George Fitt* and *H. G. Blewett*, our friends and comrades.

£89 12s. 0d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: 'Daisy Bell', £10; 'Windfall', £10; S. Turner (for Daisy Mendez, Cuba), 5s; B. W. Mackay, 6s; plus extra donation for price rise, 5s; G.L., 1s 3d; E. Strachan Rogers, £3 13s; 'Backslider', £10; L. Bates, 5s; H. Brindle, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 2s; Oldham Branch, 1s; H.H., £10; G.F., £10; 'S. Mill', £1; J. Tarver, 5s; R.F.B., £3; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 10s; 'Anon', Whitechurch, 4s; B. Ainley, 10s; S. Morrissy, £1; 'In Memory of Joe Brien', 3s; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; G. Fitt, 2s; 'Pax', 2s 6d; L'Humanite, 4s; D. Sandwell, 4s 6d; S. Townsend, 10s; M. Illing, £1; 'Oliver Twist and Friends', 15s; R. Dodd, £1; N. Usher, 2s 6d; F.G.A., 10s; J. A. Smith, 6s; R. McLeod, 5s; 'Butcher Family', 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; E.J.B., 10s; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal), 1s.

OTHER DONATIONS include: L.J.M. (Canada), 8s; W. Harmer, 1s 6d; W. Eckersley, £1 10s; H. Wolff, £1; H. Kirkham, 4s; B. Norman £2; E. Thomas, 3s; O. Ford, 5s; M. Hall, £1; K. A. Waddington, 5s; M. Brandt, 2s 6d; G. Hunter, 15s; S. Childs, 9s; G. M. Lea, 9s; W. Buchanan, 5s; L. A. Boyd, 4s; T. Powell, 2s; H. J. Daruwala, 5s; R. G. Benians, £2 2s; Ann Duncan, 4s 6d; J. Berger, 16s; D. Lewis, 10s; A. W. Wales, 2s; R. Bridgeman, 4s; C. J. Hull, 5s; J. Bowman, 2s; Edith Walthall, 10s 6d; B.F. (New Zealand), 3s; N. MacDonald, £1 1s; A. A. Woolf, 4s 6d; 'A Pakistani Friend', £3; W. Kelsall, 9s; W.G.D. (Australia), £5; J. Bird, £1 9s; N. L. Dodsworth, 19s; J. R. Smith, 10s; B.J.M., 5s; M. Hopkins, £1; F.W. (U.S.A.), 4s 4d; B.H. (U.S.A.), £1 15s 5d.

Our thanks to you all.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

Co-op. No. L.99482.

FINchley 5135.

Notes of the Month

MAY DAY'S CALL TO ACTION

Our strong arm will rise and the chains of slavery will fall. The toilers of Russia will arise and terror will strike the hearts of the capitalists and of all other enemies of the working class.

(Lenin, May Day Manifesto of the League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class, 1896.)

THIS May Day of 1963 sees the level of the working class movement rising in all the countries of the Western capitalist world. The Mass Lobby for Jobs on March 26, with 7,000 converging on London from Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, the North East, Yorkshire, Lancashire and all industrial England, organised by five Federations of Trades Councils with the support of the Scottish Trades Union Congress and the Northern Ireland Committee of the Irish Congress of Trades Unions, alongside a host of trades councils, trade union district committees and branches and joint shop stewards' committees, and with 10,000 marching in the procession leading up to the orderly marshalling at the doors of parliament, which the charges of police and mounted police vainly sought to disorganise, revealed a measure of response without previous precedent even in the thirties—and indicating significantly the difference and advance in the stage of the movement since the thirties. Elsewhere in this number we print contributions giving impressions and drawing lessons from this demonstration by participants.

May Day's Call for Unity

In France the historic five weeks general strike of the miners, with the support of the railwaymen and other sections (we print elsewhere a report from a French railwaymen's leader written at the conclusion of the strike) successfully defied the dictatorial requisition orders of de Gaulle, and compelled the concession of the wage increase over two stages which had previously been refused. What made possible this strength of the Mass Lobby and of the French miners' fight? Unity, unity and again unity—the great message of May Day. Communists and non-Communists, Labour Party and non-party trade unionists, co-operated together in the organisation and marched together in the demonstration of the Mass Lobby. This made possible its unprecedented support, and points the way

forward for the future. In France the great strike battles of the miners and other sections had the official leadership of all three trade union federations, Communist, Socialist and Catholic. Working class unity made it possible to defy the extraordinary powers of de Gaulle. This also points the way forward to that working class and democratic unity which can restore and renew democracy in France.

Against Beeching—Against Tory Ruin

In Britain also the lesson and need of unity is no less insistent. The battle of the railwaymen, which is also the battle of the whole labour movement and of the entire people, against the Beeching offensive of transport disruption and chaos (an offensive, not in the interests of transport rationalisation, but in the interests of the oil colonial monopolists and the car magnates to create greater chaos on the roads) is now coming to a head. In Britain also the same unity needs to be carried forward in the political field to hasten the fall of this corrupt and crumbling Tory Government, which is only sinking Britain deeper along the path of ruin, and to advance the fight for the alternative programme and policy which Britain's future requires.

Span of Thirty Years

Only thirty years ago Hitler was imposing his Nazi caricature of May Day in Berlin and Germany and ordering the German workers to march at his command. The reformist leaders of the German Trade Union Federation, hailing the Nazi 'revolution' as a 'continuation' of the 1918 revolution, and proclaiming that the common enemy was Communism, officially instructed the workers to participate in Hitler's May Day. 'The union leaders' (the Social Democratic leaders of the German Trade Union Federation), declared the then Labour *Daily Herald* on April 24, 1933, 'have sealed their reconciliation with the new rulers of Germany'. Nevertheless, this subserviency did not win for the Social Democratic trade union leadership the hoped for position of a recognised and tolerated adjunct to fascism. A large proportion of the workers in the big enterprises refused to obey their leaders' instructions and held off the Nazi May Day demonstration. As soon as it was thus clear that the hold of the reformist leadership on the workers was insufficient for the purposes of fascism, immediately on the next day, on May 2, the Nazis took over the trade unions, incorporating them into their

Labour Front, and threw the leaders into prison, replacing them by Nazi officials. 'The Leiparts and the Grassmanns', declared Dr. Ley, the leader of the Nazi Labour Front, 'may profess their devotion to Hitler; but they are better in prison'. There is a lesson of unity here also for today, and for our modern 'Democratic Socialists' who (with this shift in the label to hide their past) carry on the tradition and methods of Social Democracy. The disrupters of working class unity do not only strike their victims, but in the end bare their own breasts to the enemy and suffer in their own skins. The lesson might still be recommended to the gentlemen of Transport House and Great Russell Street. Perhaps also Frank Cousins may find it useful to consider this experience of the German trade unions and recognise that the maintenance of the anti-communist ban in the great union which he leads is not in the interests of working class militancy and strength.

From May Day, 1933, to May Day, 1963

Between these two May Days, within the short span of thirty years, the world has decisively changed. And the great changes have been achieved precisely where working class unity, anti-fascist unity or anti-imperialist unity have been realised. Thirty years ago what was the picture of the world? Hitler's terror was tearing the living body of Germany and preparing its offensive to extend that terror over all Europe. Fascism ruled the countries of Eastern Europe up to the borders of the Soviet Union. Socialism embraced only one-twelfth of the world's population, though the strength and endurance and unbreakable unity of that socialist twelfth of the world, in alliance with the anti-fascist struggle of the peoples, was finally to save mankind from fascist destruction. Colonial slavery dominated all Southern and Eastern Asia, the Middle East, Africa, the majority of mankind. Lenin's picture of a world enslaved and paying tribute to a handful of financiers in the capitals of Western Europe and the United States was still true. All that is now changed. Socialism has extended from one-twelfth to one-third of the world's population. The chains of colonialism are being shattered (not yet completely, not yet the chains of colonialist economic subjection and tribute, though the formation of independent states has been widely won; the great revolutions in Southern Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America are still maturing) by the upsurge of the peoples. And now in the remaining imperialist minority sector of the world in the West, the once leading and

temporarily retarded parasitic Western sector, still the hotbed of imperialist reaction and the arms race, today the working class and its allies among the middle sections of the population, under the blows of the contradictions of capitalism and the worsening economic situation, are stirring against their monopolist rulers.

Dilemmas of Western Capitalism

'The class struggle is obsolete.' The 'new capitalism' in the advanced Western countries has eliminated the old contradictions and mass unemployment. 'The legends of the dole queues of the thirties mean nothing to young workers today.' Such has been the music offered by the apostles of the 'new socialism' in the Western imperialist countries during the past decade and a half. The singers of these tunes are piping very low today and bashfully looking the other way. The Director of the International Monetary Fund, Per Jacobsson, speaking in New York on February 19, warned:

The post-war expansion in the United States and Europe is over, and a new situation has arisen which shows certain similarities with what happened in the early nineteen-thirties.

President Kennedy in speech after speech has emphasised the menace of 'disaster' for the American economy unless his desperate emergency programme of wholesale tax cuts and a huge budget deficit were adopted:

The spectre of 'disaster' for the American economy was conjured up today in Washington by President Kennedy in arguing for a cut in income tax and against a cut in the budget. (*Daily Telegraph*, March 14, 1963.)

Yesterday in Chicago President Kennedy warned that the United States might face 'ten years of recession' and chronic economic troubles unless Congress passed his proposed tax cuts. (*Sunday Times*, March 24, 1963.)

In West Germany Chancellor Adenauer declared to the Bundesrat on February 6 that 'the economic miracle . . . has come to an end'. In Britain the March unemployment figure of three-quarters of a million (after the end of the special freeze-up circumstances of the preceding two months) was the highest March figure since the second world war had brought an end to the mass unemployment of the thirties, while surveys of industry showed two-thirds of factories with productive capacity under-used, the index of production heavily fallen, and the pound sterling having to be propped up in face of falling confidence.

Economic and Political Battles

It is this worsening of conditions, and explosion of the legends of the supposed 'new' capitalist prosperity and solution of contradictions during the recent years of relative boom, which has found reflection in the marked rise of the tempo of the class struggle in all the countries of Western Europe. The significant feature of this development of the class struggle has been its political repercussions. Already last year the heroic struggle of the Asturias miners and the general actions all over Spain have reduced the Franco régime to an increasingly precarious situation and brought in view the prospect of its downfall. In France we have seen how the strikes of the miners and railwaymen and the solidarity actions of other sections, with the associated leadership of all three trade union bodies, has laid the basis for a further development of co-operation of Communists, Socialists and Catholic Republicans which, if carried forward, could replace the authoritarian rule of de Gaulle by a renovated democracy—not the paralysed sterility of the later years of the Fourth Republic, after American intervention through the Marshall Plan had destroyed its democratic electoral-parliamentary basis by excluding the largest party from government, but on a broad democratic basis of popular co-operation. In Britain the development of the mass struggle in the economic field has been closely associated with the demand for the resignation of the Tory Government and for new elections. The political bankruptcy of policy and universal discredit of the Macmillan Tory Government has now reached record proportions, unequalled since the days of the Neville Chamberlain Tory Government or the dying Balfour Tory Government before the electoral anti-Tory landslide of 1906.

Tory Government's Economic Somersaults

It is equally this worsening economic situation, combined with the rising resistance of the workers and discontent of the middle sections previously adhering to Toryism, which has given rise to the Macmillan Government's desperate succession of expedients and universally derided economic somersaults, most glaringly illustrated in Maudling's Budget. These somersaults are not merely the reflection of obvious electoral calculations—the aspect on which the Labour Front Bench has mainly concentrated its fire. They are also the reflection of the glaring contradictions and dilemmas of the boosted new 'managed' capitalism and 'mixed economy'—the aspect on which the Labour theorists have been less concerned to dwell.

The record has been a record of successive reversals of the engines. Already in the summer of 1961, in face of the weak industrial and trading position and the adverse balance of payments, the Government, after a spendthrift budget of concessions to the rich surtax payers in the spring, hastily reversed the engines, and imposed drastic economy cuts with increased taxation and credit restriction and higher interest rates, and called for a 'wage pause'—that is, to oppose any increases of wages, irrespective of rising prices. This was declared to be essential in order to restrict home demand and thereby compel manufacturers to concentrate on increasing exports at the expense of the home market. As the outcome showed, the effect was to throttle production without increasing exports, which went down further.

Industrial Battles of 1962

From the outset this policy of the wage-freeze met with resistance from the workers. At the Portsmouth Trades Union Congress in September, 1961, the Chairman's Address of Ted Hill declared that 'there is little hope of any trade union responding to the Government's appeal'. In January, 1962, the London tube strike paralysed London traffic and brought business in the capital city to a standstill. In January and February the two 24-hour token general strikes of the engineers all over the country showed overwhelming enthusiasm and solidarity in response. Over 1962 the number of workers officially recorded as involved in strikes was 4,421,000—the highest figure since the general strike year of 1926 (although allowance must be made for duplication through the two 24-hour strikes). The number of working days lost through strikes was 5,794,000—the highest since 1957, and in contrast to an average of 3,940,000 during the eight years 1954-61. Nevertheless, the readiness of response of the workers, shown where the trade unions gave the call for action, was heavily limited by the paralysing role of the dominant right wing leadership in the unions. The Government's wage freeze was to this extent successful that during the second half of 1961 and the first half of 1962 the advance in weekly wage rates fell behind the advance in retail prices, and only barely caught up in the second half of 1962.

Government Tactics and the Trade Unions

Faced with the measure of resistance of the workers, the Government pursued two tactical methods. First, they replaced the 'wage pause' by an appeal for 'wage restraint', operative from March,

1962, to apply a 'guiding light' of a maximum increase of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent—now raised, since the Maudling Budget, to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Second, they sought to draw in the trade union bureaucracy into co-operation by setting up the two bodies, the National Economic Development Council and the National Incomes Commission, and inviting General Council participation in these organs of co-operation with a Tory Government. The General Council accepted to join N.E.D.C. by a vote of 21 to 8, but rejected participation in N.I.C.—a characteristically contradictory pair of decisions, reflecting the ambiguity of the position of the reformist leadership trying to bridge both sides of the class struggle. But the rapid further worsening of the economic situation, the growth of mass unemployment, and the anger and resistance aroused by the Government's ruthless rationalisation offensive, through Beeching to close down railways, through Robens to close down pits, and through Boyle against Burnham and the teachers, tore holes in the policies of class co-operation, and compelled the Government to resort to new expedients, culminating in Maudling's Budget.

Reversing the Engines Again

By the summer of 1962 it had become clear to all that the effects of the Government's policy of economy restriction measures were proving disastrous. Restriction of the home market had not led to the expected increase in exports. Production was throttled. Steel output in 1962 was 7 per cent below the level of 1961, which had already been 16 per cent below the level of 1960; the present level is running at 70 per cent of capacity. The increase of production in 1962 was estimated at a record low level of under 1 per cent. Between the second quarter of 1962 and the fourth quarter of 1962 the index of industrial production fell by 1.9 per cent. In July, 1962, in a drastic Cabinet reorganisation Lloyd, the 'Economy' Chancellor was sacked, and in his place was put Maudling to reverse the engines. All the aims, it was now declared, must be set towards a policy of 'expansion'—of course on a basis of 'wage restraint'—with extension of credit, lower interest rates, reduction of taxation and cheerful contemplation of the prospect of budget deficits. This was parallel to the similar moves of Kennedy during the recent period, faced with the same intractable problem of stagnant production and mass unemployment continuing in the American economy, despite all his buoyant electoral and inaugural promises of a 'dynamic' 'forward' uplift.

Maudling's Budget

This is the situation which has found expression in Maudling's Budget with its tax reductions of £269 million and a prospective net deficit of £687 million. Kennedy this year has budgetted for tax reductions of £2,143 million and a deficit of £4,249 million. Britain's scale is smaller; but in each case the principle of the magic holy health-giving deficit is the same; and in each case increased arms expenditure helps to make the deficit larger than the tax reductions. Last year's budget aimed at a surplus of £433 million on current account; this year's at a deficit of £90 million on current account. Last year's budget on the total account resulted in a net deficit of £66 million; this year's calculates to increase the net deficit by £621 million. This is the essence of the plan for 'expansion'—which is the opposite of a serious physical plan to take over and expand the productive resources and output of the nation. Indeed, the physical plans (Beeching) are largely the opposite. The prospects of inducing manufacturers by tax incentives to move northwards into the areas of high unemployment are a weak alternative to real planning, when simultaneously these areas, whose problems can only be tackled as a whole, are being denuded of the transport necessary for industrial development and local life and turned into derelict areas. What the left hand of the Government offers the right hand takes away.

A Gambler's Budget

But what happens to the pound sterling? Two years ago all the Government Ministers and all the wiseacres of the financial press and expert economic preachers to the populace were proclaiming that Britain would face ruin on the balance of payments and the collapse of the pound unless home demand were curbed, exports forced up and a large surplus achieved in the budget. Now they are all singing the opposite tune (except, of course, for the continued need of 'wage restraint'). No wonder the Labour Front Bench have been having a high old time in the budget debate quoting previous speeches of Ministers amid uproarious laughter. By all means let them enjoy their parliamentary game of battledore and shuttlecock and find exhilaration in scoring palpable hits. But the real economic situation deserves more serious attention. The Government is embarking on a gamble, the old familiar gamble of the financial shot in the arm to stimulate the patient instead of treating his sickness; and the consequences, especially if this is only the first stage, as

widely anticipated, to a further electioneering budget next year, may produce new critical conditions and further deterioration of the economic situation in the end.

After Us the Deluge

Is there any present prospect of the revival of capitalist world trade to make possible the large increase of exports required simultaneously to cover the gigantic increase in Government overseas, mainly military, expenditure (from £147 million net in 1957 to £371 million in 1962) and to prevent the inflationary measures resulting in a new crisis in the balance of payments in the not distant future? On the contrary, the battle between the rival capitalist powers for export markets is sharpening. The attempt to increase exports, says Maudling, will be 'a formidable task'. 'I am not in a position to commit myself to an export target at present', says Board of Trade Minister Erroll. Already the pound has been propped up, as Maudling revealed in his budget speech, by heavy drawings on Continental banks and the International Monetary Fund. And if these credits should begin to become exhausted? By that time, if the storm breaks, the Tories evidently calculate, there will be a Labour Government to inherit the mess. Indeed, the Tory Ministers might seem to be engaged at present in creating the maximum chaos and breakdowns in every direction in readiness for a supposedly inevitable Labour Government to inherit: not only in the economic-financial situation; but in foreign policy; in nuclear strategy; in Central Africa; in Kenya; in the operation of the Beeching programme or the Greater London Act. The Labour Government would then have the job, as usual, to pick up the pieces, and, while continuing the basic imperialist cold war foreign policy, to patch up capitalism, impose the necessary controls and austerity, and thereby earn popular revulsion against these horrors of 'socialism'; after which the Tories, swinging back on this tide of revulsion, could gaily enter on a new spendthrift and racketeering orgy. Such would appear to be the present Tory calculation. The responsibility rests with the labour movement to defeat this calculation by being armed in time with a policy which really breaks with the past, breaks with the vicious cold war Nato foreign and nuclear policies, and opens a direct attack on the monopolies.

What is Labour's Alternative Policy?

This is the situation which renders so important already today the character of the answer to the question: What is Labour's alternative

policy? What will be the policy of a Labour Government? The popular demand for new elections, for an end to the Tory Government, for a new Government and a new alternative policy, has reached unparalleled strength. The Gallup poll in March showed two-thirds of the electorate demanding a new election, while the proportion of Conservative supporters had fallen heavily to 33½ per cent, that of the Liberals had diminished slightly from the previous rapid expansion to 15½ per cent, but the support for Labour had risen to 50 per cent—a figure without parallel for the support of any party in these Gallup polls since their inception. It is true that the recent run of by-elections has shown a certain variation on this picture: the Tory vote has slumped even more heavily in these constituencies, reaching less than one-fifth of the vote, with lost deposits in two cases; but the Labour vote has shown a tendency also to drop slightly. This is in some degree a pointer to the central problem of the present political situation.

Crux of the Problem

The anger of all sections of the people against the Tory Government, the rise in the level and tempo of the class struggle, is preparing the conditions for the return of a Labour Government as the visible alternative. But there is not the same degree of popular confidence in the policy of the Labour Party as presenting the alternative for which the people are looking. That is why the fight for the defeat of Toryism cannot be separated from the fight for an effective alternative policy. The two sides cannot be separated. The significance of the fight of the Communist candidates, however limited in scale under present conditions, in some of the current by-elections, the municipal elections in May or the coming general election is precisely that it gives expression to these two sides of the fight and thereby strengthens the fight of the whole labour movement. It may be worth noting that in the two by-elections where the Tories lost their deposits Communist candidates were fighting and thereby raised the whole level of the anti-Tory campaign.

Is Bi-partisanship Ended?

The popular demand for an alternative policy is equivalent to the demand for an end to bi-partisanship. But the initial signs of recent parliamentary debates, also after the election of Harold Wilson as Leader, have not been too promising. In the first general debate on policy in the House of Commons on February 11, the general

verdict of the press was to note the essential identity of policy behind the 'sound and fury' of the customary polemics:

A surprising amount of common ground between the Government and the opposition could be discerned. (*Guardian*, February 12, 1963.)

While roundly declaring the Government's whole policy in ruins and berating the Prime Minister for having no alternative plans ready, Mr. Wilson was unable to outline any very different plans himself.

(*The Times*, February 12, 1963.)

When the Opposition blueprint was analysed, it would be found that most of the proposals put forward had already been adopted by the Government.

(Reginald Maudling in the debate.)

Behind all the sound and fury, the justifiable accusations of incompetence and the calls for resignation, there was, as usual, a wide measure of agreement between the Front Benches about general policy objectives.

(*The Times*, February 15, 1963.)

Or take the debate on the budget. The concentration of Labour's Front Bench spokesmen on exhuming endless quotations from the wise saws of Macmillan and Lloyd during the period of deflation no doubt produced the most witty parliamentary scoring points; and Government Ministers were reported as grinning with delighted amusement. Well they might grin: for the effect was to turn all the attack on the temporarily defunct Lloyd for the benefit of Maudling. The main criticism of Maudling became that he had come round to Labour's policy too slowly and too late.

His criticism was certainly not that the Government had been expansionist this year in the budget, but that for three years they had held back expansion. . . . He was glad that the Chancellor had said that expanding production and a strong pound went together. . . . He welcomed the Chancellor's conversion to the proposals that the Opposition made a long time ago for linking aid to underdeveloped countries with the unemployment problem in Britain. (Harold Wilson in the House of Commons on

April 3, *The Times* report.)

The net effect becomes a certificate of merit for Maudling.

From Gaitskell to Wilson

The transition from Gaitskell to Wilson as Leader of the Labour Party since February has brought certain new factors bearing on the perspective of a future Labour Government. The role of the Leader is neither to be exaggerated nor under-estimated. In the structure of the Labour Party the hierarchical tradition of leadership from above, inherited from bourgeois parliamentarism, by which the Leader or Prime Minister lays down policy for his followers, has been uneasily yoked with the democratic working class principle of

the sovereignty of the elected conference of delegates. The always latent conflict was brought into the open by Gaitskell in repudiating Scarborough in 1960. The death of Gaitskell, as our contributor E. M. Winterton vividly described in our March issue, was treated with almost monarchical reverence by the B.B.C. and press, with a memorial service in Westminster Abbey, attended by the Government and Diplomatic Corps, and with the Archbishop of Canterbury officiating. All this has demonstrated the vital importance to the bourgeoisie of the position of Leader of the Labour Party as almost the centrepiece of the modern British Constitution. Hence the attention given by all political quarters to the choice of his successor.

Significance of Wilson's Election

Initially it was evident that official conservative quarters and their press favoured the extreme right wing candidate, George Brown. Wilson's capacity was recognised; but he had blotted his copybook in the past by one or two left adventures, as when he had resigned with Bevan in 1951, or stood against Gaitskell as Leader after Scarborough in 1960; and *The Times* feared that he might as Leader 'embitter party and class politics'. But as the election proceeded, it became clear that, with the existing currents to the left in the working class and popular opinion, Brown would antagonise wide sections of the labour movement; while Wilson, precisely because of his measure of popularity with the left, and greater skill, might prove more suitable in the coming difficult period to hold together the Labour Party and a prospective Labour Government and present the official policy in a more acceptable fashion. In the final election Wilson was elected Leader in February by 144 votes to 103 for Brown. Wilson's vote, exceeding his 1960 vote by 63, may be regarded as representing the combination of the left and the centre (these are very relative terms in the Parliamentary Labour Party) and perhaps some more calculating elements from the right. Brown's vote represented the hard core of the irreconcilable right wing.

Whose Leadership? Whose Policy?

The election of Wilson as Leader has been acclaimed by many on the left in the Labour Party as a victory for their viewpoint. This is certainly a picture far removed from the real balance of forces in the Parliamentary Labour Party and in official Labour policy. The real balance of forces in the parliamentary party was shown in their election of a Parliamentary Executive of confirmed right wingers, in

complete contrast to the election of left wingers by the constituency party delegates at the Annual Conference from their representatives on the Party Executive. Wilson's Shadow Cabinet consists entirely of this entrenched Right Wing, with the addition only, in a minor position, of the ambiguous centrist Crossman. The Shadow Foreign Minister, Gordon-Walker, made his first parliamentary intervention on March 5 to declare that 'what deterred Russia from making an isolated attack on Britain was the fear that they would be exposed to an annihilating first-strike from America' and to criticise the Government for not supplying sufficient troops for Nato in Germany. The same demand was expressed by Reginald Paget in the Army estimates debate on March 19 when he stated that a Labour Government would increase Britain's Nato contribution to four divisions of 80,000 men, in place of the present 55,000.

New Currents

The fight on policy has to be fought in the broad labour movement. Only the innocent would imagine that Wilson as Leader could inaugurate a basic change in official policy, even if he wished to do so. Nor is there any reason to assume that that is his desire. Indeed, his first declaration after his election was to affirm that he would continue the policies of Gaitskell—that is, to give assurances to the right wing with whom the power at the top lies. On the other hand, there is no doubt that his election by a keenly contested vote against 103 for the extreme right wing candidate is a reflection of the present balance of forces in the labour movement, and also of the rising left currents in the working class and in the general political situation. New questions are arising, and will further arise, to which Wilson will not necessarily react in the same way that Gaitskell would have done. Wilson showed his skill and political flair in the first beginnings of his leadership by making some gestures which, without departing from official policy, could win some popularity with the left. He reaffirmed in his first intervention in Parliament that Clause IV, affirming the aim of the Labour Party to be the common ownership of the means of production, was the policy of the whole Labour Party. He promised repeal of the Rent Act. He emphasised the importance of de facto recognition of the German Democratic Republic, thereby arousing the anger of Brandt and Continental Social Democrats. He addressed a public rally of the Anti-Apartheid Movement in Trafalgar Square to call for the cessation of the supply of arms to South Africa. (Although

since then he appears to have repudiated this by stating that a Labour government would continue to fulfil the Simonstown Agreement for the supply of naval armaments and planes to South Africa).

Danger Signals

On the other hand, the more dangerous negative signs have so far outweighed these positive expressions. He has been assiduous to reassure the right wing by reaffirming his support of Nato and the American alliance. In an interview on Bonn television he explained that he would only recognise the German Democratic Republic in the same sense that he would recognise 'an elephant in the zoo', but not establish diplomatic relations. He added that a Labour Government would seek to reopen negotiations for Britain's entry into the Common Market. While accepting an invitation to visit Moscow, as Gaitskell had been about to do at the moment of his illness, he made sure to arrange a prior visit to Kennedy in Washington. In his accounts so far given of his visit to Washington, he has emphasised the close understanding reached with Kennedy; his acceptance of United States monopoly and direction of Western nuclear strategy ('recognition of the United States as the custodian of the strategic deterrent', according to *The Times* report); his intention, not to renounce, but to place British nuclear weapons under American command; and his acceptance of the United States demand for an increased British contribution of 'conventional' forces for Nato. All this chimes in with the demands of United States policy for Britain. No wonder his reception in Washington was rapturous. At this moment even the normally subservient Tory Government is making some stand and entering into some degree of conflict with the United States over the supply of steel pipes to the Soviet Union, over the possible import of Soviet oil, and over the resistance to the demand for more troops for Nato. It would be unfortunate if the Labour Party or a prospective Labour Government should come to be regarded by the electorate as the 'Voice of America'.

United States Policy and Europe

There is no doubt that the White House and the State Department are taking into account the rising left currents in Western Europe and are making their calculations accordingly to find suitable partners for their cold war policy. On March 28 the Washington correspondent of *The Times* reported:

It might seem strange that conservative America is hoping for socialist victories in Europe, and of course a great many Europeans would be apprehensive. Nevertheless, the White House long ago made it known that a Labour Government in Britain and a Social Democratic Government in West Germany would not be unwelcome.

The United States Administration generally wants of Western Europe a new political stability and the cohesion that an ideological identity could possibly bring. The idea seems to be that Mr. Wilson in Britain and Herr Brandt in Germany, along with their Italian, Scandinavian and other colleagues, might possibly act together as did the Catholic Christian Democrats in the immediate post-war years.

Behold the 'new line' of American support of 'socialism' to carry forward the cold war in the new era. To which might be added, as in accordance with the 'new line', the parallel support of 'Arab Socialism' to cover counter-revolutionary terror in the Middle East. Forewarned is fore-armed. Let the British labour movement be forewarned. We do not want to see such social reform plans as a fourth Labour Government may attempt (leaving out of account for the moment the discussion of the limitation of such plans as so far put forward) wrecked once again by Bevinism and Fulton.

May Day Calls to the Fight

Thus May Day calls to the fight in this coming critical year alike in the industrial and in the political field. It is essential to defeat the Tory Government's offensive on the working class. It is essential to unite on the broadest front in order to hasten the defeat of the Tory Government in the electoral arena, and to secure the return of a new Government for a new policy. And it is essential to fight at the same time with all the strength of every section of the labour movement for the real alternative policy which is required in order that such a policy shall become the policy of the new Government which is formed. Both sides of the fight are inseparable. The necessity of unity against Toryism must not be allowed to be used as a pretext to paralyse the parallel essential fight for the alternative policy which the situation requires. The combination of these two aspects of the fight is the condition of victory. These lines are written before the Communist Party Congress at Easter. But there is no doubt that this Communist Party Congress will make its contribution to this common aim.

April 8, 1963.

R.P.D.

Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties

DEFEND THE RAILWAYS

Arthur Leith

Chairman, Secretarial Council 2, Scottish Region, A.S.L.E. & F.

IT is twelve months since I reported the Lobby of Parliament by Scottish Railwaymen and Scottish Unions on March 8, 1962. At that time we were joined by many English Railwaymen and could muster around three hundred men. Since then many demonstrations have taken place by Railwaymen of all grades, representing, National Union of Railwaymen, Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, and Confederation members. All-Britain demonstrations have made their presence felt before Parliament. And possibly for the first time Railwaymen of all unions played their part in the broad demonstration of March 26, for the right to work.

From these early seeds of action came the National Rail Strike of October 3, and the main unions becoming committed to National Industrial action. The N.U.R. and Confederated Unions have already stopped the Railways on the basis of the Workshop Plan on closures, and with the rising mood of all all-grades membership, can be expected to demonstrate in a wider form of Industrial action. The A.S.L.E.&F. leadership is also committed to industrial action, having agreed to the 1962 Annual Assembly of Delegates' decision on rail closures. It is ironical that this policy of 'industrial action' failed to get a majority at the N.U.R.'s Annual General Meeting in 1962, yet they used it on October 3, 1962. Whilst it got a majority at the Locomen's conference, it still has not been applied by A.S.L.E.&F. That apart, it now appears that the meeting of Railway Trade Union leaders on April 8, 1963, agreed that Joint Industrial action is now a real possibility. This creates a close bond of unity amongst the N.U.R. Locomen and Confederation Unions. No doubt the campaign within the unions of rank and file members has given a necessary impetus towards direct action, to those trade union leaders who need and deserve this push!

It is accepted that a National Rail stoppage in itself, will not stop the Plan. The need of the day is for the whole Labour movement to lead broad sections of the people to resist the Plan and create the conditions for an early General Election. Already, it appears, that Mr. Noble, Scottish Secretary of State, has reservations about

the Plan as it affects Scotland. Even the Premier had qualifications. This is Tory double-talk calculated to deceive the people. There may even be slight concessions on some lines scheduled for closure, in an effort to give the Plan some form of respectability and decency. Let Railwaymen and the public 'gang warily'! It is now clear the Plan is a blueprint on Rail closures and not Rail Development. What are the differences between it and labour movement policy? First of all it is based on Profitability: When a line does not pay close it. The Beeching Plan accepts that profitability should be the first commandment. The second is obviously to transfer traffic to the roads if it does not meet the first.

The 'Modernisation and Re-equipment of British Railways' Plan of December, 1954, para 9, laid down:

Indeed the question in the Commission's mind is the amount by which the total returns on the outlay will exceed the minimum figure of £85 millions a year, and this without the benefits accruing to the public direct, such as a better service, lower charges than would otherwise prevail, *and a major contribution to relief of road congestion.*

The 50,000 people who will die on our roads between now and 1970 when the Railways will 'almost' pay, had better make their voices heard now! The anticipated increase in private motoring and the transfer of traffic from rail under the Beeching Plan, will ensure, at least, that they will have the company of possibly another 50,000 valuable lives.

The plan itself not only envisages this transfer of traffic to the roads, but openly visualises that further closures may be necessary after experience. There is a suggestion that holiday and other 'peak' services are not justified because the cost of providing the coaches and power far outweighs the return involved. It goes on to suggest some form of seating control and a fares policy (that means an increase!). What if the bus operators also judged on this basis? After all, if they can only use their luxury coaches during the holiday and 'peak' periods, surely they can also argue that they do not get the same return as buses on regular services? Or what if Dr. Beeching examined the London Underground in the same way?

The next positive aspect of the Beeching Plan is the question of coal distribution. This part deals with hauling coal in train load quantities to depots of distribution. It is envisaged that this will be carried, by agreement of the Coal Board, in trains that can be loaded and emptied in a few moments by the use of hopper-fitted wagons. The Plan goes on: page 33, para 2, 'For the same reason, the changes

will be beneficial to the coal trade as a whole, but may not be welcomed by all individual merchants, *especially some of the smaller ones!* Coming from the private monopoly of I.C.I., the Doctor will have in mind large private monopoly of coal distribution. The miners will be thinking of the nationalisation of coal distribution, to keep this in step with nationalisation of coal production and the evident need for a national fuel policy. The Railwaymen will be seeing the question in the light of a national transport policy.

Beeching's plan therefore unites the forces of long-distance, short-distance and commuter travellers whose only outlook is either no services or limitation of services and increased fares. It unites the private motorist due to the additional hazards he can expect by greater road congestion. It unites the many people and areas that will be denuded of rail services, leaving them open to the direct monopoly—with increased fares—of the road operators. It unites the road transport worker, who is also faced with greater speed-up and exploitation on roads that will become more and more congested. It can even unite the railway trade unions on a broad basis!

The immediate task of the railway unions is to ensure that the movement of protest is co-ordinated and finds expression in the Trades Councils; Labour Parties and other working-class bodies; that the fight should be broadened to include the many organisations and people who see the Plan as a danger to them, to their country and to an adequate transport system.

At some time, action by railwaymen themselves will be necessary. That is, a withdrawal of labour to demonstrate to the people that railwaymen are serious and really concerned at the destruction of their industry by a government with only the authority of lost deposits. The pressure from trade union branches must be maintained and the Labour Party and Trades Union Congress brought into the struggle to defend Britain's nationalised railway system. These main organisations have to urge the shelving of the Beeching Plan until an examination of all transport is made, and taking into account all aspects, economic and social. The Labour Party have to declare their position in regard to the form that nationalisation has taken and its weaknesses; where mistakes exist they have to be corrected. Above all, they have to lead the struggle against the murder of the railways, not by saying that industrial action will assist the Tories, but by supporting railwaymen in their unchosen struggle to defend their industry and the property of the British people.

BATTLE FOR JOBS : THE FORWARD MARCH

Dick Beamish

Executive Member, South Wales Area, National Union of Mineworkers.

I HAVE always held the view that the marching feet of men can make history. In recent months men and women have marched in Wales, in Belfast, in Scotland, in the North East and the North West of England, as well as in London, in support of the mass Lobbies to Parliament to draw attention to the scandal of unemployment in the 'sixties. It was good to see young workers from both pits and railways heavily represented, and responding with determination and enthusiasm as their fathers had done. The method of the Mass Lobby had a great effect on Members of Parliament: it strengthened the determination of those who were already sympathetic, many of whom gave their fullest support; it served notice on reluctant Tory M.P.'s of what to expect in their constituencies.

Those who decry the Mass Lobby as 'serving no useful purpose which could not be achieved by other means' merely reveal how great was the impact upon themselves. Certainly each mass lobby, each demonstration, is an important factor in the vital campaign to bring an end to this decrepit Tory Government. What is now of greatest importance is the task of keeping both the agitation and the pressure going. Of course no one of any experience would argue that even a national lobby of all organised workers would be the only step needed. No national campaign could be successful which was not based upon continuous work in each locality. Since our own mass lobby from South Wales, which was a grand success, that is what we are concentrating upon. We have already held meetings of delegates from all our Miners' Lodges, other trade union branches, trades councils,

Local Authorities, Labour Party and Communist Party. In this way, we weld real working-class unity of purpose against our common enemy—the Tory Government. For this purpose, mass demonstrations will take place at Swansea and Aberdare on May Day Saturday.

As always my own union, the Mineworkers, will be well to the fore. The South Wales miners are in the tide of the general mass struggle, on more than one front. We conducted a campaign of moral and financial support for our comrades the French miners, to whom the South Wales Area sent £5,000, at an early stage in their struggle. In addition, the Executive decided to be officially represented on the Aldermaston March.

History is always made when ordinary people are on the forward march.

Unemployed in Birmingham

The registered unemployed for February in the industrial Midlands, and in particular in the Birmingham district, reached its highest figure since before the war. An alarming feature was the high number of school leavers unable to find employment. There is also a reservoir of unemployed not registered, so the official figures do not give a true picture.

I was unemployed myself for a short period last autumn; but as a skilled worker my chances were better than the semi-skilled or unskilled. An impression I got during this period was that a man of 50 years of age had little hope of employment unless he was skilled. The coloured workers here are finding difficulty in their search for employment and unfortunately some of the unskilled unemployed resent them. There is no doubt that the unemployed here need organising and perhaps the Lobby on March 26 could prove to be the impetus.

Birmingham is known as the city of a thousand and one trades; but we are also greatly dependent on Motors. In the motor industry here, there have been closures and short-time working. Whilst some projects are being developed outside the Midlands—Bathgate, in Scotland, for

example—and the workers transferred to other departments, unless expansion plans materialise there will be serious under-employment here. Motors produced at cheaper rate with smaller labour force.

The immediate introduction of a 35 hour week is needed to combat automation and mergers. We are faced with two problems: the run-down of the economy and the threat of speed-up. Employers are no longer retaining surplus labour in the hope of improvement; and an indication of their enthusiasm is shown by their response to the appeal by the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce for funds to launch a campaign for 'National Productivity Year'. Another aspect is the compulsory retirement of workers at pensionable age.

What is true of Birmingham is also true of Coventry, Wolverhampton and the Black Country. These were the considerations which led Midlands trade unionists to decide to support the National Lobby, sending shop stewards from the great motor factories, and representatives from trade union branches and other organisations amongst the 'thousand and one trades'.

P. BANNISTER,
Birmingham.

LONDON TYPOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY

London's craft printers send fraternal greetings to all engaged at home and abroad in the struggle to advance the position of the workers.

We pledge our continued efforts towards the establishment of world peace and universal brotherhood.

*Robert Willis, General Secretary,
3-7, New Street Square, E.C.4.*

THE FIGHT FOR NEW TRADE POLICIES

John Eaton

ON March 11-15 a conference was held in London (under the chairmanship of R. W. Briginshaw, General Secretary, NATSOPA) of the 'Forward Britain Movement' which played a prominent part in the fight against the Common Market. Its object was to emphasise the necessity for continuing the fight against the 'Common Market attitude' towards trade; and the need for Britain, in collaboration with all countries and in particular the developing and the Socialist countries, to fashion its trade policies in a new mould. Representatives and observers were present from thirty countries, including India, Hungary, Ghana, Mali, Sweden, Norway and the Soviet Union. Mr. Arzumanyan, who heads the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union, in the course of a detailed and penetrating contribution, argued that a 20 per cent annual increase in East-West trade was a practical realisable proposition. This argument was used by five* leading industrialists who wrote:

The Russians have offered to negotiate the placing with British yards of four factory ships and six dredgers valued at £20m. They imply, as a condition, that we import some oil. So far this has been refused. . . . The Russians are now interested in placing more orders with the United Kingdom for plant for manufacturing synthetic fibres, fertilisers, chemical plant, paper-making machinery, etc., to a total of about £35m. They ask for eight years' credit, terms which can be obtained from western European firms. So far, it has not yet been possible for such credit to be arranged. . . .
(*The Times*, February 19.)

The writers sent on to say:

We suggest that in the face of the current situation, and irrespective of any developments that may take place *vis-a-vis* western Europe, the Government should start negotiations with the Soviet Union, China and the other planned-economy countries, on a planned Five-Year Programme of two-way trade with a built-in increase of twenty per cent per annum.

Many speakers at the 'Forward Britain Movement' Conference referred to the needs and possibilities of increasing trade between the industrial powers and the developing countries and discussed forms of trade agreements and international trading organisations most likely to stimulate the growth of this trade. An international Committee for World Trade and Development has been established

*Robert W. Asquith, Chairman and Managing Director, Asquith Machine Tool Corporation Ltd.; Wilfred Brown, Chairman, The Glacier Metal Co. Ltd.; Dermot de Trafford, Managing Director, G.H.P. Group Ltd.; F. James Fielding, Deputy Chairman, Heenan Group Ltd.

CHICAGO DR



This forerunner of May Day, a demonstration, was disrupted by a provocater's bomb. Ten were charged: six

ONSTRATION



Chicago on May 4, 1886, was broken up by
ced; four to death, two to life imprisonment.

as a result of this conference and its Resolution No. 1 urges all Governments to take part in the Conference on World Trading and Development which the UNO General Assembly at its 17th Session resolved to call before the Spring of 1964. It also suggests that the agenda of this U.N. Conference should include 'The problem of trade between the industrial powers and the developing countries'; 'The whole matter of improving trade relations between the East and West'; and 'The seeking of ground for a new and comprehensive International Trade Organisation'.

These are objectives that the Labour movement should support and it cannot afford to delay its fight for a radical change in Britain's foreign economic policy which remains subordinated to the financial interests of the City of London and the most reactionary aims of the Cold War. Over steel pipes for Russia the British Government is at last daring to disobey 'orders from Washington'; but how much harm has been done by countless instances of less publicised obedience to Cold War restrictions on trade? Under the pretence of 'strategic considerations' trade of all sorts has been stopped. As Mr. Khrushchev pointed out, 'even trouser buttons could be said to be essential to a soldier's equipment'.

A long, difficult and stubborn fight is called for by the Labour movement, this implies struggle also within the Labour movement against the ideology of the Cold War and economic dominance over colonial or formerly subordinate territories. Deep changes in foreign economic policy are, moreover, vital to Britain's future. The modest rates of growth about which Neddy talks, are in practice nowhere near achievement. National output should now be 6 per cent above 1961, but in fact it is barely at the 1961 level. An expansion of exports, at least as rapidly as national output, is necessary but nothing is done to move towards the new trade relations with the world from which alone lasting expansion can come. The energies of the British Government have been spent chasing after its will-of-a-Common Market-wisp. The sum total of Tory philosophy on foreign economic relations up to the present has been 'keep the £ strong'—even at the price of stagnation at home—and, what is misleadingly called 'liberalisation', *i.e.*, no controls on capital or currency movements to the 'Western alliance'. The great alibi for this disastrous policy has been the Common Market. The President of the Board of Trade, at the end of last year, for example, when asked why the Government did not enter into the longer term agreements over imports that the Poles (*e.g.*, for

pork), the Rumanians (the Board of Trade debar their beef), the East Germans and others require, blandly announced that he was waiting for the 'common commercial policy' of the E.E.C. to be worked out. Again the Government suggests that it would be against the national interest to be too dependent on Socialist sources. Such pseudo-strategic calculation is both dangerous and stupid, and ridiculous since there is no question of sole or major dependence on Socialist sources.

The government experts themselves have given the lie to the argument that we could not afford to stay outside the 'great European Market'. *The Times* (February 28, 1963) writes about the National Economic Development Council's report:

One important variation in the report from the original model for 4 per cent growth set out last year by the office is the reduction of the target for annual growth in exports from 5.7 per cent to 5 per cent. This change has been made after the collapse of the Common Market negotiations. One reason that the adjustment has been possible is that agricultural imports will be less costly than was expected when Common Market membership was built in to the Council's forecasts. The effect of non-entry into the Common Market upon the aggregate output of seventeen of Britain's most important industries which were the subject of a special study, is stated to be 'negligible'. . . . The pattern may be different, but in most industries the effect on output is very small because trade with the Six is a relatively small part of output, because export opportunities will be more favourable in the Commonwealth and EFTA countries, and because any adverse effect on exports is usually expected to be accompanied by lower imports.

By not being in the Common Market we are less encumbered; but gimmicks, such as devaluation or export incentives will not add up to a trade policy. Whilst, in particular limited cases, export incentives may be of use, as a general expedient they are costly—they mean, after all, extra profits for exporters—and are not sufficiently discriminating. Devaluation (which would mean cuts in living standards at home) at best could do no more than give a short-lived boost to a limited number of commodities in a limited range of markets; it would do nothing to shape the new lasting pattern of trade that Britain needs. The time has come to recognise quite clearly that any attempt to plan for economic growth implies *pari passu* some planning and control of foreign trade. Clearly the advantage of a Socialist economy is that one can directly control the flow of goods required for export markets, as well as the flow of imports required to fulfil production programmes. Under such circumstances one need not live in fear of exchange crises sweeping away without warning the national reserves of foreign exchange. One cannot expect to enjoy such straightforward control within a

capitalist economy such as Britain; but in order to meet even immediate essentials and to take just the first steps to prepare the way for lasting solutions and an advance towards socialism, active involvement by the State in foreign trade is essential.

The British monopoly capitalists trail behind the U.S.A. and Western Europe. Their first concern is to keep in being the alliance of capitalist powers, in order to preserve the system which permits them to be wealthy and powerful. But from the standpoint of the national interest, that is the interest of the people, their policy is an absurdity. All their efforts are directed to developing trade with about one-tenth of the world's population, within the borders of industrially developed capitalist countries—'taking in one another's washing machines', as one wit has put it. The tremendous potential market outside of E.E.C. and the U.S.A. is neglected. These are markets that a progressive State policy could open up. The economically developing countries want the capital goods our industries are equipped to produce; they want also credit to help them buy. But they want assured markets too for their exports, which include manufactured products from their developing industries as well as raw materials. We can produce some of these ourselves, but we should be ready to accept them for the broader advantage of mutually increasing prosperity. The State, by becoming an active partner to trade negotiations with these countries, can guarantee, and itself handle if necessary, purchases of goods. This actually gives it collateral covering the credits it may need to allow, so as to prime the first flow of trade. But when we have surplus capacity the national cost of giving some initial credit amounts to little. It is paid for by the unused resources brought into use. For, if prepared to participate actively and not to be diverted by the private interest lobbies, public authorities can place orders where there is idle capacity, and by so doing enlarge the national product and, therefore, the national wealth. Thus credit could be allowed to trade partners without home needs being deprived.

There are vast possibilities for expansion of trade with Africa, India, Asia generally, the Commonwealth generally, as well as with Latin America along such lines; but such developments need to be geared to a development of East-West trade. East-West trade is important for the Commonwealth, too, and initiative taken by Britain will help increase the flow of trade in many directions. Thus Britain, Socialist countries and Commonwealth would all benefit.

Despite bad official attitudes, trade between Eastern Europe and

China on the one hand, and the Commonwealth on the other, has been growing as the following Table shows:

<i>Exports from Commonwealth to Eastern Europe and China</i>		<i>Imports into Commonwealth from Eastern Europe and China</i>		
(figures in £ millions)				
	1957	1961	1957	1961
Total	219	441	280	377
of which:			of which:	
from U.K.	89	149	to U.K.	123
„ Canada	12	76	„ India	27
„ Australia	28	79	„ Hong Kong	71
„ India	19	40		64

Obviously trade with the Socialist countries is not going to solve all our foreign economic problems. It has, however, a special significance which should not be overlooked. Ten years ago East-West trade accounted for about 2 per cent of Britain's foreign trade turnover; today it is in the neighbourhood of 4 per cent—a significant increase. The untapped potential in East-West trade is tremendous. This is true, too, of trade with great countries such as India, the peoples of Africa and South America. But trade with Socialist countries compels a new way of thinking, a new style, a deliberate plotting out of the future course of development, with State representatives as the negotiating party on the other side. However, there is something real enough to negotiate about. Last year gross industrial output in the Soviet Union rose by 9.5 per cent and realists in British industry are beginning to take note. Peter Trippe writing in the March issue of *Tooling* points out:

Soviet steel production exceeded the combined production of the six Common Market countries put together . . . Soviet industrial production last year . . . was about 63 per cent of United States production, compared with 47 per cent in 1957. . . . In the past five years the per capita increment of industrial production amounted to 48 per cent in the U.S.S.R. by comparison with some 8 per cent in the United States. . . . Approximately 800 major industrial enterprises have come into operation in the Soviet Union during 1962. . . . The U.S.S.R. now trades with some 80 countries, has annual long term trade agreements with 60. . . . Obviously, if we want to increase trade with the East-bloc countries, we must also be much more realistic than we have been in the past in establishing two way trade.

Finally, the efforts needed to develop this new style in trade, pilot the way to more trade with the economically developing countries of the whole world. Positive and active steps by a Labour Government with a new policy are needed to get things really moving.

ENGLAND'S HUT TAX

The Rates Crisis Examined

TOM VERNON

(President, National Association of Tenants and Residents)

GROWING protests about the effects of the new rates assessments, and about the 1963/64 Demand Notes (or landlords' notice of increase on inclusive rents) based on the new figures, give a superb opportunity to progressive organisations to go deeper than Tory M.P.s and the national Press and to expose, once and for all, the injustice and cruelty of our ancient rating system.

As from April 1 last the system is working in complete fulfilment of its codes and principles; for the first time since 1929 all derating (save for agriculture) has gone and all valuations pretend to reflect current rental values. Hence, the system's seemingly grotesque unsuitability to the conditions of most ratepayers is exhibited fully for the first time to the majority of them throughout England and Wales. Not unexpectedly, they recoil in distaste, to use a mild word.

It is the impact of the rating system, in its perfect form, which creates the present crisis. Proposals to institute instalment payments, to attack 'spendthrift' local authorities and to make some part of their services (education?) a charge upon only those who use them, are irrelevant. Pills to cure an earthquake.

Such ideas evade the real issue. They conceal the permanent determination of Tories, and the well-to-do and business interests, not to adopt a just system for financing local government and to preserve the present one somehow, giving minor 'concessions' and calling them reforms. The 'regressive' character of the rating system is denied by no one. That has been repeatedly acknowledged. The system, though quite discredited through impartial studies, is retained on the specious plea that it is well-established, it 'works' and is well understood; that any different system would have its difficulties, too, and would be unfamiliar.

The system is retained only because it is regressive. That is its great virtue in Tory eyes. What does the word 'regressive' mean? That the poorer you are, the bigger proportion of your income you have to pay. The richer you are, all the lesser. The system, in fact, has the same character as any tax on food or other essential commodities. *Labour Monthly* readers will recognise our rating system, therefore, as admirably appropriate to a class society. And it is on

this recognition that we must base our attack and formulate our constructive proposals.

How does it come about that rates are regressive? Because each person's contribution to local rates (whether paid direct or as part of rent) is quite unconnected with his income and essential outgoings. It depends on a merely theoretical view of the rental value of his home reached by the rating valuer. Rates are, therefore, an Accommodation Tax. In Africa, the British called it a Hut Tax!

Because rent (and never more so than today) takes a larger share of a working man's wages than a well-to-do man's, a tax linked to rental values must necessarily have an equally regressive character.

By contrast, income tax is based on actual earnings, or unearned income if any, less allowances which take account of school-age children, certain dependents, mortgages and life insurance, age (65 upwards) and so on. In 1960/61, out of 23 million persons (or married couples) coming under tax review, over 5 million of them were completely exempted from paying income tax; and this year's Budget considerably expands that number. All these exempted millions are held to lack enough capacity to pay income tax if they are to maintain a reasonable standard of living and rear and educate families. They are, accordingly, too poor, relatively, to contribute to the 53 per cent, of local government expenditure borne by the Exchequer. But towards the remaining 47 per cent, met from local rates they not only pay their whack, but more than a fair share as we have seen. What's left to be paid from rates comes from the more lightly burdened well-to-do and business.

On the parallel of the national tax system, local revenues should and can be raised by a local tax on incomes which would be based on actualities (and pay regard to poverty and family responsibilities). It would be a system based on facts and not upon the imaginings and hypotheses and questionable valuations of the rating valuers. The same assessment used for paying the national income tax—or being exempted—would be used for a local tax.

Is this an ingenious fantasy? Not at all. Denmark has had a local income tax since 1882—indeed, its national income tax system was a copy made ten years later! Norway, Sweden and Switzerland have successfully operated a local tax system for almost as long. Western Germany (for part of local revenues) and, too, a number of cities in U.S.A. have had the system for some years. A Departmental Committee set up by the Inland Revenue Department reported, prior to 1914, that a local income tax system would be

workable in Great Britain, subject to a few provisos which could easily be met. All these uncomfortable facts, plus many more, are ignored by Tories—and, I must say, insufficiently considered by the Labour Party.

A new foundation for abolishing the present rating system arises from two main features of post-war experience. First, the constant fall in money's worth due to inflation, a chronic feature now in capitalist countries. Second, the increasing shortage of rented housing, the rocketing of rents and the ending of rent control and security of tenure.

It has always been recognised that rating is an unsound basis for local authority financing under conditions of inflation, because of the time lag in adjustment of money values (with higher expenditure on services such as education and housing) to the rating assessments. This is the main source of the so-called crisis in local government finance, not so much the expansion in expenditure. But the effect of inflation is catastrophic for ratepayers, and especially owner-occupiers who are, or have been, wage-earners; pensioners in their own homes are cruelly affected. Owner-occupiers' assessments are determined on a basis of assumed rental value, the evidence for this being the rents of nearby houses of similar kind where recent 'negotiations' have taken place. And taken place in a scarcity market, not a free market at all. The rates resulting from this fantastic exercise in what is mis-called 'valuation' impose such a disproportionate outlay from the lower incomes in many places as to make selling out seem necessary.

The second new feature (rents) exposes the fallacy, and absurdity, of the principle of hypothetical rents (developed self-interestedly by rating assessors in order to rise from humble clerkdom to a professional status) as the basis of value, instead of the former basis of actual rent. This obliges them to get their notions of value from rents established in 'negotiations' in a bogus 'free market' supposedly brought about by the notorious 1957 Rent Act, evidence which relates to only a small minority of the rented sector in the housing stock (itself now a minority group). Hence tenants of all kinds and owner-occupiers are deemed to be occupying houses beyond their means and expectations, but 'hypothetically' in possession of incomes matching their imagined grandeur! Council tenants are, of course, amongst those assessed for rates in this ridiculous and unjust way; subsidies are ignored, although they are granted to establish a level of rents appropriate to the known general average of such

tenants' incomes. Incidentally, where the new rates are to some degree higher there should be attempts, not only to challenge the assessments, but to get a modification in a differential rents formula; the latter theoretically expresses what a man can afford for rent and rates without deprivation in living standards, so there's a good case.

In advancing the idea of having a local income tax in place of a tax on accommodation (rates) there need be no attempt to produce any proposals on detail points. Not only would the eventual Government drafters ignore our 'amateur' ideas, but it would be foolish to get involved in these. The simple demand must be made that each person's contribution to local government revenue must reflect his real capacity, as shown by his earnings less his inescapable obligations, and that we call upon Parliament to have a scheme embodying this principle placed upon the Statute Book at an early date, everything connected with the recent revaluations being totally suspended as a preliminary to scrapping for ever the discredited rating system of this country.

HOUSING THE HOMELESS

Katherine Hood

WHEN the Government made Sir Keith Joseph Minister of Housing last summer, great things were said to be under way. For this rich, ambitious, energetic man was already an expert on housing—was he not formerly a director of Bovis Ltd., one of our biggest building firms? Clearly this dynamic product of free enterprise was just the man to save us all. To be convincing this appointment should have come a little earlier. For every step that the Tories have taken in the housing sphere in the last seven years has been directed towards setting free the dynamic forces of private enterprise. The results make us look elsewhere for salvation.

The landlords were set free under the 1957 Rent Act to charge 'market value' for decontrolled houses. The land speculators were set free under the 1959 Town and Country Planning Act to charge 'market value' for building sites. The builders had been set free in the early 'fifties, but from the mid-fifties onward their path was made even easier by the curbing of local council building which was cut to half its former size in order to leave most of the field clear for the private developer. And although local councils were told to get on with slum clearance (the one thing which is not profitable

to private enterprise) they were chased into the free money market to raise the cash. In short, for seven years we have been treated to a demonstration of the benefits of creative free enterprise.

Take the actual shortage of dwellings. We were told this shortage was over in the mid-fifties; the 1961 Census showed, however, that the number of families still substantially exceeded the number of houses. To meet this situation the combined effort of local authorities and private builders is producing no more than about 300,000 dwellings a year. Nearly three out of five are built for sale and not for letting which means that they do little to meet the most urgent needs of the badly housed or under-housed. But even if the bulk of this programme was switched to council building to let, its very size is quite insufficient to keep pace with the growing number of households, overcome the net shortage and simultaneously replace sub-standard housing. It is beginning to be realised that house building in this country is taking place at a much slower rate in proportion to the population than in most of the leading continental countries, let alone the socialist countries. In 1962 we in Britain produced rather less than six new dwellings for every thousand of the population. But in the Soviet Union they produced nearly twelve. So that if we had been building here at the same pace as they did there we would have produced last year, not 313,000 new dwellings, but over 600,000. Dynamic free enterprise is not so dynamic when it comes to building things that people need.

It has, however, shown itself excessively dynamic about building things that we do not want. Since office building has in recent years proved more profitable than flat building, valuable sites have been seized, valuable labour has been absorbed, and the development of new building techniques has been concentrated on a programme of office construction, that has now reached such monstrous proportions that even the Government has had to make a few feeble gestures of disapproval. By the time all the office buildings now planned for central London are completed, the total office floor space here will be 50 per cent bigger than it was before the war. This has already utterly distorted the pattern of employment, and caused appalling traffic congestion.

Since the landlords were set partially free under the Rent Act, we have seen a rapid growth in the number of homeless families, particularly in London where the net shortage is most acute. But the recently published London census reveals an equally rapid growth in something else. The number of empty houses has greatly

increased. So that while 4,000 homeless people are herded into institutions, 25,000 houses or 'household spaces' stay empty. The same census shows that while overcrowding has scarcely changed at one end of the scale, under-occupation has vastly increased at the other. This is what happens when the private landlord system is freed from control; this process has been accompanied by a rent racket unparalleled in any previous period. Meanwhile three families in ten are without a fixed bath, nearly four in ten without a hot water tap, thousands of families are sharing and without exclusive use of stove or sink. Further north, where in places the actual housing shortage is not so acute, the housing situation is in some senses even worse. Here are vast slum belts where conditions beggar description. Dwellings *officially* classified as slums number nearly 600,000 and at the present rate of clearance many of them will be still standing in twenty years' time; in some towns they will be still standing in forty years' time. And these are only a fraction of the number of unfit houses not yet classified as such.

If you are going to tackle the housing situation you have to tackle the forces that created it. You cannot expect an ex-director of Bovis Ltd. to do that. But we have a right to expect that a future Labour Government might do something towards it. Unfortunately Labour's official programme, though it contains some excellent necessary emergency steps, falls far short of the fundamental measures needed if we are to transform the position in the longer run. The Labour Party stands for the repeal of the Rent Act—essential so far as it goes if we are to put a stop to the worst deprivations of private landlords: but Labour's programme adopted in 1957 for the virtual abolition of the private landlord system by the municipalisation of rented dwellings has long since been officially cast aside. Instead we have the new 'plan for old houses' under which it is intended to compel landlords to modernise those houses in need of improvement, and to purchase compulsorily only those houses which the landlord refused to improve. Whatever may be said in favour of this scheme, it clearly envisages the continuation of the private landlord system into the far future—this very system which has produced our present miseries.

The Labour Party proposes to provide loans at low rates of interest and reasonable subsidies to local authorities, so that the main housing drive will be switched to municipal building to rent rather than private building for sale. It also proposes to set up regional development corporations for the worst slum areas to

supplement council building, and proposes to control the timing of private building, so that where there are shortages of labour or materials, resources can be concentrated on essential rather than unessential building. All this is good. But little is said about the *scale* of operations—we do not know whether Labour intends to step up housing output from its present average of 300,000 a year or not. Since it was in respect of numbers that the post-war Labour Government failed, this is rather a crucial question.

Finally the most fundamental obstacle of all is the private ownership of land. Recognising the appalling results of the present free market in land-soaring prices on the one hand, misuse of sites on the other, so that the planning of development in the interests of the people has become virtually impossible—the Labour Party proposes to set up a Land Commission which would purchase the freehold of all land about to be developed, and lease it back to the developer, whether public or private. While such a system would go some way toward eliminating the worst profiteering, and controlling development in the right direction, land would come into public ownership so gradually that the bulk of it would continue to be privately owned for decades to come. In other words this is essentially a compromise proposal greatly inferior to outright nationalisation of urban land which is what the situation demands.

The people have now seen what the Tories can do—it is very bad indeed. Time is short—but it is still possible for the movement to ensure that the next Labour Government takes office mandated to offer a real challenge to all the vested interests in the housing sphere.

The South Wales Area of **NATIONAL UNION OF MINeworkERS**

South Wales Miners send ~~warm~~ fraternal greetings to workers the world over on the occasion of May Day 1963. We declare our solidarity with our Colonial brothers in their struggle to free themselves from the bondage of Imperialism. We call on the working class people of Britain to campaign for the removal of the Tory government whose policies are bringing economic ruin to this country and poverty to our people, and to fight for the return of a Labour government pledged to the introduction of Socialist measures to overcome our problems.

ARAB PROBLEMS

C. Enisah

THE notions of Arab nationalism and Arab unity have recently found supporters in unexpected quarters. The leaders of the coups d'état in Iraq and in Syria proclaim that they are staunch nationalists and they speak loudly of their devotion to the ideal of Arab unity, and these leaders find immediate support in the City of London and in Washington. The *Financial Times*, the organ of Britain's financial world, was among the first to welcome the Iraqi coup d'état of February 8. Three weeks later, when all decent people were horrified by the massacres of left-wing opponents in the name of this professed nationalism, the *Financial Times* (March 1, 1963) was still of the view that 'all the same, the impression remains that both for Iraq and for the West it is the best possible government in Baghdad at the present time'. In the United States they were greeted with undisguised pleasure. The persecution of communists and left-wingers was seen as a most endearing attribute of the new rulers. And the *Washington Post* (March 14, 1963) drew the conclusion that 'there is a great deal in Arab nationalism that deserves American encouragement'.

Anyone remotely familiar with the modern history of the Arab world can indeed ask what kind of 'nationalism' and 'unity' it is that has thus become acceptable to imperialist States, who had spared no effort to dominate Arab countries and keep them divided.

At the end of the first world war, when the colonial powers swooped down on the Arab part of Western Asia after the collapse of the Turkish empire, division was the order of the day. Mandates, protectorates, autonomous sheikdoms, 'territories in special treaty relations', and so on, appeared on the new political map with every conceivable division carefully emphasised. For good measure, border lines even ran across ethnical groups, splitting, for example, the Kurds of Syria from the Kurds of Turkey and Iraq. In course of time, as the liberation struggle developed, the mandatory powers—Britain and France—were gradually evicted from one position after another. But not without a fight, not without creating and leaving behind them the utmost confusion. After their departure, stooge monarchies and feudal landlords were left in place, willing to maintain the old relationship in some other form, often with the backing of foreign troops in military bases. Or if the old relationship was no longer possible then a new one emerged with a new

colonial power, eager to take over and even to elbow out the old. America began to step into Britain's shoes in the Middle East. The struggle of the Arab peoples to liberate themselves from the colonial past is part of a bitter class struggle to achieve human standards of life; a struggle where the issues are often confused by divergent trends within the forces aspiring to national independence. By its very nature, by its greed and its ruthless oppression, colonialism creates conditions where the toilers, the workers and the peasants, are not alone in their fight against it. Colonial rule, open or disguised, means that the standard of life of the working masses is reduced to the strictest minimum, that they are denied the right to organise and to develop their own political parties. It also means that the middle class, the local merchants, industrialists and small landowners, are unable to advance as a class. The Arab middle-class, frustrated economically, and politically, humiliated by the subservience of monarchs and the hangers-on to the foreign masters, placed itself at the head of the national liberation movement. Its position of leadership in the anti-imperialist struggle—in which for nearly half a century the toiling masses have carried the heaviest burden and suffered the greatest sacrifices—was due to the conditions resulting from imperialist rule itself.

So long as the colonial powers had the upper hand, the economy of the Arab countries remained desperately backward, based on the production of raw materials to feed the factories of the industrially advanced countries. Industry was not allowed to develop. Modern transport only existed where it suited the strategic or commercial aims of the foreign masters. Sources of electric power were left untapped. Education and technical knowledge were only provided to the selected few. From the social point of view, the result was that the industrial proletariat remained numerically small, and its efforts to build its organisations were hampered by tremendous difficulties. Trade unions only became legal in Egypt—with its comparatively higher degree of industrialisation—in 1942, in Iraq in 1944, and even then they rarely functioned without government intervention or open persecution. Peasants and agricultural workers—still the large mass of the population—have had an even harder struggle. In Egypt and in Iraq, the right to form peasants organisations was only achieved after the overthrow of the monarchy, and then curtailed or withdrawn again by republican régimes terrified of the potential strength of an organised peasantry. Despite these hardships, it was the heroic struggle of the masses that made it

possible for the national bourgeoisie to defeat the stooge monarchies.

The Arab national bourgeoisie has very real conflicts against colonialism, old or new. It can never attain its own aims so long as the best sources of economic prosperity are controlled by foreigners: oil in Iraq, Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf; the Suez Canal and the cotton trade in Egypt (until a few years ago); industry, banking, insurance, etc., everywhere. But never for a moment does it lose sight of its own class interests or its fear of the workers and peasants whose fight for better economic and social conditions is sharpened by every success against the foreign exploiters. The Arab countries have had ten major upheavals in eleven years. Three monarchies have been destroyed, in Egypt in 1952, in Iraq in 1958, in Yemen in 1962. The whole region has been convulsed by rebellions, counter-rebellions, foreign intervention and civil wars. The reason for the prevalence of groups of military officers in almost every one of these changes is that the officers are broadly representative of the middle class. Through them and through their following in the armed forces, the middle class literally captured the weapons with which to enforce its authority both against its foreign oppressors and the popular forces. Another common feature of these rebellions is the contradiction between the proclaimed aims and the actions of the military rulers, seizing power in the name of anti-imperialism, seeking and using the support of the left-wing forces when clashes with imperialism are inevitable, and then turning against the left with the utmost ferocity. Imperialism can be appeased by a policy of anti-communism, but does it follow that it is prepared to abandon its real aims?

The colonial powers were initially attracted to the Middle East by its situation at the crossroad of three continents, its resources of raw materials, its markets for industrial goods. These attractions were later eclipsed by the discovery after the first world war of a far greater source of profit—the oil deposits. Two-thirds of the proved oil reserves in the world are in the Middle East. A handful of foreign monopolies derive from this oil a rate of profits unsurpassed in any other industry. A recent study of the oil operations in the Middle East* assessed the profits of the concessionary companies—largely American, but with a very important British share—at a rate of 66 per cent a year during 1955-60. Imperialism has had to cede important economic and political positions to the local bourgeoisie. But the oil companies, the power behind the scene at

*Study by the American firm of industrial consultants, Arthur D. Little, Inc., commissioned by the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting countries, and reported in the Italian weekly 'Il Punto' (January 5, 1963).

the White House and in Whitehall, have kept their hold on the oil-fields. They are determined to put off the day when the oil riches must pass to the rightful owners, the peoples of the Middle East.

This has become the chief reason for the alarm at every step in the Arab liberation struggle, for the turns and twists of imperialist strategy, at times trying to hold back the whole process, at other times looking for possible allies in the ranks of the Arab middle class. This is why imperialist circles are helping to create new upheavals in the Arab countries, counter-revolutionary upheavals that would reverse the tide, at least for a time. Their new allies can only be the sections of the bourgeoisie who are ready to put aside the national interests in order to put down the militant democratic parties. The recent coups d'état in Syria and Iraq are the work of military and civilian elements whose fraudulent use of nationalist slogans cannot hide that they are the flag-bearers of reaction.

The Syrian government of Khalid el Azm was overthrown at the moment when the national front of 1956 and 1957 was about to be revived. In Iraq, the coup d'état took place as the Kassem government, after foolishly trying to compromise with the oil companies, was finally preparing to make a definite move. One of Kassem's last actions, barely a week before the coup, was to announce that he had decided to launch an all-Iraqi oil company to engage in oil production in competition with the foreign companies. The new Iraqi rulers have not yet dared to define their oil policy, but say they will take no action against foreign oil interests, and repudiate the authors of Kassem's oil policy. The whole personnel of the Oil Ministry, with only two exceptions, was thrown out immediately after the coup d'état and many of its members are now imprisoned. A régime of terror, unprecedented even in the darkest days of Nuri el Said, has been installed against the progressive forces. The intensity of the persecution is a measure of the fear that when the masses lose faith in the bourgeois leadership of the national struggle, they will follow the parties of the left. Hence the empty promises and the confusing slogans of 'unity, freedom and socialism', to divert the people from the path of democracy.

There can be no freedom without democracy and no socialism so long as the progressive forces are persecuted. These are lessons that the Arab peoples have learned from bitter experience. As for unity, is a unity of undemocratic rulers of any use to the national interests? Is it even viable? In 1958, Syria and Egypt merged into the United Arab Republic; the merger lasted only three and a half

years; it was ended by the Syrian people who were not prepared to tolerate a distortion of the ideal of unity into an oppressive rule imposed from Cairo. Arab unity is not a new notion conceived by Nasser or any of the military rulers in power in the Middle East. It has been an imperative need of the national liberation struggle from its inception half a century ago. The Arab peoples know full well that their disunity plays into the hands of their enemies. They are also fully aware that unity can only be the closing of the ranks, not to halt the struggle, but to carry it forward against their exploiters and first of all against the foreign monopolies still looting the national wealth that could ensure a decent life for the whole region.

THE STRIKES IN FRANCE

French Railwayman

WITH whom should one start if one is to talk of the struggle of the worst-paid workers in France—with the miners, the railway workers, the workers in gas and electricity, the Post Office workers, or the employees of the nationalised banks? For years, and particularly since 1958, the position has been growing worse and worse. Why has the miners' struggle developed on such a broad scale? Remember that at the time of the Liberation the Miners' Code made the underground worker one of the best paid, but today he gets on the average only Frs. 615 (about £46) a month; and in the last two years cases of accident and industrial disease have been doubled.

The miners' unions in the CGT, CFTC and FO,* record that wages are 11 per cent lower in the nationalised mines than in private industry. French miners have the longest working day in Europe, 44 hours a week. The fourth week of holidays with pay which the Government has been refusing them, is already enjoyed by thousands of French workers. The situation of the gas and electricity workers is the same; they too are claiming an 11 per cent

*The CGT (Confédération du Travail) is similar to our Trades Union Congress. The CFTC (Confédération Française des Travailleurs Chrétiens) is the organisation of the Catholic trade unions. The FO (Force Ouvrière) is the minority organisation set up at the time of the Marshall Plan under Socialist guidance.

increase in wages and various other benefits. In 1957, the Minister of Industry admitted that railwaymen's wages were 20·1 per cent below private industry. Since then, incessant struggles have reduced the margin to 11 per cent; 160,000 railwaymen are earning less than Frs. 600 (about £45) a month, in a period where their work is being changed by intensive modernisation, calling for higher skills on their part.

By a policy of preferential tariffs, which they propose to extend over all the Common Market countries, the trusts and monopolies help themselves to large additional profits at the cost of smaller users by the manipulation of the coal, electricity and railways of France. By transforming the 'public' services into their own private concerns with the help of the State, the monopolies add to the profit taken from the direct exploitation of their workers, the fruits of a policy of looting the working class in town and country. The following report, taken from an employers' publication *La Vie Française* of March 22, 1963, under the title of 'Capital multiplied a hundredfold', will give an idea of this prodigious profit-taking:

We can be highly optimistic as we watch the rising graph of French securities since 1938. The scale of the rise is astonishing. Stocks and shares have certainly been the best investments in the post-war period. A capital of Frs. 100 in 1938 would amount at the end of 1962 to Frs. 9,450.

And the bomb explosion in the Sahara has shown the working class that there are large assets put to bad use.

The position of the Government is shown very clearly by the following analysis in the employers' weekly *Usine Nouvelle*:

A month ago, seeing the workers' demands coming, the Prime Minister decided that a firm stop should be put to the flood of claims, in order to safeguard the great economic and financial equilibriums that were to some extent threatened. He and his collaborators thought that, if they could hold back the most crucial sector, that of the miners, they would be able to resist the whole flood . . . after the failure of the attempt to 'conscript' the miners, and the disappointment caused by the strike not disintegrating, the Government was forced to change its tactics. . . . In this second phase . . . the government tried to 'isolate' the miners' claims, to present them as a particular case and to meet them to a relatively large extent. . . . Once they could appease the miners, they planned to turn on the other nationalised industries and to offer them very limited and 'definitive' increases.

This shows very clearly the importance both of the miners' strike and of solidarity in the trade union field.

The failure of the 'conscription' attempt was a mighty defeat for

the Government, but the great wave of active solidarity throughout the country was an equally great one. The coal and iron miners and the potash miners, wearing their helmets, went all over town and country to take collections, and workers and democrats subscribed in their hundreds of thousands in response to the appeals of the Socialist and Communist Parties, the CGT, the CFTC, the FO, the National Educational Federation, and the Union of French students; they were giving a meaning to the remark of the Catholic Archbishop of Arras: 'This strike concerns all of us'. Acting plainly in solidarity, 750,000 Paris engineers won at this same period their fourth week of paid holidays.

The Congress of French mayors, meeting in Paris at the beginning of the strike, passed unanimously (including the votes of mayors of the Union Nationale Republicaine (de Gaulle's Party)) a motion of solidarity with the strikers. The popularity of the movement is so great that the French Institute of Public Opinion (which nobody would suspect of anti-Government bias) records that 79 per cent of the French people think that the miners' claims are justified.

The government, defeated in its 'conscription' attempt, turned to the tactic of proposing 'an independent and wise third party as judge'; and a Commission of three members, all wholly devoted to the ruling financial circles, was set up. These 'wise men' were to say 'whether the claims of the nationalised sector were justified or not, and to what extent'. It was a real farce; the railwaymen were told in the Commission's report that their wages were in reality 'higher than those in the private sector', but that by juggling with the figures one could discover that they were 4.7 per cent to 5.2 per cent less (from September, 1957, to January, 1963). The railwaymen left them in no doubt when they appeared before the 'Committee of Wise Men', the importance of which, 'for improving the atmosphere among the railwaymen', had been emphasised by the government radio and the Press. They had just finished, on March 14, a 48 hours' strike, carried out very swiftly in a remarkable spirit of initiative and responsibility; this strike was decided on in common by all the trade union organisations in defiance of the obligation to give five days' advance notice of all national stoppages, under pain of penalty. The railwaymen at once asked the 'wise men': 'Are you empowered to discuss the claims of the railwaymen and to take decisions?' The presiding commissioner, Masse, answered 'No', and the attempt to fool the workers thus collapsed at the start.

If the miners have held out for more than a month, one must not forget that, even before they had the active financial and moral support of broad sections of the population, the women from the miners' rows were already playing an extremely important role. What is one to say of some of these women and girls, making speeches for the first time in their lives at pit-head meetings, of others supporting their husbands on the picket lines, and of yet others going to offices and houses to call on elected representatives of the various political bodies, from Mayor to Member of Parliament, to Counsellor General and Senator? Nor must we forget the delegation of the miners' wives from Lorraine, who went to Paris to see de Gaulle himself, to tell him of their problems, and were turned away from the doors of the Elysee Palace by—a door-keeper! Who can fail to admire these women, who often have to face the problems of the family budget alone, when they answer the question, after four weeks of strike: 'How much money have you left?' with 'Twenty Francs'; and the further question: 'How will you make out?' with: 'We'll get through, the children, my husband and I. There are always potatoes. The vital thing is to hold out'.

On the railways, the two-hour strikes cause the maximum disturbance without the loss of a whole day's pay. Two-hour strikes, well staggered, create havoc in a railway centre. They often necessitate extra efforts from the railwaymen, as a result of the collapse of planned working; and the repercussions may last several days. The railway administration certainly 'prefers', if one can talk of preference in this context, a 'good' 24-hour strike to a two-hour call from the unions.

A new form of solidarity in sympathy with the miners was shown in the united appeal of the railwaymen of Somain (Douai) concerning the carriage of imported foreign coal. This appeal called on all railwaymen for a collective stoppage of work in the event of any train carrying coal of foreign origin being found in or passing through their centre. This new form of struggle apparently led the State Railway administration to take measures against certain drivers likely to take the initiative and also to divert certain trains on to less 'dangerous' lines.

Like it or not, the present struggle, covering a whole group of economic questions, is the first great social battle of the Fifth Republic. The unity forged in the trade union struggle and the unity born of solidarity, consolidates the unity achieved in other

fields, in particular that of the Socialists and Communists since the legislative elections.

On April 3, the miners' strike ended. Two days before the employers' paper *Usine Nouvelle* had written: 'If the miners' battle had in fact been prolonged, there would have been a rapidly increasing proportion of the national working population which would have found itself very shortly unemployed'. Then the employers' real worry becomes apparent as it continued: 'there is no doubt as well that financial repercussions would have made themselves felt'. The article continued by dealing with 'the reasonable compromise . . . in a negative sense the capitulation of one of the parties would mean either the fall of the régime with all the upheavals that means . . . or the crushing of the trade unions resulting in the régime becoming more and more authoritarian'.

To sum up, the compromise on the 35th day of the strike was settled by a retreat on the part of the Government, for the miners' wages, taking into account the increase of 2.25 per cent from January 1, 1963, will be increased by 13.25 per cent on January 1, 1964. Four weeks' holiday have been guaranteed, and the questions of hours of work and supplementary holidays for length of service are going to be the subject of discussions. Another result will be the examination in the future of the mining industry, in the framework of the problems of all the power-producing industries and in the presence of the trade union federations of all workers underground. The miners' strike has given moreover, considerable and effective support to the demands of the other French workers.

We are far from the time when de Gaulle made his personal edict from Colombe les deux Eglises, that he was taking the step of 'conscripting' the miners. We have gone a long way since the government manoeuvres against the workers' struggle. The miners' 'block' has remained indivisible, just as other workers have. But the workers are not fools and they realise fully that their exploiters will try to take back with the one hand, what they were forced to give with the other. The monopolists have retreated but the battle continues. It is continuing particularly through demonstrations of unity in the collecting of food and money for the care of miners' children.

The struggle proved that the strength of the working class rests in its unity—a new lesson of capital importance. The de Gaulle government, which refused to summon the National Assembly, will prove in the end to have suffered permanently from this test of strength.

Socialist-Communist Co-operation against Fascism in Saxony

The Social Democratic Buck-Lipinski Government in Saxony was forced to resign on January 30. The immediate cause of the fall of the Cabinet was the failure of the Home Secretary, Lipinski, to grapple with growing Fascist forces. . . . On March 21 a new Cabinet was formed, with Dr. Zeigner as Premier. This decision was reached after long deliberations, the more reactionary Social Democrats favoured a coalition with the bourgeois parties; but the Social Democratic Congress in Saxony decided against any such coalition by a three-fourths majority and in favour of approaching the Communist Party. The Communist Party promised support on certain conditions, which were accepted by a delegate conference on March 20; the result is that the new Government is composed of left-wing Socialist elements.

The acceptance by the Social Democrats of the Communist conditions is the first actual step in forming a united front, and it is generally expected will lay the foundation of a real Workers' Government in the province of Saxony.

(From 'The World of Labour', *Labour Monthly*, May, 1923.)

BOOKS

Problems of Contemporary History

R. Palme Dutt

Lawrence & Wishart. 130 pp. 7s. 6d.

SEVERAL generations of Marxists have received a great part of their political education from R. Palme Dutt. He is, as every reader of *Notes of the Month* knows, one of the most distinguished living practitioners of contemporary history, and both the subject of his latest book and the occasion which produced it—the award of an honorary doctorate by the University of Moscow—are therefore very well chosen. The four papers on 'History and Truth', 'The Cold War', the 'Delay of the Socialist Revolution in the West', and 'Marxism and Socialism in Britain', which make up this volume, were originally given as lectures in Moscow.

Contemporary history has, as R. Palme Dutt points out, a number of special difficulties. It is written on the basis of incomplete and often misleading information, for even several years after the event many official documents are still kept secret, or only made available to selected generals and politicians. Also, 'the political controversies of the period may still be smouldering while the historian is at work, and may inevitably affect judgement in the consequent treatment'. These difficulties, as the author notes, affect both Marxists and non-Marxists. Nevertheless, the history of the present can be written scientifically, that is to say in such a way that its analyses and forecasts stand the test of time. Marx himself has proved this, for some of his most brilliant works were written in the rush of day-by-day political commentary and not in the quiet of the research library, e.g. the *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* or the *Civil War in France*.

Conversely it is easy to demonstrate the blindness and muddle of those who face the world without the guidance of a scientific theory. The author very effectively recalls the confusion, the wild errors and miscalculations, of bourgeois politicians and scholars when faced with the events of the past fifty years: Lord Milner predicting (a few weeks before the 1917 revolution) that the Russian soldier would never rebel; *The Times* believing that there would be no second world war; the late J. L. Garvin arguing on the eve of the 1929 slump, that slumps had become too mild to disturb the world economy.

R.P.D. points out that this superiority of Marxism is not due to a lack of commitment, but to the fact that it is part of an advancing historical movement. It does not need to be afraid of the conclusions of scientific enquiry, because these show that socialism is a rising, capitalism a declining force. This is why the 'period of partial interruption of the full range of fruitful Marxist-Leninist studies in the field of contemporary history' to which he draws attention, is so much to be regretted. Its effect has been to 'discredit the theory in place of demonstrating its strength'. On the other hand many bourgeois historians shy away from science, or even deny its possibility, because they are afraid of the conclusions to which it may lead. No doubt few of them nowadays still claim to be superior to Marxism because they are unbiased searchers for truth. If any do, R.P.D. does well to remind them that in 1914 the bulk of Oxford historians, as historians claimed that Britain was right, while the bulk of German professors, if possible even more academic and scholarly, published ■

manifesto arguing that history showed the rightness of Germany. The point is, that the commitment of anti-Marxist historians inhibits and does not assist their writing of contemporary history.

This the author illustrates by the example of the Cold War. The official Western theory, supported by much scholarship, was about as wrong as any theory can be. No serious scholar now maintains that the Cold War was due to the determination of the U.S.S.R. to 'communise' the world by means of armed aggression and local revolutionary action, and that only the firmness of the West with its nuclear weapons prevented this. On the contrary, R.P.D. shows that U.S. and British governing circles were planning to push back Soviet power even before 1945 and in doing so took over Nazi arguments (such as the very phrase 'iron curtain'); and that the Western military theory of massive bombing was based on methods first developed to suppress colonial risings through the use of the technical superiority of industrial over backward nations.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class Ads.', *Labour Monthly*, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

DUPLICATING, tape-typing, verbatim shorthand reporting, translating. Complete Secretarial Service and equipment. Shorthand/typing tuition (boarding accommodation. Garage available). Mabel Eyles & Partners, 10, Beaconsfield Road, Friern Barnet, N.11. ENT 3324.

VETERAN L.M. readers: your early copies and pamphlets may be invaluable to others. Send details to. L.M. Exchange Service, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

WE BUY books, pamphlets, Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: RIV 6807. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6.

URGENTLY REQUIRED—All back numbers of *Labour Monthly* from 1921-1930 inclusive and 1939.

Whatever its weaknesses in that period, it is useful to remind ourselves that Marxist analysis of the Cold War has stood the test of time better than anti-Marxist propaganda.

The last two chapters are slighter. The discussion of the socialist revolution is particularly valuable, however, because it shows that Marx himself did not (as vulgar criticism alleges) expect the victory of socialism to occur first in Western Europe, but sketched out a forecast which led naturally towards the Leninist analysis. The last chapter also, and rightly, goes back to Marx himself, stressing the importance of the liberation of formerly colonial peoples for the emancipation of Britain.

R.P.D. has written a most useful and instructive book. One may in conclusion welcome the fact that he has not kept himself in the background entirely. He has included a short account of his career at Oxford, his expulsion on the eve of the October revolution, and the subsequent political discrimination against him. This is in itself a small, but by no means unilluminating, contribution to the history of our own times.

E. J. HOBBSAWM.

Africa in World Politics

Vernon McKay

Harper & Row. 468 pp. 52s.

A MORE CORRECT title for this book would be 'U.S. Plans for Africa'. True, it is concerned with the world impact of Africa's struggle for liberation. Precisely for this reason

U.S. imperialism is striving desperately to extend its political and ideological influence in Africa. Rear Admiral Charles Bergen, in his evidence to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs (1958) made the position clear: 'The size, population, untold wealth of natural resources, and geographical position flanking both the Nato and the oilfields and communications of the Near East make Africa of vital strategic importance'. No wonder the United States has 43 'information offices in 31 African countries, with 133 U.S. political directors and 476 "local employees"'. The number of Foreign Service 'and other' U.S. officers in Africa rose from 664 in October 1957 to 1,359 in July 1961—more than half of them serving under the Mutual Security Act.

There is now virtually an army of U.S. 'observers' in Africa, ranging from missionaries to businessmen, from 'research' workers to military experts. Since May 1962, Washington has had its 'Bureau of African Affairs' with a staff of 163, financed by the Government, the Ford Foundation, and the Rockefeller Trust. This book reveals that the U.S. Government has not the slightest concern for the interests of the African peoples. Even its so-called economic aid is designed to serve U.S. interests. The author stresses that 'foreign aid is not an economic but a political operation', and the whole theme of the book is that Africa should serve the interests of the United States.

IDRIS COX.

LABOUR MONTHLY

Bound Volume, 1962

It's a history of the year and a permanent record

ORDER NOW

From your usual newsagents, price £1.5.0d., or send 10s. 6d., plus 1s. 6d. postage and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

THE MANAGER, . 134, Ballards Lane . LONDON, N.3

THE MUSICIANS' UNION

on behalf of 30,000 musicians sends warm fraternal greetings to the readers of 'Labour Monthly' and the Trade Union and Labour Movement.

National Office,
29, Catherine Place,
Buckingham Gate,
London, S.W.1.

The National Union of Mineworkers Derbyshire Area

Sends May Day Greetings to all Trade Unionists in Great Britain and throughout the World, and wishes them peace and prosperity.

MAY DAY GREETINGS

to all readers of
Labour Monthly from
the editor and staff of

SOVIET WEEKLY

3, Rosary Gardens, London, S.W.7

MAY DAY GREETINGS

FROM

PLATO FILMS

Send for our
FILMS for PEACE list

PLATO, 164, Shaftesbury Avenue,
London, W.C.2.

tel. COVent Garden 1921

WHY NOT BY POST?

NAME

(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS

.....
.....

I enclose 21s. (Overseas, 24s.,
Canada and USA, \$3.50), for
year's subscription from the
.....issue.

(SIGNED)

To LABOUR MONTHLY

134, BALLARDS LANE,
LONDON, N.3.

TRADE UNIONISTS

Has your branch seen our
"Problems of Trade Unionism
in the Sixties" series?

Special ~~offer~~ for Organisations

LABOUR MONTHLY
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating
by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

For all interested in the fight for Peace and
Progress in the Countryside and the problems
of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.

Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or

Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD
27, Bedford St. Strand, London, W.C.2.

LABOUR RESEARCH

'Tycoon's Plans for Railways'

'The Rates Crisis'

1s. (1s. 2½d.) post free

Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

Arts and Sciences in China

APRIL—JUNE ISSUE INCLUDES :

The Past in China's Present

by Joseph Needham

Copies obtainable, 2/- post free, from

WE Holloway Road, London, N.19

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor : R. Palme Dutt

ELECTION PROSPECTS

The Editor

★

GIMMICKS OR POLITICS?

D. N. Pritt, Q.C.

★

TRUTH ABOUT MALAYSIA

Ian Page

★

Trade Unions: Victims of Fords, F. Blake ;
Nicky and the Builders, J. C. Paterson ;
Modern Conditions and the Unions, Roy Sanderson.

JUNE 1963

Two Shillings

CONTENTS

<p>Notes of the Month: Election Prospects. <i>Tory Electoral Strategy—East-West Trade—Sino-Indian Peace Prospects?—Who Wants Economic Cold War?—Salvaging Western Capitalism—Anglo-American Friction—Waving the Nuclear Flag—Foreign Policy and the Electorate—Record of Twelve Elections—A Policy for Peace—Peace and the Elections.....</i>R.P.D.</p>	243
<p>Gimmicks or Politics? Advertising for votes...D. N. Pritt, Q.C.</p>	255
<p>Nicky and the Builders. An Executive Committee Member of the Scottish Plumbers shows the Government's fight against the 40-hour week.....J. C. Paterson</p>	258
<p>Victims of Fords. A leading trade unionist condemns the Jack Report.....F. Blake</p>	261
<p>Salute to Julian Grimau. The Secretary of the Scottish Miners' call to outlaw Franco.....John Wood</p>	264-5
<p>Truth About Malaysia. An exposure of the real interests behind the planned Federation.....Ian Page</p>	266
<p>Modern Conditions and the Unions. An examination of the issues that determine trade re-organisation.....Roy Sanderson</p>	271
<p>Trades Councils and Jobs. A call for co-ordinated action in the Battle for Jobs.....Drew Duncan, Gordon Massie</p>	274
<p>Men in Property. The exploiters of our 'golden' acres exposed. Wilfred Macartney</p>	276
<p>Britain and Ireland. Why 'The Irish Question' is the 'British Question'.....John Hostettler</p>	281
<p>Dear Readers: <i>We Shall Overcome</i>.....Angela Tuckett</p>	241
<p>Book Reviews. 'American Foreign Policy', by J. P. Morray and 'Yalta to Disarmament' by H. Aptheker: <i>Andrew Rothstein</i>; 'Menace of the Miracle', by H. Abosch: <i>Gordon Schaffer</i>.</p>	286

DEAR READERS

We Shall Overcome

*Black and white together, black and white together,
Black and white together some day,
Deep in my heart I do believe
We shall overcome some day.*

SUNG by an immense congregation in the streets, this was described by *The Times* correspondent as the 'signature hymn' of the movement in Birmingham, Alabama. To us in Britain this *We Shall Overcome* is a favourite song amongst peace demonstrators, young and old. Once started you can't stop singing, as new verses spring to your lips, expressing all the things we shall overcome to achieve peace and socialism, the brotherhood of man. Perhaps the singers in Birmingham, Alabama, and Holy Loch, Scotland, may not all realise in what a deep sense they are singing the same song. Whether it is to overcome colour discrimination, or the indiscriminate mass murder of civilians (indeed, 'black and white together') by nuclear weapons, or to beat cuts and unemployment, it is a sign of the peoples against the proprietors, the creators against the destroyers. It is the sign in which we conquer, the 'signature' to which all could put their hand. The question is: how soon can we change the 'some day' of the original revivalist hymn into 'this day', the longed-for 'sometime' into 'now'? Newspaper editorials lately linked Birmingham, Alabama, with Bristol, England, when attempts were made to discriminate against West Indians applying for jobs as bus crews. In this city, where so many local

fortunes were originally built on the slave trade, there were not lacking Bristolians to support the just claims of their West Indian fellow workers. I wonder how many recalled an incident during the last war, when white American soldiers ordered a Negro soldier to give up his bus seat, because 'a nigger should not sit whilst white troops stand'. The clippie told them flatly that their rotten way of life would not be tolerated in her bus, not in her country. She turned them out, and rang the bus off with the Negro soldier restored to his rightful place and the other passengers cheering. Some are still fighting that war for democracy and will not stop until it is won.

At the root of conflict, amongst nations as in the cities and villages of the 'Free World', is of course the economic factor. It is not only the Southern States where the bare bones of the economics of a class society begin to show through. An *American* writes: 'The problems of Pennsylvania sound like those of Northern England. The unemployment rate is 7%—officially—but double this for Negroes (a third of the population of Philadelphia) and youths. The only reason California is so relatively prosperous—only 4% out of work—is that it gets most of the \$55,000,000,000 arms orders.' He

criticises *L.M.*'s optimism: 'Britain seems so far along the path to Americanisation and the U.S. corporations have thousands of dollars invested there. It's hard for me to believe that any further steps will be taken towards nationalisation and other moves towards a socialistic state.' But economics is only one factor. Instability and fear for jobs and the housing shortage produce their effects in Britain; but they also produce mass demonstrations and public campaigns in the fight for jobs. We must never stop explaining, showing how each struggle can merge into the main stream. '*Backslider*' writes: 'A young reader asks what *L.M.* had to say in the 'thirties —when I first began to take it. It's no exaggeration to say that if *L.M.*'s line had been followed then by the majority of the British Labour movement we would, together with the rest of Europe, probably have been celebrating Socialist Power here, this May Day.' A *Durham subscriber*, who has been using our leaflet in

times like this you need L.M. to win new people, writes: 'How I long for our people to be reading the significantly substantial; the solidity of the core of understanding that *L.M.* makes is breath-taking.' In one of the *Six Counties* an Irish reader, who distributes 50 copies, has won increases, having 'run a bit of a campaign with the leaflet'. A number of copies are passed on in this area of heavy unemployment, so his 'next step will be to see how many of these "second cousins" can be won as buyers.' An old and valued friend in the *Midlands* has been watching the fund anxiously. As his own income is now under £5 and he cannot help as he once did, he set about winning a friend not only to become a new subscriber but also to give to the fund. As another old friend, from *Brighton*, says: 'Every new buyer is a potential fund supporter.' Thanks to you, old friends and new.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

Ayrshire.

My affection for and appreciation of the magazine grows with each new issue I receive. My best wishes to all who help to make *L.M.* the outstanding publication in the realm of political literature.

D. H. STRATHERN.

£79 2s. 5d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: 'Daisy Bell', £10; 'Windfall', £10; H.H., £10; G.F., £10; B. W. Mackay, 10s; Marie Philibert, 10s; S. Turner (for Daisy Mendez, Cuba), 5s; B. Ainley, 10s; E. Strachan Rogers, £3 3s; 'Backslider', 10s 5d; L. Bates, 5s; H. Brindle, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 3s; Oldham Branch, 1s; 'S. Mill', £1; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; R.F.B., £3; D. H. Strathern and friends, 10s; S. Townsend, 10s; G.L., 7s 3d; 'L' Humanité', 4s; B.J.M., 5s; 'In Memory of Joe Brien', 3s; 'Oliver Twist and friends', 15s; F.G.A. (Canada), 10s; D. Sandwell, 2s 6d; R. Dodd, £1; 'A Highgate Reader', £3; N. Usher, 2s 6d; S. Morrissy, 10s; 'Humphreys family', 10s; 'Butcher family', 10s; J. A. Smith, 6s; Socialist Sailor, £1; E.J.B., 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal), 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: Donation per J.D., 2s 8d; J. P. Thomas, 10s; E. E. Cripps, £1 1s; C. Brooke, 1s; D. Ben Rees, 4s; J.A. (Canada), £2 1s 7d; A. A. W. Boyd, 5s; R. H. Baker, 19s; A. Beak, 18s; D. R. Morrison, 11s 6d; M. Tizzard Brown, 15s; H.S., 15s; Congress Donation, 1s 6d; Mrs. P. Barrass, 4s; Miss D. M. Adams, 4s; G. M. Vevers, £2 2s; K. B. Kay, 19s; H. V. Lewis, 4s; J. Allenby, 19s; J. Smith, 4s 6d; R. N. Smith, 5s; D. H. Calcutt, 8s; J. Prewett, £1; P. G. Oliphant, 2s; J. Paton, 19s; J.D. (Canada), £2.

Our thanks to you all.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

Co-op. No. L.99482.

FINchley 5135.

Notes of the Month

ELECTION PROSPECTS

The Prime Minister made it clear last night that the General Election, whenever it comes, will be fought on the issue of Britain's independent deterrent.

(Daily Telegraph, March 30, 1963.)

PROSPECTS and predictions of general elections are the happy hunting ground of rash speculators. Certainly the local elections have shown that the mass demand for the end of this Tory Government and its replacement by a Labour Government has reached a high level—even though the drop in Labour's lead registered by the Gallup poll between March and May from 16½ to 10 points, and the actual slight swing of the vote to Toryism in the local elections in Scotland, needs to be taken into account. Certainly the lesson of these electoral trends shows how important it is to strike while the iron is hot and exert every effort to hasten the election before the discredited Tory machine has had time to launch new tricks and confusions in the hope to stage a comeback. It is no less evident that the coming general election, whatever its date, and whatever the immediate situation at the moment when it is called, will need to be fought on all the cardinal issues, equally of international and of home policy, on which twelve years of Tory rule have brought this country to such a disastrous outcome. However, the peculiar combination of confidence trickery, a roulette gamble and unscrupulous sharp practice which characterises the normal functioning of the British electoral system, is such that only a fool would venture to predict with confidence at this moment, either the date on which the Government will finally decide to call the election, if the mass movement does not force their hand, or the central issue on which they will decide to concentrate their challenge. For this reason it is worth while to examine with some care present indications of Tory strategy in preparation for the coming general election.

Tory Electoral Strategy

Toryism is today heavily discredited. So it was in 1906—through the aftermath of the Boer War and in the international mass upsurge which followed the Russian Revolution of 1905. So it was in 1945—through the delayed aftermath of Munich and the long depression of the thirties and the new upsurge of the peoples all over the world following the joint victory over fascism won in alliance with the

Soviet Union. Some trustful souls at that time joyously declared that Toryism was down and out never to rise again. Not so. The Tory strategists, the expert manipulators on behalf of the big monopoly interests whose economic domination was in fact never challenged by the victors of 1945, systematically set to work to rebuild the shattered fortunes of their party, and especially to seek to camouflage its too obvious upper class limitations by reaching out to construct a base in the mass electorate. For this purpose they took advantage of all the abundant openings offered by the Right Wing Labour Attlee-Bevin Government, whose cold war anti-socialist policy of dependence on America, hostility to the Soviet Union and inflationary rearmament brought burdensome consequences of austerity cuts, the wage-freeze and mass disillusionment with this supposed picture of 'socialism'. On this basis Toryism won a new lease of twelve years of power. The resultant orgy of twelve years of racketeering, soaring rents and profits, gambling speculation and corruption has led to its inevitable outcome in a mass revulsion of disgust against this record and a somewhat less confident turn to Labour as the visible alternative. Once again Tory fortunes are at a low ebb. Britain has fallen to the bottom of the economic league among capitalist powers, let alone in contrast to the soaring advance of the socialist world. Britain is internationally isolated and despised. Every policy and project of the Government, from the Common Market to Blue Streak, has ended in a resounding fiasco. Once again the Tory experts are working overtime to reconstruct the electoral mirage. And once again they are calculating on the openings offered them by Right Wing Labour policy to save them.

Economic Conjuring Tricks

Certainly Toryism cannot hope to stand upon its record, or to bask in the sunshine of a temporary terms-of-trade boom ('never had it so good'), which was no more the outcome of the Tory Government's policy than full employment was the outcome of the Labour Government's policy after 1945. Derelict areas, redundancy, housing shortage (almost the lowest level of housebuilding in relation to the national product in any European country, barely over half the level of France or West Germany, and below even Portugal), rising rents and rates have made all sections of the people angry. No doubt Macmillan and his Ministers hope that their conventional stopgap pump-priming measures may produce a little upward turn in the economic situation to brandish for the election. But by now

there is growing scepticism among the least observant about the eternal switchback of the modern 'managed' 'mixed' monopoly capitalist economy. So with the customary wave of the conjuror's wand all suckers in the audience are cordially invited to fix their gaze on the hypothetical joys of 'the seventies'—in the hope that this may distract attention from the ugly realities of the sixties (six and a half years still to run). All the bits and pieces of projects and programmes—especially paper programmes and proliferating White Papers—are shaken up together to produce a picture of the 'modernisation' of the bankrupt monopoly capitalist economy in Britain. It is possible that the special concentration of some of the projects inaugurated and plans announced in relation to Scotland may account for the slight swing of the local electoral vote to Toryism there. Similarly they may hope that the concentration of the Polaris submarine building orders on the Merseyside may win votes there; since the North-East is too solidly Labour to leave much hope of inroads, while Northern Ireland, whatever the distress, can be counted on anyway to produce its regular bonus of twelve 'Ulster Unionist' pocket boroughs to swell the Tory total in every House of Commons so far since the invention of this colony.

East-West Trade Moves

However, all this is hardly sufficient to give confidence to Lord Poole and his associates. It is now increasingly evident that the Macmillan Government, alongside these home economic projects, is working to extend the range of its initiatives in the sphere of international relations, and once again, as in 1955 and 1959, though in new forms, to take advantage of the openings offered by Right Wing Labour policy in this field. Conspicuous in this respect is the exchange of high-powered trade delegations with the Soviet Union and with China, and the top governmental attention given to these. This has even been carried to the extent of making a loudly proclaimed show of defying the displeasure of the United States and of Nato, as in the export of the supposedly banned steel pipes to the Soviet Union. British pressure for a new Summit Conference has also been widely publicised.

Sino-Indian Peace Prospects?

Similarly, it has now been reported in the Indian press that Britain is resisting Indian demands for more arms against China and exerting pressure on India to make peace with China, on the grounds that the continuance of the border conflict is facilitating

American penetration of India and hindering Britain's aim to extend trade with China. India's demand for £600 million from the United States and Britain for a gigantic three-year rearmament programme against China 'has little chance of success', affirmed *The Times* on May 15, since such 'a vast armaments programme . . . may simply be wasted'. Significantly enough, the most belligerent press organs in India, which have warned their public of these new moves of British policy, have claimed that the Labour Party leadership has made representations to Macmillan to express 'objections' to these moves to promote peace with China:

It is understood that Opposition leaders who met Premier Macmillan to submit to him their fears of Indian and even American objections to such a wholesale reversal of Nato policy *vis-a-vis* the most belligerent Communist country have been pacified with information regarding the top secret moves.
(*Blitz, Bombay*, April 6, 1963.)

The heirs of Bevin seek to teach the Tories to beware of Communism, and the Tories have to teach them to learn to manoeuvre.

Who Wants Economic Cold War?

It would be idle to fail to see the significance of this present ostentatious emphasis of the Macmillan Tory Government on the importance of developing East-West trade, the lavish reception to the Chinese Trade Minister (the first reception of a Chinese Government Minister since the victory of the revolution), and announcement of an impending similar Ministerial Mission to China, following the enthusiastic report of the top-level British business men's delegation to the Soviet Union after the preliminary Roy Thomson expedition. This is of course the first beginning of a response to Britain's vital trading needs, following the rebuff to the policy of entering the Common Market. But in reality the practice is still considerably behind the words and gestures. The practical steps taken for the expansion of trade are still far short of the possibilities. This revealing fact, that the publicity is ahead of the practice, suggests that Toryism is not unaware of the propaganda and electoral advantages of such a course, at a moment when the main gospel of every Labour Front Bench declaration on international trade and economic problems is to insist that Western capitalism must close the ranks and supplement the military system of Nato by closer economic concerted measures of all the Western capitalist powers, in order to meet the 'challenge' of the superior economic advance of the socialist world.

U.N. International Economic Conference or Cold War

At this moment the United Nations is committed, by the decision of the Assembly in December, 1962, to hold an International Economic Conference in 1964, drawing in equally all countries, capitalist and socialist, to promote trade and development, combat bans and discrimination, and secure more equitable returns for the primary producing under-developed countries. It might have been thought that the whole weight of Labour's campaign would have been rallied behind this United Nations International Economic Conference and to end the bans on East-West trade. However, in the first parliamentary declaration of Harold Wilson after his election as Leader, in the crucial debate on February 11 after the collapse of the Common Market negotiations, the main emphasis was turned to a different alignment. He urged that the United States, Britain, the British Commonwealth, the Common Market and Efta, and possibly Latin America, that is, the Western Bloc, should 'sit down together'. He threw out one daring suggestion to cross the line into Eastern Europe, and that was to explore the possibility of developing trade with Yugoslavia. On April 8, following his visit to President Kennedy, in his article in the *Daily Herald* on 'My U.S. Trip', he returned to the same theme:

Britain and the U.S. should now sit down with the Common Market countries, the countries of Efta and the Commonwealth, to work out plans for freer and expanding trade.

The omission of the Soviet Union, China and the other socialist countries is sufficiently conspicuous.

Salvaging Western Capitalism

By the time of his speech of May 15, appropriately made to the American Chamber of Commerce in London, the economic cold war conception was in the open:

To meet the challenge of Soviet economic expansion, what was needed was a grand conclave of Britain, the United States and other friendly countries to undertake a major reform of the international monetary and credit system . . . to give full central banking powers to a reformed International Monetary Fund. . . . The result would be to increase the total liquidity of the non-Soviet world. . .

What is important is that the Western world takes action quickly. The challenge from the Eastern world cannot be shrugged off. . . . What is at stake is the ability of the Western world to survive.

The character and consequences of this plan to establish 'central banking powers' and an 'international investment fund' under the

U.S.-controlled International Monetary Fund, with its implications for neo-colonialism and the further exploitation of the under-developed countries, would need separate examination. But this concentration on the supreme task to salvage Western capitalism against the 'challenge' of socialism plays conveniently into the hands of the Tory Government to pose as the champions of East-West trade. The Tory Government symbolically defies Nato and the noisy protests of the United States and West Germany in order to export steel pipes to the Soviet Union, while the Labour Party clamours for the Western capitalist countries to draw their economic links closer as an integrated Western capitalist grouping in order to counter the 'challenge' of the economic advance of the socialist world. It is to be hoped that Mr. Wilson's forthcoming visit to Moscow will prove fruitful in leading to some relaxation of cold war attitudes and a more positive approach to the problems of international economic co-operation and peace.

Anglo-American Friction

No less noticeable is the way in which the Tory Government and leading Tory spokesmen are at the moment bringing into the forefront points of conflict with United States policy in a whole variety of fields, and encouraging semi-officially and sometimes even officially sentiments highly critical of the United States—at the very moment when Harold Wilson is belauding the United States Government as the finest Government in the world, and Washington is letting it be known that the return of a Wilson Labour Government in Britain and a Brandt Social Democratic Government in West Germany would be highly pleasing to the State Department. Of course there are real points of conflict reaching a considerable degree of sharpness at this moment between the United States and Britain, as well as between the United States and de Gaulle and Adenauer. These are characteristic of the present sharpening contradictions of the Western imperialist camp. These contradictions, which are rending Nato, reflect the deepening clash of rival monopoly economic interests in the battle for the shrinking world market and in the scramble for the neo-colonialist redivision of the world. The friction between the United States and Britain has been currently illustrated in the economic sphere over trade with the Soviet Union, shipping, Atlantic air fares, or Lord Hailsham's complaint of the United States living 'parasitically' on British scientists; and in the political-strategic sphere over Nato, the Skybolt sell-out, the 'multilateral' or 'multinational' nuclear force plan,

B.A.O.R. and the preparation for 90 days or 30 days non-nuclear war, or the British demand to 'plug in' on the proposed 'hot line' between Kennedy and Khrushchov (a demand refused by the United States). All this is part of the economic-political reality of the present world situation, independent of elections. But the publicity given at the present moment by Tory official and semi-official spokesmen to these differences is possibly not without regard to the electoral value of appearing to stand up to the United States.

Two Voices

Consider the contrast. Here is Harold Wilson on the Cabinet of the American multi-millionaires:

For sheer quality, the U.S. Government, from President Kennedy downwards, are without equal in any Administration in any country.

(Harold Wilson: 'My U.S. Trip', *Daily Herald*, April 8, 1963.)

And here is Selwyn Lloyd, able to speak the Tory mind with all the greater authority as a former Chancellor of the Exchequer and Foreign Secretary, and with all the greater freedom as being temporarily out of office. Writing in the New York *Saturday Evening Post* in February, he declared that some of America's allies

are getting increasingly tired of the feeling that they are being pushed about. . . . It is all right for the United States to take savage action against our shipping, to reject the idea of interdependence over weapons production . . . to deny entry into the United States market of our aircraft, to encourage American businessmen in economic imperialism and to have them compete against their allies, not always with complete scrupulousness. . .

Ostracising Russians, imposing stupid restrictions on trade, refusal to develop every form of contact is a weak and defensive policy.

(Selwyn Lloyd in the *Saturday Evening Post*, quoted in the *Daily Telegraph*, February 26, 1963.)

'Economic imperialism.' 'Pushed about.' 'Savage action.' 'Stupid restrictions.' Strong language. Perhaps the great British public will rise in wrath to hear such impious and disloyal language addressed to the American Idol? Perhaps they will rather purr with satisfaction when Wilson sings Hosannas too? Anyone who thinks that such is the tone of public opinion in this country had better lift his eyes from the servile official press and listen to the accents of the man in the street, in the pub, or, for that matter, in the club.

American View of British Public Opinion

It is well known that United States official circles have been increasingly concerned over what they call the 'anti-American' trend

of British public opinion. Recently they took soundings through a Gallup poll which was published in New York and revealed the following conclusions:

A large section of the British public has become convinced during the last few months that the United States is not treating Britain as an equal partner in matters concerning both countries.

A Gallup poll published today in New York says that 70 per cent of Britons are dissatisfied with treatment by America. This compares with a figure of 60 per cent in December.

At the same time British opinion is inclined to favour, by 43 per cent, a policy in which Britain settles for a neutral role in world affairs.

(Daily Telegraph, April 5, 1963.)

Seventy per cent critical of the United States in relation to Britain. Forty-three per cent for leaving Nato. The Tory election managers have their ears to the ground. They know that if they can succeed in presenting the Tory Government and the Tory Party as standing up for Britain's national independence against the United States, and label the Labour Party as the pro-American party beloved of Washington, with the rubber stamp of approval already given by the State Department for a Wilson Labour Government (*The Times* Washington correspondent, March 28, quoted last month), then they can still hope to retrieve their fallen fortunes and even achieve the almost impossible task of winning a fourth time in succession. Certainly their stock is now so low, in view of the visible state of the country, that by any reasonable measure they should be doomed anyway. But Right Wing Labour policy is doing its best to save them. The mass of the labour movement will be well advised to heed the warning, take nothing for granted, and intensify the fight for an effective alternative policy as the indispensable condition equally for electoral victory and to garner some fruits from the new Government after the electoral victory is won.

Waving the Nuclear Flag

This is the context in which the Tory election managers have apparently decided to make the issue of British 'nuclear arms independence' against the United States monopoly their key issue for the election. On the face of it, this attempt to brandish before the electorate the fantastic fiction of the British so-called 'independent nuclear deterrent', just after it has been shot to pieces by recent events, might appear an exercise in lunacy worthy of an apocryphal nuclear Colonel Blimp. Bomber Command is a dead duck in relation

to a modern nuclear war, and due to be dismantled, save so far as it is kept for colonial wars. Skybolt, Blue Streak, Blue Water—all have joined the snows of yesteryear. All that remains are the hypothetical front legs and hind legs of a future submarine not yet built, of which the decisive missile machinery is due to be made in America. How can this be an election winner? However, the Tory election managers are not entirely fools. If we are to believe the plain indication of Macmillan's Bromley speech on March 29, and the authoritative declaration of the main Tory organ, the *Daily Telegraph* next day, 'the General Election will be fought on the issue of Britain's independent deterrent'. To confirm the importance attached to this supposed key winning issue, on May 3 the Great White Chief himself was dragged out from his retirement to break a long silence and in an oracular utterance pronounce his blessing on the magic slogan. The Ace of Trumps has been played. It can only be beaten by a prior call of No Trumps: No H Bombs for Britain, neither British nor American. None of the three official parties is yet prepared to take this line. So the Tories hope to get away with it by invoking their old familiar maxim: When in trouble, Wave the Flag.

A Glorious Choice

The stage is set. The Tories call for the British H bomb to be maintained alongside and independent of the American H bomb. The Labour Party and Liberals call for the British H bomb to be gradually replaced by dependence on the American H bomb (with American use of Britain as a nuclear base, since the 1961 Labour Conference decision, carried against the leadership, condemning the Polaris base, has never been accepted by the parliamentary leadership, and M.P.s have been disciplined for obeying the Conference decision). The consequences of either policy would be equally suicidal for Britain; and in reality all three parties stand equally for the Fulton policy of surrender of Britain to United States domination and nuclear strategy. But if the Tories should succeed to twist the issue of the election into this shape: if they should succeed with their customary brazen hypocrisy to present themselves as the champions of British national independence and independent nuclear power against American nuclear domination, and to present the Labour Party as the representatives of surrender either to pacifist disarmament or to acceptance of American nuclear domination; then indeed they might hope to turn the unfavourable balance by

rallying the deep feelings of patriotism and national independence on their side to conceal their real betrayal of Britain.

Magic of the Electoral System

Thus by the marvellous alchemy of the two-party system (or three-party system, if the same basic imperialist and Nato policy is accepted all round) the grand issue and choice is presented for the sovereign electorate to determine: For the British H Bomb? Or for the American H Bomb? It is true that in a handful of constituencies, where Communist candidates are standing, it will be possible to vote against both; but under existing conditions this opportunity will only be open for a very limited fraction of the electorate. For the great mass of the electors, if the Tory Government makes this the issue of the election, and if present official Labour policy remains unchanged, the actual voting choice will be between the British H bomb and the American H bomb. Once this inspiring choice has been made—and whichever way it is made—all the ills that the operation of monopoly capitalism, Nato and rearmament may inflict upon the people during the next five years will be declared to represent the freely expressed will of the sovereign people.

Foreign Policy and the Electorate

Harold Wilson is reported by the Political Correspondent of *The Times* on May 13 to have warned at a private meeting, when pressed by some Left Labour representatives to take an initiative on some question of foreign policy, that 'foreign affairs may lose elections in Britain, but do not win them. We shall fight the next election on home policy'. What he meant is entirely understandable. The mass issues felt by millions are the conditions of life: homes; jobs; wages; redundancy; prices; the sick; the aged; schools. All these are in fact governed by international policy, by war and peace policy, especially in a country which is a great imperialist power, spending a great part of its wealth and production on armaments and overseas military purposes, and drawing tribute from all over the world. It is the responsibility of a serious political leader to help to make this connection understood by the people, rather than to take refuge in a false separation.

Record of Twelve Elections

But in fact there is an obvious contradiction in this judgment of

Harold Wilson, if he has been correctly reported by *The Times*. For if, as he is stated to have said, foreign policy can lose the election for one party in a general election, then it inevitably follows, with a mathematical necessity inescapable to so acute a brain as that of Harold Wilson, that the other party is winning the election on foreign policy. This general theoretical formulation can be tested by practice. An examination of the record of the twelve elections since the end of the first world war, nine of which have been won by Toryism, would show that in the majority of cases the Tories have chosen an issue of foreign policy to make the main fighting issue of the election. The 1918 election was won on 'Hang the Kaiser'. The 1922 election sprang from the Chanak crisis. The 1923 election was called to put over Imperial Preference. The 1924 election was won on the forged 'Zinoviev Letter' (with the aid of MacDonal). The 1935 election, preceding Munich, was fought on the pledge of 'collective security' to resist fascist aggression. The 1955 election was initiated on the H bomb, and then swung on Churchill's Summit call, with the immediately following Summit Conference. The 1959 election repeated the Summit call, immediately following Macmillan's visit to Moscow. Thus it would appear from this record that the Tories, who have won three elections for every one for Labour during this nearly half a century, do not regard foreign policy as mass poison for an election, but on the contrary again and again place it in the forefront. Perhaps it might be argued that Wilson's view is that foreign policy is a winner for the Tories, but a loser for Labour. In that case the question becomes: What kind of foreign policy?

A Policy for Peace

The conclusion is inescapable. A serious policy for peace is the first necessity for Labour in this election, both to win the election and to make possible a constructive achievement by the new Government in the home social and economic field. The home issues cannot be separated from the policy for peace; the former depend on the latter. The experience of the 1945-51 Labour Government showed once and for all that the failure of a policy for peace, the Attlee-Bevin-Churchill Fulton policy, the acceptance of the cold war, Nato, U.S. nuclear strategy and bases in Britain, Nazi rearmament and a crushing rearmament programme wrecked the home policies for social advance, wrecked the 1945 mass victory,

and ushered in twelve years of Tory rule. We do not want to see this experience repeated on what could prove an even more serious scale in the present dangerous world situation. Therefore the fight must be fought now while there is time. It is necessary to speak plainly. There are undoubtedly a number of important and admirable points in the many resolutions on foreign policy adopted at various times by Labour Party Conferences. But what matters now is the main actual line presented by the official leadership as the voice of Labour to the people. It is not compatible with a serious peace policy to surrender Britain to the United States nuclear strategy. It is not compatible with a serious peace policy to accept the Polaris base or Panzer training troops in Britain or overseas colonial wars or the present indefensible rearmament programme (and even propose to extend expenditure, as Gordon Walker has done, on occupation troops in Germany) or East-West trade bans. Such a policy makes nonsense of the social and economic promises.

Peace and the Election

Peace is the paramount issue before the people today, and governs every other issue. If Tory electoral strategy at this moment, as we have indicated, is able to make play with a hypocritical show of standing up for Britain's national independence against United States domination, or for moves to promote East-West trade and co-operation, it is only because the opportunity has been handed to them by the Right Wing Labour policy of cold war rigidity and servility to the United States. It is essential for the active fight of the whole labour movement to change this situation. A clarion call and mass campaign for an independent foreign policy for Britain in the interests of peace, for the end of the cold war and repudiation of United States and Nato nuclear strategy, for the drastic reduction of the arms programme, and for close co-operation with the advancing world of socialism and national liberation in mutually beneficial trade and economic expansion, and on this basis for social and economic advance at home, could rally support of the majority of the people, and open the way, not only for electoral victory over Toryism, but for the inauguration of a positive alternative policy by the new Government of the labour movement on the basis of such a victory.

May 20, 1963.

R.P.D.

GIMMICKS OR POLITICS?

D. N. Pritt, Q.C.

THE two main political parties are now preparing for the periodical business of letting the British electorate 'democratically' exercise its free and quiet choice of those who are to have the political leadership and government of the country, so far as may be allowed by the finance-capitalist ruling class.

The 'ins' start, as always, with the right of befouling the free and quiet choice by selecting a moment for the election at which they think that hysteria, a temporary rally of our chronically sick capitalist economy, or a judicious use of bribe-promises, may bamboozle the electors into making a choice which they would not have made a month before and would not make a month later. With that advantage, the 'ins' are planning, as usual, an expensive advertising campaign, designed by experts in the sale of unsaleable commodities; this, they hope will make the 'free and quiet' election as unfree and unquiet as possible, and thus secure—for the fourth time running since the war—a new lease of life (or death) in which they may keep their power, break their promises, keep the sick capitalist economy ticking over, and prepare for a fifth swindle.

It is no good blaming them. What else could one expect them to do? 'Let (jackals) delight to bark and bite, for 'tis their nature to'. Nor can one expect them to explain frankly to the nearly one-half of the working-class that still votes for them that their nearest approach to a political principle is: 'What we have we hold. What we hold, we exploit. And that means you.' So, for them, the aid of experts in the sale of the unsaleable is the most natural thing.

But what of the 'outs'? Whilst they cannot select the date of the General Election (unless they can force the 'ins' into such a mess that they have to dissolve Parliament at once), they can prepare to fight the election by whatever means they choose. They can say, for example: 'We are a party with political principles which we do not need to conceal, good principles, Socialist principles. We can and we will proudly proclaim these principles, and convince the majority of the working class and a good many others too—and thus the absolute majority—that these principles are sound. And then they will follow us in setting our country on the Socialist path, bringing it out of the shadow of capitalist death into the clean fresh air of our Socialist future, of justice, prosperity and peace.'

This they can do, well and victoriously. Or they can copy the 'ins' and plan an election campaign to secure votes by methods recommended by publicity merchants accustomed to helping their clients to sell washing-machines. And if by such methods they can out-gimmick the 'ins', they will—whatever else they lose—win the election. And if they thus win the election, by what policies and methods will they govern the country? What course will they follow? In the election, it is already clear that they are to copy the 'ins'. They have announced—see for example *The Times*, April 22, 1963—that over six months they will spend 'hundreds of thousands of pounds . . . according to carefully worked-out plans', and that their election campaign 'will be based on public opinion surveys commissioned . . . from a well-known commercial organisation'.

And the aim of this campaign? Surely, to try to convince the whole mass of the electorate of the need for a Socialist future? Oh, no. The aim is 'to concentrate the appeal not merely on the ninety or so marginal Conservative constituencies but on the marginal voters in them!' (If ninety constituencies contain together about 4.5 million electors, and 10 per cent of them may be 'marginal', the target will be less than half a million!)

And what propaganda will be offered to this restricted target? Will it be that of a Socialist future? Not quite: we are told, 'the propaganda will be in the form which the experts'—experts in salesmanship—'think will most impress them'. On May 20, the first advertisement actually appeared in the National Press, and seemed to follow, both in form and substance, the line of the corresponding Tory advertisements, thus seeming to reduce the great political problems of the day to a competition between rival publicity merchants.

So much for methods, methods copied from the 'ins', who are richer, craftier, and more experienced in salesmanship and mass-swindling. The next, and equally important, question is: How will they govern the country if they win? (Which includes the question, what sort of a programme will they put before the electorate at the election?) All the signs at present are that they propose to preserve the capitalist state, and to govern it on capitalist lines, just as the 'ins' propose to do; they merely offer to do it better. Perhaps they could scarcely do it worse; indeed, the muddle, incompetence, and irresolution at present displayed by the 'ins' is actually dangerous, for it may tempt the 'outs' to sit back and wait idly for victory, forgetting the infinite capacity of the 'ins' for reviving their own corpses.

But in any case, running a capitalist country on capitalist lines

is not the job of a Socialist party. Equally, it is not the way to win an election, for right-wing electors think that, if the country is to be run on capitalist lines, it should be run by a purely capitalist party, and the Left may think that a Labour Party which wants to do the Tories' work for them is not worth fighting for. (There is, too, the additional danger that, if they really propose to run the country on capitalist lines, they may find the Tories giving them a legacy of stagnation, slump, and unemployment which will make it impossible to run the country on such lines, with a result reminiscent of 1931.)

The proposal of the 'outs' is in effect to employ the wrong people to operate a wrong method of selling the wrong policy. They should realise that their offer to run capitalism better than the capitalists has been rejected at the polls three times running, and should get back to Socialist principles before it is too late. They should take up the battle for a real decisive change in policy; the end of bi-partisanship; for peace against the cold war; for the interests of the people against the monopolies, and educate the whole electorate to insist on that change, with the unity of the whole of the left-wing forces to carry it through.

LABOUR MONTHLY

FORTY YEARS AGO

APPROACH TO POWER

Again and again in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords on certain fundamental issues which arise it is proudly stated by the Leader of the Opposition and proudly accepted by the Government that 'the question is one on which there can be no division of opinion', that 'every section of the House stands behind the Government in its attitude on this matter'. Fundamental issues of this kind are usually those of foreign and imperial affairs (with which are connected the Army and the Navy), or questions of the maintenance of law and order inside this country. If there were any chance that a General Election might be a revolution, then you may be sure Conservatives would fight against the advent of Liberals or Labour men with other methods than those now employed. If victory of a party meant victory of a class then it would be resisted by every conceivable means. But it is understood that party changes will operate only on a certain limited range of matters: that certain other matters are in the cant phrase, 'above party'. What are these matters that are above party? They appear to be now one thing, now another, but a very little thought reduces them to one single conception—that is the assured continuance of the rule of the bourgeoisie. It is the continuance of capitalist civilisation as we know it that is above party.

(From 'The Labour Party's Approach to Power' by R. Page Arnot. *Labour Monthly*, June 1923.)

Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties

NICKY AND THE BUILDERS

J. C. Paterson*

THERE is a tendency in these days for large corporations to become known by their initials. One must agree that the National Incomes Commission is aptly described as N.I.C. or as Scotland's National Bard used to say 'Old Satan, Nick or Clottie'. The first report of N.I.C. is now out on the question of the Scottish Plumbers' and the Scottish Builders' agreements of 1962 on the working of a forty-hour week, and it is certainly the Devil's Brew so far as any progress on the forty-hour week, or the wages struggle, by the working-class movement is concerned.

Before studying the report, trade unionists should remember that this commission was brought into being by the Tory Government under the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, Selwyn Lloyd, whose dear money policy and rigidity in the operation of pure capitalist economics was responsible in the main for the high unemployment and deplorable state of our economy. We should also recall the period of so-called wage stabilisation and the Chancellor's direct interference in wage settlements arrived at in various government departments with the result that protests came from all sections of the trade union movement. Ultimately Selwyn Lloyd had to resign, yet within weeks the Tory Party were congratulating him on the success of his policy. Selwyn went on the sacrificial altar of expediency but the policy of wage restraint under the guise of a National Incomes Policy was to be carried on under the cover of the National Incomes Commission.

One can readily understand, therefore, the discussion at the Trades Union Congress in 1962 and the decision of the General Council not to take any part in the National Incomes Commission. They advised all trade unions to boycott the Commission by refusing to appear before it, and the Plumbing Trades Union and the National Federation of Building Trade Operatives carried out this decision. Yet, so keen was the Commission to carry out its task of opposition to progress by Building Trade workers, that we had the laughable position of the Chairman of the Commission donning the mantle of the Unions and answering questions he put to himself.

The Tory Government submitted statements and supplied a

*Mr. Paterson is ■ Executive Committee member of the Scottish Plumbing Trades Union.

number of documents to the Commission and both Government and Employers' representatives gave oral evidence. In the Government statements, emphasis was placed on the need to have an incomes policy aimed at keeping the rate of increase in money incomes within the rate of increase of national production. The building trade employers, without exception, claimed that the forty-hour week would increase costs in the industry and that these costs would be passed to the consumer. Both the Government representatives and the building trade employers' representatives objected to the plumbing and Scottish building workers' agreements, and hoped that something could be done to prevent their extension to other sections of industry.

With such uniformity of thought and purpose between the Commission itself, the Government and the employers' representatives, it was only to be expected that the Commission would decide that the Scottish builders' agreements on the forty-hour week was against the national interests. Added to this the Commission had the temerity to make reference to the negotiations taking place in England and Wales and make recommendations as to how a settlement should be arrived at. This interference in negotiations will be resented by the building trade workers.

One would have believed that any enquiry into costs and incomes would also have included the question of profit margins and dividends, but the Commission made no recommendations with regard to these. In one paragraph of the report the Commission clearly accepts the assurances of the employers that their profit margins were not unreasonable and that they left no room for the absorption of any increased labour costs. Yet building trade workers know that in this industry there are no less than 5,619 main contractors employing more than 25 persons, while sub-contractors in the same position number 1,134. Such is the organisation of employers in this industry that only 25 per cent of the companies publish accounts to which the public have access. In the main these are companies which get money from the Stock Exchange. Seventy-five per cent of the profits in the industry are made by companies to whose accounts the public has no access at all. According to the Board of Trade summary of the published accounts, for the years 1950 to 1960 they show that gross profits rose from £13.2 million to £31.3 million, an increase of 136 per cent. There is no reason to believe that this 75 per cent of companies whose accounts are not open to the public, are any less healthy so far as profits are concerned.

Similarly one would have thought that any discussion on costs in the building industry must make reference to the major items of cost, namely, interest rates and the price of land. Interest rates running at $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent are the greatest addition to costs so far as housing is concerned. For example, the annual loan charges on a £2,000 house, if the money is paid back over sixty years, represents £137 per year or about £2 13s. 0d. per week of which around £2 is interest. This £2,000 house would ultimately cost £7,700 and the total interest over the sixty years would be £5,700. So much for the incomes of the money lenders at the expense of the public and on this subject the National Incomes Commission is silent. The same position prevails so far as the purchase of land is concerned. In Surrey a plot of land which changed hands at £800 in 1953, now sells for £11,000. In Nottinghamshire in 1953, 22 acres changed hands for £1,800—*i.e.*, about £82 an acre. Now the Rural District Council has had to pay £45,000 for them—*i.e.*, about £2,000 an acre. Many more examples could be given.

So far as the building trade workers are concerned, profits, interest rates and high land values are the major cost items in their industry and they will reject entirely the findings of the National Incomes Commission. The trade union movement has already rejected the Commission's findings and one should note that while the Commission was sitting, other agreements were arrived at in the electrical and heating industry for the operation of the forty-hour week. The General Secretary of the National Federation of Building Trade Operatives has declared, quite correctly, 'the findings of the National Incomes Commission are just what we and no doubt the Government expected'.

Building trade workers in common with other trade unions must carry on the fight for improved wages and conditions. It is significant that in the report of the National Incomes Commission the following statement is made:

It is worthy of note that this was the first occasion in some 40 years of national negotiations in the Building Industry that direct action was resorted to, to achieve a major change in wage rates and working conditions.

Here is the key to the struggle for building trade workers. For too long this industry has been a Cinderella. The present negotiations must result in improved wages and working hours. The Trades Union Congress should not only be advising unions to boycott the National Incomes Commission, but should be leading a campaign for the forty-hour week in all industries. Such a campaign would be in line with the declaration of the International Labour Office.

This is the way forward and the way to defeat the Tory Government's attempt through N.I.C. to have an incomes policy at the expense of the wage earners.

VICTIMS OF FORDS

Fred Blake

*Organising Secretary, East London,
National Union of Vehicle Builders.*

[A dramatic breakdown in negotiations with Fords comes at the moment of going to press. This article shows how essential it is to stand firmly for reinstatement of these victims.]

THE fate of the seventeen victimised workers of Fords of Dagenham is being watched closely by the trade union movement. Already the first shot has been fired in the fight for their reinstatement. The policy-making National Committee of the Amalgamated Engineering Union has repudiated Professor Jack's report on the Ford dispute and instructed its Executive Council 'to take effective steps to secure the reinstatement of victimised active trade unionists'.

This 58-page report of Professor Jack's 'Court of Inquiry' published in April was cloaked in carefully chosen words in order to curb too much criticism of the Ford Management's bungling of industrial relationship. Its purpose appears to have been to add to the already much publicised false image, created for the general public, of the dangers that will confront Britain's economy if the trade union movement maintains a 'militant element' in its ranks.

These constant attacks on the active union members in the factories by outside bodies must be decisively defeated by a strong, united labour movement. The elimination of the active shop steward from industry would result in non-unionism, and isolated scattered units each fighting their own battle. It is not surprising therefore, that the Jack Report is just another attack on the Shop Stewards' Committee at Fords. The report goes to great lengths to emphasise the Company's rights to manage its own business and to hire and fire at will, but completely ignores the democratic responsibility of the trade unions to manage their own affairs.

The report states that 'There is no doubt that over a number of years, the Company had been frustrated and put to unreasonable inconvenience by a militant element among their employees'. So let us examine these so-called 'unreasonable inconveniences' that the

mighty Ford Company were called upon to tolerate :

Workers' claim for joint consultation on new time study figures, mobility of labour, overtime requirements, allocation of merit awards and future changes in working conditions;

full facilities for Convenors and Shop Stewards to operate within the terms of the National Agreement and for 'status quo' to come into force pending negotiations;

to hold union card checks, collect union subscriptions, organise the election of Shop Stewards and the democratic right to hold Shop Meetings for the report-back of negotiations to the workers.

Would it be correct to assume Professor Jack is unaware of the fact that the 'unreasonable inconveniences' the Ford Motor Company are complaining about, are actually the aims and policies of every trade union in Britain today?

For example, the National Union of Vehicle Builders in their Rule 33 states 'Shop Meetings of members shall be called once a month and special meetings may be convened by the Shop Committee or when requested by 25 per cent of the members'. Or to note the 'Civil Rights for Citizens', 'It is the right of the citizen freely to meet and express himself and to further his views by peaceful demonstrations'.

The Company complained at the Court of Inquiry that pamphlets issued by the Shop Stewards' Committee contained bitter attacks against them—a small retribution for the attacks on the Ford worker through the medium of the press, television, radio, religious and political bodies. Never have such a group of trade unionists had so much press publicity as at Fords; even a small section of workers declining to work excessive overtime hit the headlines! And when the placards appear on the streets, certain National leaders and bowler-hatted gentlemen in the City solemnly declare again that the only solution is to sack all the Shop Stewards.

Professor Jack's proposals for the training of Shop Stewards must be completely rejected. This is the responsibility of the trade unions and outside interference in trade union affairs cannot be tolerated. Further, the method of the election of the Shop Steward who has to abide by the rules of his own union, must be done within his union's constitution, free from any Company interference.

The Ford Joint Shop Stewards' Committee enjoys the full support of the Ford workers and the Shop Stewards have always been a militant and active body playing no small part in the constant struggle to improve the present inadequate negotiating machinery. More attention should have been paid by the Court of Inquiry to

the basic root of all the trouble at the Dagenham factories, which was the reluctance on the part of the American-owned Company to operate a joint consultation system at all negotiating levels in the procedural machinery. There was the glaring example of the unnecessary urgency by the Ford Motor Company in dismissing Bill Francis before allowing the opportunity for District Officials to have the right of negotiation.

This is the second time at this plant, that reliance has been placed on a 'Court of Inquiry' to find a solution to their industrial troubles. These supposedly impartial bodies (in which, on this occasion at least, the trade union assessors were not even allowed to see the Report) should be viewed with the utmost caution.*

There can be no turning back now. The Ford trade union leaders must take steps to gain confidence in the ability of the trade union movement to maintain necessary safeguards for their members to carry out their union functions in the factories, or the factory organisation could revert back to 1937 conditions. Professor Jack's proposals (almost entirely in favour of the employer) should be rejected. The trade unions should put forward their own formula for improving relationships:

1. Immediate re-employment of Bill Francis and the seventeen trade unionists.
2. Future dismissals and disciplinary action to be negotiable with trade unions.
3. Wages and conditions in conformity with other major car industries.
4. Abolition of the compulsory overtime clause.
5. Workers' safeguards within Mobility of Labour operation.
6. Right to hold Shop Meetings in the workers' time on the premises.
7. Dissolution of the Work Study procedure.
8. Replacement of the merit award system by service increments.
9. An amended Ford 'Blue Book'.
10. The operation of District Officials, Works Committees and Shop Stewards more fully in the procedure machinery.

At the time of writing this article the trade unions are still pursuing their negotiations with the Ford Company. Meanwhile the victimised workers have been 'on the stones' for 28 weeks with an overall average income of less than £8 a week to provide food for them and their families. Their struggle for trade union rights deserves the wholehearted support of the labour movement.

*Over fifty years ago, C. W. Bowerman, M.P., then Secretary of the Trades Union Congress, told how the right of combination (which includes the right to elect shop stewards with full powers, as well as other trades union officials) ■■■ always in danger from the judges 'whose decisions' he wrote 'have invariably favoured Capital against the interests of Labour'.

SALUTE TO

(The Annual Conference of the Scottish Trades Union Congress unanimously passed a resolution pledging the Congress to outlaw the Franco Government and assist the Spanish people to regain their democratic rights and freedom. We print below the speech made by John Wood in moving this resolution.—Ed, L.M.)

Millions in every land were shocked at the shooting of Julian Grimau by a Fascist firing squad on the orders of Franco.

British representatives described the trial as a travesty of justice. Charges which his accusers refused to substantiate and which he denied, went back twenty-five years to when Julian Grimau, representing the legal democratically elected Government of Spain, side by side with the International Brigade defended it from the counter-revolution, led by Fascist Franco, assisted by Hitler and Mussolini.

When Franco ordered the shooting to take place at dawn on April 20, 1963, it was deliberate judicial murder. To Julian Grimau it was the ending of his longest night. We cannot bring him back to life, but we can make the shots of the Fascist firing squad that ended his life the signal for a new dawn for the Spanish people in their fight for political and trade union freedom and a democratic government. Franco, his Fascist Government, and Fascist thugs must be outlawed. The workers' international movements, political and trade union, including the 47th Conference of the International Labour Office, can serve notice to quit on them.

The Spanish people will arise to a new awakening. Democratic victory will mean the ending of the long dark night for them and the dawning of a new day. While we cannot resurrect Julian Grimau, we can keep his memory green. His brutal death cannot shield his murderers from the condemnation of world opinion. The work of Grimau and all his comrades who have lost their lives and suffered in the struggle against Fascism and for a free and democratic Spain will not have been in vain. The long dark night will be gone for ever and the people of Spain will take their rightful place in the ranks of the free democratic countries.

We pledge to them our full unfettered support.

JOHN WOOD

(Secretary, Scottish Area of the National Union of Mineworkers).

LIAN GRIMAU



*'I have been a Communist for 25 years,
and I will die a Communist.'*

TRUTH ABOUT MALAYSIA

Ian Page*

UNLESS it can be prevented, a Federation of Malaysia is due to be created by August 31, 1963, covering the Federation of Malaya, Singapore, North Borneo, Sarawak and Brunei. There is mass opposition in those countries to its establishment.

The British Government is mainly responsible for this proposed Federation, which is planned as the political framework supporting the unified military command already in operation in the area covered by the five territories. The most important local influence in this framework will be the extreme right-wing Government of the Federation of Malaya, led by Tengku Abdul Rahman and representing feudal and business interests. Malaysia will give it the opportunity to extend its hold to the other four territories. Basically, Macmillan's Government aims, through this Federation, to maintain its grip on the vast profits extracted from rubber, tin, bauxite, oil, gold, iron ore and timber, and on the great strategic bases and training grounds in Malaya and Borneo.

Let us look at each of the territories due to be forced into Malaysia. The Federation of Malaya is the largest, both in area and population (6,500,000). Foreign capital, mostly British, controls the economy, owning at least 60 per cent of the rubber plantations and 60 per cent of the mining industry—tin, iron ore and bauxite. In recent years, U.S. capital has been making increasing inroads. At Butterworth, in north Malaya, is the modern, British strategic air base. Further down the west coast stands the big new army base of Fort George (Bukit Terendak), which has so far cost the British taxpayer at least £5 million, and houses British, New Zealand, Australian and Gurkha troops.

In 1957, the British Government, satisfied that its economic, political and military interests would be safeguarded, conceded political independence to Tengku Abdul Rahman's Government. Immediately after the independence proclamation, a 'Defence and Mutual Assistance' agreement was concluded, providing for the continued stationing of British troops in Malaya, and the continuation of the jungle war against the Malayan Guerillas; without foreign troops, of course, the Tengku could not have continued that war. For instance, during the military 'Operation Ginger' in north Malaya in 1959—nearly two years after independence—no less than 12 of

*Ian Page is Secretary, London Area, Movement for Colonial Freedom.

the 15 units involved were British, Australian or New Zealand. Only three months ago, the memorandum accompanying the British Government's air estimates for 1963/64 stated that R.A.F. 'Air transport and reconnaissance operations continue in support of internal security forces in the border areas of Northern Malaya. Supply has been at the rate of about 75-80 tons a month . . . and an average of about 550 troops have been transported by air each month'.

In spite of repressive Internal Security legislation, opposition to the Malaysia Federation continually makes itself heard. On April 25, 1963, a mass rally of 10,000 was held in the capital, Kuala Lumpur, protesting against Malaysia, and sponsored by the Malayan Labour Party, Party Ra'ayat (People's Party), People's Progressive Party, Pan-Malayan Islamic Party and the United Democratic Party. Arrests are continually taking place of those opposed to Malaysia. On February 13, 1963, Ahmad Boestamam, Party Ra'ayat chairman and a Socialist Front M.P. (the Socialist Front links the Labour Party and Party Ra'ayat) was arrested and detained.

Singapore (population of 1,750,000) was deliberately cut off from the mainland of Malaya in 1948, as part of the British Government's 'divide and rule' policy and desire to protect that island base, with its three military airfields, vast naval base and dockyard, and large areas of army barracks. This is the headquarters of British Far East Command, and the centre of Britain's contribution to Seato, as well as being a great and wealthy entrepôt port. In 1939, as the result of continued popular pressure, the people of Singapore won a limited form of self-government. Britain retains overall control and helps to maintain in office the increasingly unpopular Government led by Lee Kuan Yew. The existing constitution expires this year, and the British Government is afraid of the Singapore people's desire for the total abolition of British sovereignty. In September, 1962, a phoney referendum was therefore held—instigated by the British, Singapore and Malayan Governments—with the aim of forcing Singapore into the Federation of Malaya, and thence into Malaysia, on severely disadvantageous terms. The referendum was, of course, a 'success'; the questions were 'loaded', all people were compelled to vote and threatened with the loss of citizenship rights if they did not, and all blank and uncertain votes were counted in favour of the proposals! Let us be quite clear that the Singapore people want *genuine* reunification with Malaya, but not on the basis of adding Tengku Abdul Rahman's oppressive Government, more

foreign troops and extra Internal Security Regulations to their already severely restrictive conditions.

Widespread opposition has, therefore, been expressed in Singapore to the proposed Malaysia scheme. On February 2, 1963, the Singapore Internal Security Council (made up of British, Malayan and Singapore Government representatives, with a British chairman) ordered a police swoop; altogether, 118 persons from trade unions, student/graduate associations and from the opposition Barisan Socialis (Socialist Front) were arrested, and subsequently detained without trial for at least one year. On March 24, 1963, a 10,000-strong rally was held against Malaysia; the Barisan Socialis chairman, Dr. Lee Siew Choh, called for the reunification of Singapore and the Federation of Malaya into a genuinely democratic and independent Malaya free of foreign troops and foreign control. On April 22, 1963, a demonstration took place outside Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew's office, followed by marches with crowds of people crying 'Merdeka' (freedom). On this occasion, no less than 7 of the 13 Barisan Socialis Legislative Assemblymen were arrested, including Dr. Lee Siew Choh. There are now 133 members of the Barisan Socialis, Singapore Association of Trade Unions (SATU) and others, detained without trial.

The 'protectorate' of Brunei (60,000 people), and the colonies of Sarawak (700,000) and North Borneo (400,000) are situated on one side of the island of Borneo (Kalimantan), most of which belongs to Indonesia. The territories—artificial creations of earlier colonial days—are called by the people 'North Kalimantan'. Brunei is rich in oil, with the Sultan receiving £10 million a year in royalties. Recently, the Shell Company announced a further strike of oil two miles offshore from Seria. Mass opposition to the proposed Federation of Malaysia came to a head in December, 1962, when, in desperation, the Brunei Party Ra'ayat (People's Party) led an open revolt against Malaysia. It is significant to note that when, last September, the first elections were held under a new constitution, the Party Ra'ayat won all of the six elected seats on the Executive Council, the entire 16 elected seats on the Legislative Council, and 54 out of 55 seats in the District Council elections. Of course, the constitution is very limited, with the British Government controlling the apparatus and nominated members outweighing elected members. It took 4,000 British troops, together with aircraft and the Royal Navy to suppress the immediate revolt in Brunei and in the neighbouring areas of Limbang in Sarawak and Weston in North Borneo, and sporadic fighting still continues.

In North Borneo, opposition to Malaysia is developing apace. On April 5, 1963, a body called the North Borneo Revolutionary Government issued a manifesto calling for independence and unity for North Kalimantan. Opposition in Sarawak is widespread. For instance, in April, 1962, the Sarawak United People's Party held a demonstration of 10,000 against Malaysia, and some leaders were detained and deported. A protest rally subsequently took place at Sibul, attended by 20,000 people. After this, the British authorities banned all meetings. Armed opposition is also developing. On April 12, 1963, a unit attacked and captured Tebedu Police Post not far from Kuching, the capital of the colony. Strong reinforcements of Royal Marines, King's Own Yorkshire Light Infantry and Gurkhas have been sent into Sarawak from Singapore and Brunei.

It is obvious that these three territories, if their peoples really had a chance to declare a new opinion, want nothing whatsoever to do with Malaysia. They want genuine independence, with a view to subsequent integration among themselves. It could be that eventually they will unite with the Republic of Indonesia, with whose peoples in the rest of Kalimantan the three territories have much in common, both ethnically and historically.

The proposed Federation of Malaysia is becoming an important international issue. Condemnation of this blatant example of neo-colonialism is increasing. Already, appeals have been made to the United Nations from the Singapore Barisan Socialis and other bodies in the area; the most recent coming from the Wharf Labourers' Union Federation and First Division TUC in Sarawak.

Indonesia is particularly threatened by this strengthening of imperialism right next door. On April 24, 1963, at the opening session of the Afro-Asian Journalists' Conference, President Sukarno declared 'The struggle of the people of North Kalimantan is to resist the formation of Malaysia and to try instead to achieve full independence'. On May 4, 1963, at a rally in Kotabaru in West Irian (former Dutch New Guinea) he linked the British Borneo territories with Portuguese Angola as centres of the anti-colonial struggle which Indonesia would always support. Earlier this year, Major-General Achmed Jani, the Indonesian Army Chief of Staff, told troops at Pontianak in West Kalimantan, bordering on Sarawak, 'We give our fullest moral support to our friends there, while the army is awaiting the order to move'. Such is the feeling of Indonesians to their kith and kin across the colonial border.

The London *Times* said, in an editorial dated April 25, 1963, 'If all signs of opposition to the plan for a Malaysian Federation were

added together, the weight might seem enough to crush the new state that is to be born at the end of August'. In spite of this, in spite of the bitter lesson of trying to force a federation on the peoples of Central Africa, it is clear that Macmillan's Government intends to do its utmost to initiate the Federation of Malaysia by August. In Britain, it has been difficult for many people to learn the real facts. Most organs of the press, television and other media, when they do report the issue, usually dismiss the widespread opposition in South-East Asia as 'communist inspired'.

The Labour movement therefore has a particular responsibility to oppose this Federation and reveal the realities behind the façade. Some trade unions and constituency Labour parties are beginning to declare their opposition to Malaysia, and their concern at the wave of arrests and general repression of those in the five countries who oppose Federation. The Labour Party is sending a fact-finding mission to the area. Legislation affecting Federation will have to pass through Parliament at Westminster, and some opposition M.P.s—only a few at present—are expressing concern.

Surely we need to broadcast widely that the people of Britain, taxpayers all, also have a real interest in opposing the Malaysia scheme. It was the British taxpayer who was squeezed to the tune of at least £1,000 million to maintain the war against the Malayan guerillas from 1948 to 1959, and the total in further millions poured out to pay for the continuation of these jungle operations in Malaya from 1959 to date is anybody's guess. Several more millions have been provided for military operations in Borneo since December.

Early in 1962, a Socialist Conference was held at Kuala Lumpur in Malaya, the Party Ra'ayat of Brunei, the United People's Party of Sarawak and the Barisan Socialis Party Ra'ayat and Workers' Party of Singapore. The Conference roundly condemned the Malaysia scheme, and declared that any closer association of the peoples in the area could only be founded on:

- recognition of the right of self-determination of all the peoples of Malaysia; negotiations between the representatives of the peoples and not with the British government;
- rejection of military pacts with the West;
- friendship with neighbouring countries, particularly with Indonesia.

Surely it is the right of these peoples to freely decide their own future, and not to be moved like pawns into a complex designed to 'protect' profits and bases. It is clearly in the interests of the people of Britain that we should give them maximum support in their campaigns against the proposed Federation of Malaysia.

MODERN CONDITIONS AND THE UNIONS

Roy Sanderson

AT Brighton this September, the Trades Union Congress will hear the first report of the General Council on 're-organising the structure of Britain's trade unions so as to fit them to modern industrial conditions'. While at Blackpool last year both platform and delegates alike approved the need to look at 're-organisation', it was clear from the start that any eventual proposals for harmony's sake would have to 'face both ways' (not an impossible feat at the T.U.C.).

Clearly there are two totally opposed concepts of the role that 're-organised' trade unionism should play in a Britain dominated by monopoly capital. The right wing, convinced by a decade of stability, more apparent than real, that at last capitalism has found a durable form, sees capitalism as the only possible social system for Britain. They accept, therefore, the closures and run-downs, the Beeching style rationalisation, ruthless work speed-up with its resultant sackings and human miseries, as a necessary, if unpleasant, price to pay for efficiency. The trade unions, they say, must not challenge the system, but rather become an absorbed, respected part of the establishment, dedicated to the dying cause of private profit.

The progressive left wing, too long dissipated by anti-communism and too often failing to channel its workshop strength into the official movement, points to the flagging economy, the derelict areas, wage freeze, impoverished pensioners, and jobless school leavers, to show that British capitalism is more rotten today than ever it was. They know that sweeping changes are needed, that socialism is the answer, and seeing the class-war as a reality they know only too well how vital the unions are to ultimate working class victory.

Two opposed policies then, but that is not new; in one form or another the antagonism is as old as the movement. What is new, however, is the objective pressures building up to compel a decisive choice. Not within one particular union, but in Congress itself, involving the entire movement. These new and compelling pressures arise from the frantic efforts British capitalism is making to survive the fierce economic rivalry of friends and allies. Costs must be reduced, production expanded, wages depressed: this is their formula for survival. Clearly the carrying through of such policies is incompatible with strong and independent trade unions. So both major contestants prepare for battle. The right wing, backed by the State machine, is determined to drown the unions in class collaboration.

The left wing, armed by the Communist Congress decisions on the future of trade unionism, is determined to transform them for working class advancement.

Monopoly capital has more than just a passing interest in this first interim report at Brighton. It is vitally interested, and extremely active in trying to influence the direction of any proposals. Their tactics are in classical style: the velveted iron fist; a case of soft soap and the big stick. On one hand 'productivity year' bun fights, and, on the other, the heavy hand at Fords. Their main objective now, having lured the unions with 'Neddy' is to find a formula which will enable right-wing leaders to pass off 'Nicky' as not so bad once you've grasped the nettle. Although the General Council are cool towards 'Nicky' now (what else could they be, in view of the 'pay pause' revolt) it would be fatal for the Left to consider the issue a dead letter. Take careful note of Sir William Carron qualifying his luke-warm opposition to 'Nicky' with a call for 'equal sacrifice'. The same catchy phrase echoes along the Opposition front bench, and even some Tories are taking it up. Now, surely, an advertising agency can devise some gimmick that would portray 'Nicky' as a dispenser of 'equal sacrifice', then both workers and employers could pay equal tribute. For whose benefit? Why, the employers, of course.

It is the outcome of these issues, class issues, that will determine the form and structure of a re-organised trade unionism. It is not a case of settling down to work out, unhindered, the most efficient type of organisation; this question of structure cannot be separated from the question of role—it is complimentary to it—that much emerges from the Communist Party's 28th Congress resolution 'The Future of Trade Unionism' referred to earlier. As yet the only comprehensive contribution to the discussion, it gives voice to workshop aspirations and provides much-needed leadership in offering a counter strategy to that of the monopolists. Its corner-stone is unity between the Communists and progressive trade unionists, aimed at winning a still broader unity throughout the movement.

One of its principal demands is for extended democracy—a key factor for trade union strength. The Left has always held that the more democratic a trade union, the more its members participate in the day-to-day affairs, the better equipped it becomes to extract concessions from the employers. An integral part of any democratic structure is the periodic election of union officers, at whatever level. In this regard some unions have the appearance of a dynasty rather than a workers' organisation. The right-wing leaders flourish in

such set-ups and realising that trade union democracy equals working-class strength, they bitterly resist democratic reforms. They want an 'officer class' installed in the top trade union jobs, with salaries at Company Director levels. They want to instruct the members rather than consult them; a sort of 'managed' trade unionism to harmonise with 'managed' capitalism, so both could stagnate together. This question of democracy, therefore, is the 'Achilles heel' of the right wing; it can rally the broadest sections of the movement. It is a vital and indispensable part of Left strategy.

The controversy will take on different forms and no doubt become sharper after the Brighton report. Fleet Street scribes will intensify the General Council's demand for greater powers—though they already have powers that they have not begun to use yet. Of course, these are powers that the Press Lords do not want to see used; these include mobilising support for unions engaged in struggle with the class enemy, encouraging trade union recruitment, demanding better social services for working people, taking emergency action when the peace is threatened. (Yet, what happened on Cuba?) These are powers indeed. What better 'terms of reference' could any working-class leadership wish for? But the documents setting out these powers must surely be lost somewhere in Congress House.

The powers the Press Lords want to bestow on the General Council, as one might expect, are those which would prevent any activities which may run counter to the wishes of Big Business: powers to prevent unions fighting in the interest of their members, union member, in whose view, the General Council have always would have to excuse the utter confusion of the rank and file trade union member, for in his view, the General Council have always had such powers and have exercised them vigorously, as in the 'Big Strike' and now on 'Beeching'. Indeed, the only time the rank and file hear from the General Council is when some strike or other needs preventing, or some Tory Chancellor's budget is in need of congratulations. No alteration in the powers of the General Council is called for—what needs to be asked with renewed persistence is, when are they going to use the ones they've got?

Two paths have opened out before the movement. The next few years will see the decision as to which path is taken, and there are tremendous opportunities which the Left must grasp. The Communist Party's resolution deserves the careful study of all progressives. It is a guide to action, not a rigid dogma. But it does provide a firm foundation on which a mutually agreed programme for all progressive trade unionists could be built. Once this firm unity is fashioned, then victory is guaranteed.

TRADES COUNCILS AND JOBS

[The Battle for Jobs continues: the fight against the Beeching cuts and pit closures goes forward, as trade unionists see the effects of the Tory Government's policies. The need for unity in action against the Tories is the keynote of the contributions we print below.]

Irvine Trades Council, Ayrshire:

The catastrophic rise in unemployment is in our basic industries which built Britain up to be the industrial country it is—or was. If things continue the way they are going, it will be producing nothing but motor cars for our congested roads and Bingo halls for Lord Rank. Shipyards, railway workshops and pits—in Scotland it is these which are being closed at a speed which puts Donald Campbell and Bluebird amongst the also-rans. (If Dr. Beeching continues his massacre of the railways at the present rate, they will be sending him out to Salt Lake flats to pace Bluebird.) The Government's policies have resulted in a rate of unemployment which cannot be tolerated. Their policies must be fought by the whole movement in Britain, a united fight against this evil of unemployment. In France the trade union movement fought a magnificent fight; the solidarity given to the French miners was a wonderful expression of what unity in the trade union movement can achieve. Here too we *must* have co-ordinated action between various sections of the trade union, both the industrial and the professional sections. But it is especially important in the fight against unemployment that the trades councils should come into full action if the fight is not to be divided and less effective than it should be. They should be allowed and encouraged to participate

in national demonstrations. How important they can be was shown in the March 26 Lobby. Resisting unemployment is tied up with the constant warfare being waged against the workers, under cover of the National Incomes Commission for example. They fling out the decisions of the Burnham Committee on teachers' salaries. They 'streamline' the railways, at the expense of 70,000 jobs and even more over-congested roads. The answer is to build unity in action fast; and in that the trades councils have an important part to play. That is the opinion of my organisation.

DREW DUNCAN,
Irvine.

Cambuslang Trades Council, Lanarkshire:

In those parts of Britain like Scotland where unemployment has been high over a long period and the battle for jobs intense, there are a number of important facts of which we must not lose sight. While on the one hand the Government have been forced to make certain moves to alleviate the problem, on the other hand, their deliberate policies which are the basic cause of unemployment, remain substantially unaltered.

For instance, the wholesale slashing of grants to local authorities for school-building obviously has a

serious effect on the unemployment prospects in the building trades. The Government's failure to remove purchase tax on furniture and household goods, together with their policy of wage-freeze, severely limits the market for those consumer goods. Railway and pit closures and the failure to support shipbuilding, of course, have very far-reaching effects indeed on other industries.

Over the past year and more in Scotland the General Council of the Scottish Trades Union Congress made a number of efforts to bring pressure to bear at all levels, going on deputations to the Scottish Office and to interview the Prime Minister, presenting sound and logical arguments round the conference table. But practical experience of trade union and class struggle has taught us that this is not enough to bring about that decisive change in public opinion necessary, not only to get major concessions from the Tory Government, but replace it by a Labour Government of the calibre needed to transform the situation radically. Last year in the engineering industry, after sound and logical arguments had been fully and capably presented, it took two separate one-day stoppages to extract even 5s. to 6s. per week.

In the opinion of my trades council it is only by the utmost stimulation of militant mass rank and file action that the decisive change can be brought about. The form of action that counts is the joint Lobby last spring of miners and railwaymen; the Cowlairs and St. Rollox demonstrations by rail shopmen last

autumn; and, of course, the March 26 Lobby this year.

Yet many in the top leadership of the Scottish trade union movement displayed a negative attitude to these forms of action, fluctuating between active discouragement to grudging consent. That has got to be reversed. Urgently needed is for the General Council of the Scottish T.U.C. to develop a massive campaign, co-ordinating centrally all efforts of affiliated organisations, so that demonstrations could be held on a scale that would put even the March 26 Lobby in the shade. They are already armed with a Congress resolution calling for immediate short-term measures including 'actions such as the direction of industry', while stating that 'the furtherance of economic growth should be the foremost and persistent consideration' of the movement. Congress has gone on record for the revival of the Economic Conference as in the early post-war years, and a Scottish Development Authority, with effective powers and finance. It has a detailed policy for support to the shipbuilding industry and mining; and above all, it has adopted a policy of all-out opposition to the Beeching Plan to destroy the railways.

But what we cannot do without are the measures for putting these policies into practice. It cannot be done without active encouragement to all lobbies, demonstrations and stoppages against redundancy which are organised by any section. That is what will be decisive.

GORDON MASSIE,
Cambuslang.

MEN IN PROPERTY

Wilfred Macartney

ROUND about Derby Day in the spring of 1920, the late Sir John Ellerman bought the south side of Oxford Street. During that lovely summer, the richest man in England (he left £40 million in slump time) was to be seen urbanely strolling along his property, pausing here and there to stroke and caress gently the buildings, almost purring like a cat crammed with cream. Late in that cold autumn, round about Manchester November Handicap time, Sir John sold Oxford Street to various institutions and insurance companies, making a profit of £2 million; then he was observed a little later walking down the no longer sunny side of the street, viciously kicking the stones and bricks and hissing venomously: 'They never were any good, didn't like them anyhow'.

However, making millions from property in the 'twenties and 'thirties was not all that easy. Between the wars property men were generally expert and hard-working, but many less capable, or gamblers, fell by their own roadsides. 'The developer loses' was a commonplace business remark of the time: the Dorchester Hotel came into the hands of the original contractors, the McAlpines; and Grosvenor House suffered a similar fate.

In general, buildings in those days were well built, if not well planned, *i.e.*, ribbon building. A glaring exception was the Morrell case. These people put up about 100 houses and arranged for mortgages to be obtained through a Building Society, the Bradford Third Equitable; many of them were not up to standard. However, in this famous action, the Building Society denied liability and the House of Lords upheld them. Years later this helped Bevan. He was able to quote this judgment, against interference in his programme by the Building Societies, branding them for what they are, mere money lenders.

It is worth noting that while historically Napoleon I and Napoleon II created a sound basis in the petit bourgeois fonctionnaire for their states to rest upon, their British colleagues across the Channel created a solid, well-drained gravel foundation in the 'Own your own home' slogan for the lower middle class. While most women know, slyly, that a house may not be a home, a roof is a roof. The situation was changed politically, financially and above all morally, by the successive Tory victories over a right-wing Labour Party and that second generation, so bitterly ashamed of 'mum and dad' they

do not really approve of rent restricted dwellings or council housing. Even the established property men themselves did not foresee, or indeed, welcome this monstrous boom. A story is told of several of the property people complaining in conclave of the regulations and restrictions placed on them by the Labour Government, but a wise one said 'Why grumble boys, here we are comfortably protected behind barbed wires having a good time, cheap money and no competitors?'

But when Macmillan's Rent Act gave the go ahead in formal terms that made Guizot's 'Enrich yourselves' a mild encouragement to prudent investment, the dam burst. Yet even this was not enough to turn it all into a raging torrent smashing homes, heart and bodies against the jagged rocks of savage greed. It was the insurance companies and institutions scrambling on the gravy train. Previously, insurance companies seldom bought ordinary shares; they bought ground rents, such as the corner sites of Burton Bros., and Marks & Spencer, bought by the Prudential.* These investments are shown in the Balance Sheet as first preference or debentures and so long as the Insurance companies received their stipulated interest and the funding was sound, they were satisfied.

Then the actuaries and investment managers woke up to the real Bonanza which was blazing away under their pavements and in they went: of course, some of the cunning old companies had foreseen that Dalton cheap money would not last. It is told of the late Lord Kennet (Chairman of the Capital Issues Committee and also Chairman of one of the greatest property companies, people who, to this day, look down their nose in terms of wealth as well as their decent reticence, at the Cottons and the Clores) that he had an application from his own company before his Committee, about 1948, for an issue of a £5 million debenture at $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. He got up from his chair and engagingly remarked, 'I must, in a way, declare my interest. I will smoke a cigarette by the window. Somebody else can take the chair'. C.I.C. gave permission and today the 5s. ordinaries stand at 110s.

It is one of the oddities of this land boom that the City, that is to say the Merchant Banks and the Bank of England, knew very little about property dealings, or indeed values. Harold Samuel, of Land Securities Investment Trust, possibly the richest of them all and maybe the most agreeable, dislikes publicity. Quiet in manner and modest in demeanour (unlike Max Joseph, his brother-in-law, and

*Prudential investment in property is up from £74.5 million to £124 million (*Daily Express*, April 24).

the late Howard Samuel, his first cousin, who were more extrovert), he had the foundation of his fortune laid by this unawareness. He held the 'fag end', 60 years, of a Crown lease in Regent Street, the Quadrant. He was approached by old established City Agents who told him that the Bank of England Estates Department would consider paying £30,000 a year for a 30-year sub-lease. Either Samuel did not believe it, or he may have been indolent that day, but he did not go into the City. The next day he was further importuned by the Old Lady of Threadneedle Street. He is reported to have said, 'Well, I don't suppose there is anything in it, but I have never seen the Court of the Bank of England sitting'. So he went and was greeted politely by the then Deputy Governor, who said that he quite understood that Mr. Samuel did not want to have 30 years of a Crown lease on his hands, so the Bank would take the whole 60 years at £30,000 a year, with a Bank of England covenant. Samuel, somewhat overwhelmed, agreed; came out of the Bank still dazed and got on a bus to return to the West End. Then he knew he was an authentic property millionaire in the old tradition, for he had not been on a bus for years!

But it was not only the Insurance Companies who joined the gold rush. Pension Funds got in, some of whom invest millions a year, and finally the amalgamation of Queen Anne's Bounty and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners brought into the market possibly the greatest sum of 'searching' money in history in any country. This was helped by the uncanny technical knowledge and personal contacts of Sir Mortimer (Tim) Warren who had been Secretary of the Queen Anne's Bounty and Archbishop Fisher who, as well as being a zealous angler for souls, seemed to know all the property angles. He was an astute accountant whose books were balanced by Mammon. Not a penny was invested in low rent housing.

With soaring interest rates; hotels and office blocks often taken by Government Departments, whose satraps were busy building empires for their ministries and paying huge rents (£3 a square foot) out of taxation; vast sums being allowed by the Treasury to cross the Atlantic into a real estate market on the verge of collapse; and even further sums going into Hong Kong, where sweated labour rears similar offices in an even more hazardous location, there is very little money left for housing. Before the war, a small brick-built, two-bedroom, 850-ft. super., with bathroom and an Ideal boiler with two radiators, could be put up for £265, and let at 11s. 6d. a week, the landlord doing the repairs, would return an

interest of 4 per cent. A similar house today, built of some phoney glass plastic to fall down within twenty years, would cost £2,600, and let at £5 per week would return $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. It is not so much the profit of the house developers, as the rapacity of the money lender to whom the builder must go, such as the insurance companies and banks, that keeps interest rates up. (*The Observer*, May 5, 1963, showed that 53 per cent of the rent of a new house is accounted for by interest payments.) They still have the romantic, rubbishy notion that London is the financial centre of the world, forgetting that half the human race finances itself and the Moscow Narodny Bank in London recently made short-term loans to British County Councils at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

After the big shots, came the snipers; after the lions and tigers came the jackals, and property companies proliferated all over the place. In general conversation these spoilers complained 'Our raw material is in short supply'. Ye gods, our land their raw material! Anything vital in short supply should be rationed for the good of the people and not bid up for profiteers. But there is good cheer in sight for the speculators, for soon on the market will come literally thousands of surplus golden acres from the railways, 'Beechings for the Boys'. There are several experts who understand this type of land. Douglas Tovey, now head of Healey and Baker, one of the biggest estate agents in the country, a professional if ever there was one, came up the tough way from the railway estate office, where only hard work and ceaseless drudgery in tiresome negotiations took place. It is said about this able and energetic man that while working in the railway estate office at a low salary, he would save up so that he could lunch at least once a week at the Savoy, a haunt in those days of the big estate agents. His sound advice will be available.

So much effort, time, materials and money have gone into high yields, that we come back to a very simple explanation of the housing shortage; that those who wish to build low rent dwelling houses, and there are several entrepreneurs besides councils, just cannot do it without government help and control. When the Tories separated housing from health and created two eunuchs, vicious and sterile, the deed was done. The Building Societies just do not help, for most probably a moiety of their funds go into commercial investments. The precise distribution is difficult to ascertain. They love secrecy and high interest rates with an addiction that is pathological. And in places like Liverpool, where 20

people sleep in one room with one window and maybe 50 are in one house without hot water or toilets, slum landlords make a profit of £100 a week out of a house which cost £75 to build nearly a 100 years ago. In *The Times*, May 2, 1963, Mr. Maclean (President, Halifax Building Society) is reported as saying that 'many people have had to turn to home-ownership simply because the private landlord has been unable to offer them rented accommodation to their liking and *within their means*' (our italics). Such a situation, he maintained, shows there is a 'serious gap' in the national housing programme.

Will there ever be enough houses in Great Britain? Even if a Labour Government returns after 13 years in the wilderness, have the Tories done so much damage that it is irreparable? Discount the idea that the profiteers will be forced to disgorge, pleasurable as it would be to pour a powerful emetic through their greedy mouths, down their gulping throats, and into their swollen guts. The Labour Party might try to work within the existing system, but even this could be made radical. If interest rates were reduced to say a bank rate of 2 per cent, many of the office builders would be left as high as their buildings and as dry as their avarice. This would not disturb the economy too much for people who borrowed at $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, while those who finance it at over 10 per cent would get the wallop they deserve.* They should plan through a strict allocation of material and labour the reuniting of the Ministry of Health and Housing, *i.e.*, Homes and Hospitals. Nearly 100 years ago, Parnell with his three Fs, Fair rent, Freedom of sale, and Fixture of tenure, nearly avoided bloodshed for decades.

Harold Wilson is reported to have said recently that he would not dine with the rich members of his own party. Merit there may be in this Lent-like restriction, but his resolution should be in not getting bogged down around a negotiating table with bankers, investment managers, actuaries, building society chiefs and fifth-column senior Civil Service (who in any case are far richer than the few plutocrats in the Labour Party). He should direct and govern, govern and direct and face squarely the issues at home, so that while we may not unscramble this unsavoury omelette, we could make, eat and enjoy the next one.

*A few days ago a well-known property company advanced money on freehold land at 15 per cent.

BRITAIN AND IRELAND

John Hostettler

SUCCESSIVE Tory Governments have used every trick in the book to keep the Irish question out of British politics, ever since Lloyd George pushed through the Government of Ireland Act, 1920 at the point of a gun. The threat of Lloyd George is described by Lord Beaverbrook in his latest book:

Lloyd George was determined to reach a settlement. . . . He told Miss Stephenson that if the Irish refused the terms there would be only one thing to be done—to *re-conquer Ireland*. (*The Decline and Fall of Lloyd George*, page 90.)

As Churchill's frustration in later years on the question of Irish ports showed, the threat of 'terrible war' is no longer possible. Other times produce other methods. Today, questions in Parliament on Northern Ireland, which remains part of the United Kingdom, are usually ruled out-of-order by the Speaker. Where they get through, the Home Secretary always succeeds in sitting in judgment like the three wise monkeys by emitting a repetitive formula that it would 'not be proper' for him to comment.

The press proprietors have taken the Tories' point and for years the noisy presses of Fleet Street have skilfully maintained an almost total silence on Irish affairs. It is an effective blackout. Unfortunately, total silence has its effect and many people think that what happens in Northern Ireland is no concern of theirs, and is a matter solely for the Irish, little realising that they are victims of a sustained and subtle conspiracy of Tory Governments. As a result, although the Government of Ireland Act and partition with its evil consequences still bedevil British politics, the opposition to them in Britain, that must be led by the working class, has been largely missing.

Everything changes, however, and a reversal of this trend is to be seen today. Britain's imperial position and power in the world have seriously diminished in the last decade, and in Ireland itself a new approach is discernible. Furthermore, over one million Irish-born people now live and work in Britain. It is time for the British people, and the Labour movement in particular, to reject in their own interests the ideas of the ruling class in Ireland and look again at the whole question from the standpoint of democratic and working class progress.

An outstanding contribution to bringing the Irish question back

into British politics is *The Irish Question and the British People* by C. Desmond Greaves.* This short book is unquestionably the best on the subject for a very long time. It is indispensable reading, both on the Irish question and for understanding the way this question boomerangs back at us and weakens the struggle for progress in Britain. The argument and polemic of the book are directed not only to interesting, but to convincing, the reader in the British working class movement, and wider, that it is vital to himself to understand these two interacting factors. It will be remembered that Marx said in relation to Ireland that, 'A people that enslaves another people forges its own chains', and:

For a long time I believed it would be possible to overthrow the Irish régime by English working class ascendancy. . . . Deeper study has now convinced me of the opposite. The British working class *will never accomplish anything* before it has got rid of Ireland. (Marx, letter to Engels, December 10, 1869).

In a sense, *The Irish Question and the British People* takes up this point in present-day conditions. It is glibly said in some quarters that Ireland is now free—at least, save for the six north-eastern counties that remain part of the United Kingdom. That is a contradiction in terms. It is precisely this partition of Ireland that prevents the country working out its own future. Northern Ireland is completely subordinate to Britain, and the twenty-six counties forming the Republic of Ireland suffer severe economic and political consequences which Desmond Greaves analyses with rare insight. Its economic and political effects on Britain are also considerable. Consequently, partition is the key issue to Ireland and it is also the issue about which the British people can, and have the right to do something. For the partition of Ireland was given effect by the Government of Ireland Act 1920 and it continues today by virtue of the Act which will remain in force until there is sufficient organised pressure against it.

It is often said in official circles that the establishment of the six-county régime was an experiment in devolution of power that is unique in the world. The truth is the exact opposite. The Stormont Government may be housed in a fine building with a commanding view, but its powers and real status are not so very different from those of a large county council. Part of the machinery of government is decentralised whilst the Government retains Executive power. Far from being unique, it has been in many ways a prototype for modern Colonial constitutions forced on British imperialism

by the revolt of subject peoples and giving 'formal' independence precisely to cover the lack of real freedom. Later Colonial constitutions have been 'improved' in form, but the Northern Ireland experiment—meant to divide Ireland—was also the first constitutional experiment in meeting the crisis of Imperialism. In other words, it was the first modern experiment in neo-colonialism. Indeed it is a little-known fact that the Government of Ireland Act was passed after the publication in 1920 of the Report of a Government Conference called in 1919 to study 'Devolution'. Since that time, and adapting the experience gained in Northern Ireland, the technique of formal independence has been used in a large number of colonial countries to hold back national liberation movements. It is because Verwoerd and Welensky cannot grasp that the last ditch stand of imperialism in Africa must involve an appearance of giving power to Africans that they are undermining Britain's overall plan to retain real control.

Consider both the constitutional and the actual position in Northern Ireland. Parliament cannot legislate on 'Excepted Matters' which are the Crown, peace and war, the armed forces, treaties, foreign and diplomatic relations, treason, naturalisation, foreign trade, radio, aerial navigation, coinage, income tax, customs and copyright. Similarly, it cannot legislate on 'Reserved Matters', which include postal services, savings banks, the Supreme Court and certain matters in connection with Universities and local authorities.

The Westminster government legislates throughout the year on these matters for Northern Ireland, and it might well be asked what is left for Stormont to legislate upon. The answer lies in certain transferred powers, which include justice (including the police and the preservation of law and order), agriculture, land purchase and housing. Even these powers, however, are subject to the over-riding control of Westminster, for section 75 of the Government of Ireland Act provides:

Notwithstanding the establishment of the Parliament of Northern Ireland, or anything contained in this Act, the supreme authority of the Parliament of the United Kingdom shall remain unaffected and undiminished over all persons, matters and things in Northern Ireland and every part thereof.

Earlier, in section 6 of the same Act, we find a provision whereby if any statute of the Northern Ireland Government conflicts with an Act of Westminster, the latter prevails. Section 6 also provides that Stormont cannot repeal or alter any Act passed by the Imperial Parliament even if it relates to Northern Ireland and deals with

powers transferred to Stormont. Finally, the Governor represents the Queen in Northern Ireland and in good old colonial style has power to block legislation and declare an Emergency.

Could anything possibly be more watertight? Who can allege the autonomy of Northern Ireland in the face of this 1920 Act? If it is argued that 1920 is a long time ago the reader will recall the current use against peace fighters of an Act dating back to 1381, the original of which cannot be fully read or understood. The main answer however is the fact that the Government of Ireland Act is in continual use. Indeed the Act remains the legal basis for partition. As recently as December, 1959, in the case of *Belfast Corporation v. O.D. Motors*, an appeal involving section 5 of the Act, the House of Lords held that the Act was still in force, thus answering those who alleged it had been repealed by the Ireland Act, 1949.

Yet still the Tory Government says it cannot act when issues of democracy are concerned. Having shown why the Government should act, Desmond Greaves sets out to show why it does nothing of the sort. 'The object of the Act', he says, 'is to maintain Britain's dominating position on both strategic and economic grounds. By means of this Act British imperialism holds Ireland but removes the Irish question out of British politics'. Hence, to give an example, the British government can disclaim all responsibility for the heavy permanent unemployment in the six-counties caused by its own policy of dividing Ireland in order to exploit it.

In closely argued chapters that illuminate and clarify on every page he deals with the economic consequences of partition to Ireland and Britain, its effect on the religious problem, the widespread gerry-mandering which is a scandalous mockery of democracy. The question of government without consent including the many facets of a police state exhibited in the six counties and the trials of Republicans. Finally, he devotes a section to what is required for a democratic solution of the Irish question.

Six years ago when repression was at its height in Northern Ireland it was difficult to see a democratic solution to the Irish question. And this had been true since 1922. Yet against the background of Britain's declining world power it was the very severity of the repression together with the will to organise a campaign against it of the Connolly Association that helped bring about the change. Perhaps the turning point was the trial of Kevin Mallon and Patrick Talbot on a charge of murder of a police officer. This trial—one of

the hardest-fought legal battles in Ireland's history and widely known as the Torture Trial—was waged in Belfast in the summer of 1958. Defended by F. Elwyn Jones, Q.C., M.P., these two young lads of 21, whom I met in the cells beneath the Court, showing great courage and dignity, revealed the grim meaning of the hated Special Powers Act and the police methods it encourages. In doing so they were acquitted.

As Mallon and Talbot's allegations of torture became more widely known so did other exposures come to the surface. The full meaning of the Special Powers Act by which 180 men were imprisoned without charge or trial, or the opportunity to see lawyers or relatives, which made Habeas Corpus ineffective, and gave the police powers similar to those in Hitler Germany, was more widely understood. As a result trade unions began to go on record against the suppression of democracy in Northern Ireland. Some 145 Labour M.P.s supported the campaign for the release of the 180 internees. And their release was won.

The Movement for Colonial Freedom and the National Council for Civil Liberties took action on these issues and a Civil Liberties Council was formed in Northern Ireland with trade union support. On each side of the water the struggle grew with a unity of purpose. Activity is more difficult in Northern Ireland, however, where British troops are stationed and where police and 'B' Specials stalk the streets with revolvers and machine guns, as I saw for myself when I went to the six counties for the first time as an observer at the Mallon and Talbot trial. Widespread religious discrimination and electoral malpractices have the same effect.

In many ways the main effort must be made in Britain and directed in the long run at forcing the repeal of the Government of Ireland Act and ending the partition. This is our duty and it is vital to progress in Britain and Ireland.

My experience in speaking at meetings and conferences of trade union branches and trades councils since the Mallon and Talbot trial is that there is a quick recognition of this once the facts are known. In my view *The Irish Question and the British People* cannot fail to convince any trade unionist or progressive who is prepared to give it careful study. Its mass sale, to develop the struggle to which the author has dedicated himself, namely, the triumph of democracy in Ireland and Britain, would also be a far-reaching blow at the Tory Party and for progress to socialism in Britain.

BOOKS

From Yalta to Disarmament

P. Morray

Merlin Press. 368 pp. 42s.

American Foreign Policy and the Cold War

Herbert Aptheker.

New Century Publishers (New York).

416 pp. \$4.75.

LITTLE BY LITTLE the intellectual revolt in the U.S.A. against the brutal aggressiveness, the warmongering, the brazen lies and double-crossing of the State Department and the Pentagon, is spreading. Its background is the spreading anger in many sections of the American labour movement, and the still wider fear of nuclear war provoked by the adventurist bullies in Washington. It would be foolish, however, to ignore the great influence which American intellectuals can wield, at this stage of their nation's struggle, to avert the deadly peril caused by their rulers' dream of world domination. First came the two massive volumes of Professor D. F. Fleming's *The Cold War and Its Origins*: now we have this work—on a narrower front but no less important—by a former American diplomat.

Mr. Morray begins with a merciless documentary analysis (32 pages) of the respective treatment by the U.S.S.R. and its western Allies of the Polish problem in 1944-5, exposing in every particular the barefaced attempts to foist an enemy government on the Soviet Union as its western neighbour. Then comes an equally ruthless examination (28 pages) of Winston Churchill's notorious speech scathed not a shred of Churchill's at Fulton, Missouri, on March 5, 1946: the speech which 'began the long process, still going on, of making an ally of the Germans

against the Soviet Union' (Churchill a year before, it may be remembered, was already laying up the arms of the surrendering Nazi armies for the same purpose). The author leaves uncharges and insinuations. In another 45 pages, Mr. Morray deals—quoting documents on both sides at every step—with the question of international control of atomic energy as it arose after the war: the Baruch Plan, with its insolent assumption that all must accept the control of world atomic resources by the U.S.A., already armed with the atomic bomb; then the Soviet criticisms and the alternative Soviet plan. It would be well for right-wing Labour experts on foreign affairs who consider that the Soviet Union was up to 1955 in the wrong on disarmament to consider carefully these sections, in particular.

It is in the largest section of the book (219 pages) dealing with disarmament as a whole, that there occurs the turning-point of May 1955, which they accept: when the U.S.S.R. declared that it agreed with reductions in armies, armaments and war budgets proposed by Britain and France barely two months before, whereupon (led by the U.S.A.) they turned tail and ate their own words. This, by the way, was by no means the first time such a thing had happened in the relations between the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist world. What Mr. Morray shows, however, is that the dénouement of May, 1955, was only the climax of a process going on since 1946—and still going on. Each of the main aspects of the disarmament problem, including the question of bacterial and chemical weapons (usually kept out of sight by the capitalist press) and nuclear testing, is dealt with, documents in hand.

Every reader will be better armed

for reading this book, which ought to be in all public libraries.

The same applies to the book by Herbert Aptheker, editor of *Political Affairs* and one of the most distinguished Communist thinkers in the United States. Compiled on the basis of his writings over fourteen years, the book takes in a far wider horizon than Mr. Morray's. Its value is that it gives a Marxist appraisal of U.S. foreign policy, based on deep knowledge of the economics and politics of American monopoly capitalism.

The first section provides a searching analysis of the mainsprings and methods of United States policy—'The Realities of Today's World'. With a magnificent series of precise references, Aptheker convicts the American 'Establishment' out of their own mouths on such subjects as the sabotage of disarmament, the break-up of the Summit Conference in May 1960, American colonialism in Latin America and elsewhere. Most of the material is quite inaccessible otherwise for British readers.

The very scope of the world problems surveyed in the second section, from the angle of the part played in them by the United States, will show the value of the book for any student of international problems.

The third section consists of reviews of a number of important books, among them the memoirs of Count Karolyi (Premier of Hungary before the Soviet Republic of 1919, and Hungarian Minister in France in 1947-9); the books of Mr. Morray and Professor Fleming; and a work not seen in this country, Chief Justice Douglas' *Democracy's Manifesto*, written after a visit to the U.S.S.R., which left him very impressed. There is a fine tribute, in the preface, to the Editor of *Labour Monthly*.

ANDREW ROTHSTEIN.

Menace of the Miracle

Heinz Abosch

Collets. 276 pp. 25s.

THE MAIN ACHIEVEMENT of this well documented survey by a West German journalist is that it demolishes the carefully fostered picture of a German Federal Republic where democracy has triumphed and the minority of ex-Nazis, who admittedly are in high positions, are incapable of serious harm. The truth is in Abosch's words that, 'those who helped Germany re-arm from 1950 onwards, resemble more and more sorcerer's apprentices who can no longer control the evil forces they themselves brought into being'.

What are these evil forces? The author sets them out in their full horror. The size of the officer's corps in West Germany today is the same as when Hitler launched war. 137 of Hitler's Generals have been recalled to service. Ex-members of the S.S., the body responsible for the extermination programme, are freely admitted into the West German army. A survey of non-commissioned officers established that 40 per cent looked upon Hitler as 'one of the greatest German statesmen'. Nazi emblems are openly displayed in the naval messes. There are 1,200 associations of old soldiers and refugees, all openly preaching 'revenge', and a number are run by ex-members of the Waffen S.S. The Sudeten Association demands the legal recognition of the frontier with Czechoslovakia imposed with Chamberlain's agreement at Munich. And these are not a lunatic fringe disowned by the West German leaders. Heusinger, now in a Nato command in Washington said in 1957, 'The common enemy of the free world is Communist imperial-

ism, which can never be changed and must therefore be exterminated'. Spiedel, commanding Nato troops in Central Europe, is the very man who boasted of the measures he took in occupied France against Jews and Communists. Naval Commander Johansson, who now trains the West German Air Force was a member of the Nazi Condor Legion, which fought against the Spanish Republic. Seventy per cent of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs worked with Ribbentrop, who was hanged for war crimes.

Monopoly power, recreated by the unilateral currency reform in 1948 is even more concentrated than in the thirties, when the big industrialists paved Hitler's path to power. Today three fifths of all industrial shares belong to 16 giant trusts, controlled by the same forces which backed Hitler and in many cases by the same individuals. This Germany publicly proclaims a policy of revenge. In the author's words: 'Herr Adenauer has repeated on a number of occasions that it is necessary to "create a new order in Eastern Europe". And Herr Hallstein confirmed this by explaining that Europe must be united as far as the Urals. However cautiously the phrasing of these demands, they simply amount to the old programme of the drive to the East, in Bonn's revisionist programme'.

The plan for war has been put in more precise terms by Strauss, West German Defence Minister, who is bluntly accused by Abosch of preparing for a 'limited war to liberate East Germany', and by Professor Kissinger who proposed that if the Soviet Union signs a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, 'the road to Berlin should be kept open by force of arms'. Even Nato supporters in Britain admit

that these threats are being made, but they declare that since West Germany would be an inevitable victim of nuclear war, the bomb is a deterrent to the hot heads. Abosch gives this answer: 'When one realises the light-hearted way in which Herr Strauss's propaganda service seeks to prepare people's minds for an atomic war, on the grounds that such a war would provide an effective defence for Germany, one cannot help feeling the greatest alarm'. The truth is that the present leaders of Western Germany calculate that they can get their way by the threat of nuclear war and they are ready to risk actual war. They are seeking, with the support of their allies in France, America and Britain to secure more complete control of nuclear weapons.

When these same forces in Germany were preparing war in the thirties, Chamberlain and those supporting him preferred a policy of appeasement, because they were confident Hitler would go East. Churchill had no hostility to Fascism, but he warned against Germany's strength. Today, with Chamberlain's lieutenant, Lord Home, at the Foreign Office, anti-Communist hysteria is even readier to risk world peace and the very existence of the British people. But 1963 is not 1939. There is another Germany where the power of the militarists and monopolists has been broken. The official leadership of the Social Democratic Party and of many of the trade unions support the Adenauer policy, but there are many in West Germany who actively struggle for policies of peace. This book should spur all progressive forces in Britain to move into action for peace while there is still time.

GORDON SCHAFFER.

NEW SUBSCRIPTION RATES

SPECIAL CONCESSION.....

AND DELIVERED TO YOUR DOOR!

(All Post Free)

Second Class Mail (Unsealed Envelope)

Great BritainOne year 21s., six months 10s. 6d.

OverseasOne year 24s., six months 12s.

CanadaOne year \$3.50

U.S.A.One year \$3.50

First Class Mail (Sealed Envelope)

Great BritainOne year 23s., six months 11s. 6d.

Commonwealth CountriesOne year 27s. (Canada \$4.50)

Outside Commonwealth.....One year 35s. (U.S.A. \$5.50)

From the U.S.A.

NEW WORLD REVIEW

The only American Magazine
exclusively devoted to East-
West relations and peace

\$4.50 (£1. 12s. 0d.) for one year
sub. (12 issues)

\$1.75 (12s.6d.) for 5-month sub.

Send order to :

NEW WORLD REVIEW
34 WEST 15th STREET
NEW YORK 11, N.Y.

A HISTORY

of Twenty, Thirty and
even Forty years ago!

We have a few
BOUND VOLUMES
of earlier years for sale.

Apply to:

THE MANAGER,
134, Ballards Lane, N.3.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with
order to: 'Class Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134,
Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

VETERAN L.M. readers: your early copies and
pamphlets may be invaluable to others. Send
details to: L.M. Exchange Service, 134, Bal-
lards Lane, London, N.3.

WE BUY books, pamphlets, Socialism, U.S.S.R.,
Comintern, Spain. We collect: RIV 6807. The
Hammersmith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6.

URGENTLY REQUIRED—All back numbers of
Labour Monthly from 1921-1930 inclusive and
1939.

Labour Monthly

Bound Volume, 1962

It's a history of the year and
a permanent record

ORDER NOW

From your usual newsagents,
price £1.5.0d., or send
10s. 6d., plus 1s. 6d. postage and
your loose copies as soon as
possible to:

**THE MANAGER,
134, Ballards Lane,
LONDON, N.3**

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating
by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

For all interested in the fight for Peace and
Progress in the Countryside and the problems
of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.

Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or

Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

27, Bedford St. Strand, London, W.C.2.

L.R.D. PAMPHLET

'The Case Against Beeching'

Foreword by S. F. Greene

6d. or 8½d. post free

Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

£4261

TAX FREE
CASH AT 65

or

£412

A YEAR
FOR LIFE

AND COVER FOR FAMILY

of £1681—£4261

if you die before age 65

All for £1 a week at age 30

or less or more according to age now

We are independent brokers. Our advice to you is free. Our remuneration comes from the insurance company which we select for you and we always know where to find the best terms that are on offer. For instance, we can arrange SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE from 1s. 8d. a week for benefit of £5 a week.

INSURANCE EXPERTS LIMITED.

1a, Well Road, London, N.W.3. HAM 5421/2: after hours HAM 6269

Please send me details without obligation. **POST THIS COUPON NOW.**

Name

Date of Birth Phone Number.....

Occupation

Address

.....

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor : R. Palme Dutt

THE SCANDAL—AND BEYOND

Andrew Rothstein

★

HAIL AFRICAN UNITY!

R. Palme Dutt

★

CASE FOR A FORTY HOUR WEEK

J. E. Mortimer

★

This Monstrous Law, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn,
Swedish Labour: The Facts, William Mennell.
New West German Outrage, D. N. Pritt, Q.C.

JULY 1963

Two Shillings

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL. XLV

No. 7

JULY . 1963

CONTENTS

- Notes of the Month: The Scandal—And Beyond.** *Past History, and a Warning—Hailsham's Bluster—West German War Propaganda—German Rocketeers at Work—Britain, Germany and 'a New Europe'—Sob-Stuff and Double-Dealing—Kennedy's Speech—A Flagging Economy and Public Opinion—World Wide Trend*
Andrew Rothstein 289
- Hail African Unity!** An assessment of the historic Addis Ababa Conference.....**R. Palme Dutt** 300
- This Monstrous Law.** Outstanding U.S. Communist leader, imprisoned for 28 months, shows up this U.S. attack on progressives.....**Elizabeth Gurley Flynn** 307
- Victory In Mourning.** A letter from Greece..... 312-313
- The Case for the 40-hour Week.** Leading trade unionist gives irrefutable arguments for the immediate attainment of the 40-hour week.....**J. E. Mortimer** 314
- Swedish Labour: The Facts.** An examination of the realities of Swedish trade unionism.....**William Mennell** 319
- The Boilermakers' Conference.** Delegate's summary...**Finlay Hart** 323
- New West German Outrage.** An indictment of the perversion of justice by ex-Nazis.....**D. N. Pritt, Q.C.** 325
- How Cuba Was Saved.** From the speech in Moscow.....
Fidel Castro 328
- South American Journey.** A picture of the great contrasts of this awakening continent.....**E. J. Hobsbawm** 329
- Book Reviews.** 'Signposts for Scotland', Labour Party: *G. McLennon*; 'Laval: A Biography', by Hubert Cole: *D. N. Pritt* 333
- Having It Now**.....**Angela Tuckett** 335

Notes of the Month

THE SCANDAL—AND BEYOND

Andrew Rothstein

THESSE notes are being written after two weeks of great uproar in British politics. The resignation of Mr. John Profumo from his post of Secretary for War on June 4, when he admitted (or it had been discovered) that he had lied to the House of Commons on March 22 about his personal relations with Miss Christine Keeler, has aroused an explosion of indignation. The Tory Party has been deeply divided about whether the Prime Minister and others of his colleagues knew of this departure from public and private standards of conduct. Moral indignation was heightened by suspicion that breaches of security might have taken place, through Miss Keeler's acquaintance with a Soviet officer. The Labour Party leaders, while disclaiming any intention to exploit the moral aspect of the case, fastened on the supposed threat to Britain's military secrets (such as whether, and when, nuclear warheads were being supplied to the West German militarists—a matter by the way in which many people in this country are legitimately interested). Hundreds of outraged speeches have been made by politicians and clergymen, the newspapers have given up their main columns to the issue, editorials without number have been written threatening the Government. Some of its members for a time gave the impression that they were about to resign—which opened the prospect of the Government's collapse and a general election. The debate on June 17 ended with a lower Tory majority and an understanding that Macmillan would soon resign.

Past History and a Warning

Nothing quite like this has been witnessed in Britain since the great Marconi scandal fifty years ago, in the early days of wireless telegraphy and of Government contracts connected therewith—when, in the dry words of that superb anti-imperialist Wilfred Scawen Blunt, Rufus Isaacs (later Lord Reading) and Lloyd George, members of the Liberal Government, 'had gone in for a Stock Exchange gamble a year ago and denied it flatly last summer in the House of Commons, and now it turns out to be true' (*My Diaries*, April 2, 1913). The essence of that scandal, however, was the fact

*The Editor will resume the Notes in the next issue.

that the established gambling machinery of the capitalist system presented at the time (and still presents) a permanent inducement to such 'operations': the awkwardness was only that Isaacs and Lloyd George had been found out. And capitalist society in Britain, as it exists in 1963, likewise presents a permanent inducement to the Profumos, providing they are not found out. That is the problem which all three Parliamentary parties have avoided. It is not one which *Labour Monthly* has burked. Here is what the Editor wrote in the January issue:

Certainly there are new 'growth industries' breeding and burgeoning in the fruitful soil of the 'new capitalism'. Take, for example, one of the most important. Betting Shops—that great social reform of the Tory Government—whose luxurious premises now decorate every street in the island. No lack of capital and incentive and enterprise and expansion here. . . . The Tory Government, who have simultaneously, in their tireless reforming zeal, cleared the streets—thereby ensuring the maximum profitability of the call-girl racket—carried special legislation to facilitate the proliferation of obscene literature (always in the name of the highest 'enlightenment', and the delighted yelps of the highbrows), and sought to extend drinking hours until the publicans themselves rebelled, have never lacked loving care to provide for the lighter requirements of the people in a period of danger of social unrest.

Hailsham's Bluster

In his blustering and almost hysterical television outburst on June 13, Lord Hailsham (what a promising candidate for Macmillan's succession!) again and again protested that this was not a party issue, but a moral one which might arise in any party. For all his well-timed frenzy, Hailsham knew very well that he was evading the real point. Parties express the interests of this or that class. Party issues are class issues. It is the way the capitalist class is managing Great Britain and determining its policies that makes the climate in which such affairs as those just mentioned (and how many others, still undiscovered?) take place. This is what leading Conservative papers themselves, startled into a moment of truth, have admitted. Who wrote on June 11: 'Eleven years of Conservative rule have brought the nation psychologically and spiritually to a low ebb. . . . They giped at austerity. . . . They declared they had the right road for Britain. They would set the people free. Nothing else, they seemed later to think, mattered, compared with the assertion that the nation never had it so good. Today they are faced with a flagging economy, an uncertain future, and the end of the illusion that Britain's greatness could be measured by the so-

called independence of its so-called deterrent'? Was it the Communists—or even the Labour leaders? No, it was *The Times* (June 11). But that is an 'anti-Conservative paper', shouted Lord Hailsham. Then who began an editorial, the following day, with the words: 'At the moment, the Conservative Party is a shambles'—and went on to justify them by references to the new rating policy and to the heavy rise in unemployment through 'delaying incentives to expansion too long', *i.e.*, in plain language through deliberate restriction of the economy for the sake of overseas investments, military expenditure and other policies of capitalist monopoly? Was it the *Daily Worker*? No, it was the *Daily Telegraph*.

A Useful Reminder

We cannot expect Tory Ministers and ex-Ministers to admit in so many words that the management of the capitalist system in general, and of British imperialism in particular, requires a regular policy of lying to the people. Yet that is what was implied in the nineteenth-century saying by one who was past-master in the art: 'Toryism is distrust of the people tempered by fear: Liberalism is trust in the people tempered by prudence'. History has provided many examples of the lying which this system involves. To encourage our readers in the fruitful search for some of them nearer our own day, here is one kindly provided by yet another Conservative paper, *The Observer* (June 16):

To support dishonest policies which affect the lives of millions while expressing outrage at a Minister's private morals shows a lack of proportion. It will seem curious to many that Lord Hailsham and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd should now wax so excessively indignant over Mr. Profumo's lies when, as senior Ministers at the time of Suez, both of them were able to stomach the far more serious lies that were then told about our Government's collusion with the French and Israeli Governments in preparing an attack on Egypt.

But in no practical question of the day does Tory irresponsibility, contempt for public opinion, impudent presentation of black as though it were white, show up more glaringly than in their co-operation—for open class reasons just as between the first and second world wars—in the nuclear rearmament of reborn German imperialism.

West German War Propaganda

West German aims in Europe are being continually restated with increasing frankness: here is but a few days' testimony. On June 2 over 300,000 German 'expellees' from northern Czechoslovakia

gathered at Stuttgart to hear the West German Federal Minister of Transport, Seehofer, demand 'a return to their homeland', and the Federal Defence Minister von Hassell denounce the expulsion as 'morally unjustified' (*The Times* and *Guardian*, June 3). On June 7 a three-day rally of 100,000 German 'expellees' from western Poland began at Cologne, with the Federal Minister for All-German Affairs, Barzel, to inform them that their claim to 'their old homes' would not be renounced, and that Germany 'does not end on the Oder-Neisse line' which is on the frontier of Socialist Poland. Federal Chancellor Adenauer and West Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt attended the Congress to encourage it—Brandt likewise denouncing the 1945 settlement as a 'diktat'. Of course all these spokesmen assured the world that they did not dream of changing these frontiers by force—although both the Czechoslovak and the Polish Republics have made perfectly clear that there will not be any change otherwise. Such assurances were a commonplace on Hitler's lips, at one stage of his career. But the 'expellees' showed what their real mind was, by nearly lynching a TV commentator who had dared to describe the progress made by the Poles in their old city of Wroclaw, seized by Prussia in 1742 and returned in 1945 (*Guardian*, June 8 and 10, *Daily Express*, June 10). Again, a warrant was recently issued in the German Democratic Republic for the arrest of Hans Globke, Adenauer's State Secretary, on charges of drafting the main Nazi racialist laws, decrees based upon them, regulations which led to mass murders, and individual decisions on 'borderline cases'. His trial will begin on July 8. The denunciation of this 'propaganda move' by West German officials at once revealed the solidarity of Adenauer's State not only with Globke himself, but with the Nazi régime in which he filled such an important post. Almost every day brings new examples. 'It is almost incredible—to cite the latest *Schweinerei*—that Herr Oberländer who, on account of his dubious part in eastern Europe, was eventually compelled to give up the Ministry of Refugees and was rejected by his constituency at the last Bundestag election, wriggled back into Parliament in May through a stratagem provided by an unexpectedly empty seat and the party's list of indirectly chosen candidates.' Thus speaks *The Economist* on June 15, going on to give two more outrageous cases of Nazi criminals in responsible posts. But such things are only incredible to those who for many years have refused to face facts. D. N. Pritt's trenchant article in this number shows up a peculiarly monstrous case.

Now for Nuclear Weapons!

A new militarist and aggressive State has been built up in western Germany, within the outer cloak of a parliamentary régime. Every member of it is 'in the know', and it is protected by a bureaucracy no less servile to the militarists than that which served the Kaiser up to 1918, the Weimar Republic from 1919 to 1933, and Hitler from 1933 to 1945. It is this régime, and no other, which is to play the leading European part in the scheme for a special nuclear force within Nato agreed upon at Nassau between Macmillan and Kennedy—in utter contempt for British popular opinion—and carried one stage further at Nato's Ottawa Conference. Naturally the German reactionaries are pleased. 'The mixed-crew seaborne force made military sense. It had overwhelming political advantages', said that same von Hassell at Ottawa (*Telegraph*, May 23). 'West Germany's delegates', headed by Foreign Minister Schroeder, 'are cock-a-hoop. They are specially pleased about an arrangement for 9 non-American liaison officers to be attached to the U.S. Strategic Air Command headquarters. A German will certainly be in this team, who are to get secrets on the handling of atomic weapons' (*Daily Herald* correspondent at Ottawa, May 25). The Ottawa mixed-manned crews proposition 'has the important attraction, especially for Bonn, that they (the Americans) would become much more irrevocably the hostages of Europe' (*Sunday Times* Ottawa correspondent, May 26). It was possible that talk of multilateralism 'has whetted appetites in West Germany', wrote *The Times* Washington correspondent (May 27). Indeed it had: von Hassell told the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* on May 25, 'that Germany wanted in the long run to get rid of the American veto on the use of the fleet's Polaris warheads' (quoted by the *Economist*, June 1). He repeated this in a different form in the Paris Assembly of the West European Union: 'the principle of unanimity could not last for ever' (*The Times* report, June 7).

German Rocketeers at Work

No wonder von Hassell and his colleagues see overwhelming political advantages in getting access to existing nuclear secrets. It will be a step to a position when they can end 'the principle of unanimity'—by deciding to break away from it. How? By secretly preparing methods for dragging not only all Europe but the U.S.A.—'hostages of Europe'—into war, unless they accept German

domination. And here another interesting feature appears. Two years ago, our diplomatic correspondent Quaestor pointed out the preparations which the German militarists were making for 'unscrambling' the mixed Nato forces, so far as their own forces were concerned, in case of necessity—by developing a Territorial Command, not under Nato control, which could become a skeleton General Staff, with its separate trained reserves. Now we learn that a new department of astro-physics in West Germany has as one of its aims 'the development of more economical rockets', because 'at present the cost of the existing chemical rockets is prohibitive' (for West Germany), and 'a nuclear rocket is the only cheap answer, Professor Sarger and his colleagues believe'. Professor Sarger's programme received four times as much money this year as last year, 'and will certainly be expanding next year'. The *Daily Telegraph's* science correspondent, reporting this from Berlin (May 30), modestly mentioned only the sending of communication satellites into orbit, and bringing back raw materials from the moon, as the purpose of such rockets. But he knows, and so does everybody else, the less innocent purposes to which they could be put.

Britain, Germany and 'a new Europe'

How does the Tory Government act in fact of these developments? It pretends not to notice them, and does not stick at trifles like the truth in doing so. Lord Hailsham—that fierce exponent of uprightness in *private* life—opens British Week at Munich. What does he tell the Germans? 'For fifty years Europe has suffered agony and crisis because of its inability to combine.' Fifty years takes us back to 1913. In 1914 the war between German-Austrian imperialism and Anglo-Franco-Russian imperialism broke out, with the German Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg reproaching the British Ambassador because 'just for a scrap of paper, Great Britain was going to make war on a kindred nation who desired nothing better than to be friends with her' (*Great Britain and the European Crisis*, 1914, p. 78). Was Lord Hailsham expressing his regret for *that*? Hardly: the scrap of paper has served too well as a diversion from the real causes of the first world war. One suspects that what he really regrets is one great outcome of the war—the fall of Tsardom and the establishment of the Soviet Union. Thieves fell out, and in one country honest men came into their own. This is the more likely because Lord Hailsham said nothing about a much more glaring 'inability to combine' which

occurred in his own political lifetime—when his Tory leaders in 1939 refused to combine with the Soviet Union *against* revived German imperialist aggression, and spurned the Soviet offers of a firm triple pact of mutual assistance, backed by a military convention, in order to chase the sinister will of the wisp of an agreement with Hitler which would encourage him to go east. Nor did Lord Hailsham say anything of the official pamphlet sponsored by Foreign Secretary Halifax himself in November, 1939, which reproached Hitler almost as Britain had been in 1914—for his ‘betrayal of Europe’ in order to fight the only Powers able to champion the ‘historic civilisation of the West’, instead of reaching an understanding with other nations equally opposed to ‘the bloodstained altars of the World Revolution’ (*The British Case*, 1939, pp. 53, 55, 60). That lament that Britain did not fight the U.S.S.R. instead of Nazi Germany is of course still the view of Lord Hailsham’s eminent colleague, the Foreign Secretary, as set out in his *Observer* interview last September.

Home, Propagandist

By a division of labour among them, it is to Lord Home that they leave the tireless effort to whip up unreasoning fear and hatred of the U.S.S.R. and thus create the most favourable climate possible for the activities of the German militarists. On May 18 he sent a Note to the U.S.S.R. manifestly intended for propaganda of such fear and hatred. The Soviet Union had deployed over 700 nuclear missiles and many divisions in Eastern Europe threatening the West—as though the Soviet Union has not been offering for many years utterly to abolish and prohibit such missiles, and to cut down its armies to levels proposed by the West themselves in 1955, if the Nato powers would do the same. It has threatened their ‘ports and territories’—as though, ever since Churchill’s speech at Fulton, Missouri, in 1946, American Generals had not started threatening the U.S.S.R. while it was still grappling with the fearful destruction caused by the war. The Soviet Union was encouraging ‘aggressive military preparations by East Germany’—as though the G.D.R. has not almost from its foundation proposed heavy cuts in armaments by both German states, renunciation of atomic weapons, and mutual respect for each other’s frontiers (the latest offer was made by Walter Ulbricht in January this year). Resumption of large-scale testing was due to the Soviet Union restarting in September, 1961, thus destroyed ‘the policy of voluntary abstention observed since

1958'—as though in fact President Eisenhower had not proclaimed before handing over to Kennedy that the U.S.A. regarded itself as free to resume testing, as though in February, 1960, France did not begin testing on behalf of the Western powers, as though in June and July, 1961, the Western Powers were not openly threatening nuclear war over Berlin, mobilising additional forces and greatly increasing their war budgets. No more atrocious farrago of deceit than that Note, by suggesting the false and suppressing the true, has ever been produced in the history of Anglo-Soviet relations. Compared with its coldly calculated enormities, Lord Home's subsequent anti-Soviet outbursts at Ottawa are secondary.

Sob-Stuff and Double-Dealing

It is hardly surprising, is it, that after all this there should have been much alarm caused in London by the Ottawa proceedings? Or that the following interchange took place on May 29 between a Conservative back bencher, whose question aroused 'a wave of supporting Conservative cheers' (*Guardian*, May 30) and Mr. Heath, of Brussels fame :

Sir Arthur Vere Harvey (Macclesfield, C.). Some of us are rather alarmed at the prospects of this arrangement. Will the Lord Privy Seal see that there is no question of paying lip service, and see that we are absolutely frank?

Mr. Heath. I am sure the Foreign Secretary will want to formulate a balanced judgment.

When that is the kind of 'frankness' used by the Government on an issue involving hundreds of millions of lives, why should the Profumos think twice? And (once again to descend from the sublime to the ridiculous) here is an equally vivid illustration of how Tory leaders call frankness what anyone else would call double-dealing. After Lord Home at Ottawa had 'made a strong plea for a favourable response to any serious Russian feelers for a detente in the next few weeks'—Western leaders 'could never forgive themselves, nor would future generations forgive them, if they missed such an opportunity' (one could almost hear the sob in his throat)—the following little note appeared at the foot of a column in *The Times* on May 30 :

GENERAL'S NEW POST.—Major-General T. B. L. Churchill, who relinquished his appointment as Deputy Chief of Staff, Allied Land Forces, Central Europe, last September, has been appointed Director of the Great Britain-U.S.S.R. Association.

This Association, it will be remembered, is the body enjoying Foreign Office sponsorship which is supposed to work for the improvement of British-Soviet relations!

Kennedy's Speech

In such conditions, it was inevitable that even President Kennedy's remarkable speech for peace at American University, Washington, on June 10 should arouse some wry reflections. It echoed in fine outspoken terms the last message to the world of Pope John XXIII, whose death seven days before had brought such a volume of sincere tribute to his activities for peace from every country and every political camp. Like the Pope, Kennedy reminded America that whatever they may think of the Soviet State or of Communism, they must respect the achievements and the culture of the Soviet people, and realise that the two countries have a common interest in peace and in halting the arms race. Like the Pope, Kennedy spoke of the utter devastation which war could bring to the two countries first and foremost; and the need to 'help make the world safe for diversity'. He announced the agreement to hold early high-level talks in Moscow for a comprehensive test-ban treaty; and as an earnest of good faith he promised that the U.S.A. would hold no more atmospheric tests so long as other States did not do so. It was a good speech, though there were some passages in it which no one who knows Soviet policy and history would accept. However, President Kennedy's way of following it up was (according to a carefully-argued case passed on by *The Times* Washington correspondent the same day) to come to Britain on June 29 to 'persuade' the Tory Government to join in the proposed multilateral Nato force of surface missile vessels. And he would use two big sticks, each presenting an accomplished fact. First, that otherwise Polaris missiles, in which *the warheads cannot be detached from the body of the missile*, would be established in West Germany, with the Federal Government at least sharing joint control with the U.S.A. Second, the American and West German naval staffs are already jointly planning an 11,000-ton surface missile ship. How did that square with Kennedy's declaration in his speech: 'America's weapons are non-provocative, carefully controlled, designed to deter and capable of selective use'? It did not square at all. And the lukewarm reception the announcement of the Moscow meeting had in Tory quarters in London—capped by the ludicrous appointment of the fiery Lord Hailsham as the negotiator, an affront

to common sense—showed the effect of this footnote to Kennedy's speech.

A Flagging Economy and Public Opinion

Thus the Labour Party leaders, if they wished, had on June 17 more than supposed security dangers to attack, let alone Mr. Profumo's morals. The whole range of Tory foreign policy was vulnerable as never before. The same applied to the essential facts of the home situation. 'You never had it so good' is all very well for the capitalist class: *The Times* was a little indiscriminating there. *Labour Research* (June, 1963) has shown that income from rents went up by 7 per cent in 1962, and profits in the fourth quarter of 1962 were 8.9 per cent higher than a year before. Dividends to ordinary shareholders in 1962 were 64 per cent above those of 1958, while wages and salaries rose only 27 per cent over the same period. The index of retail prices in April and May was once more higher than a year before. All the City pundits bear evidence to the continuing stagnation. 'In spite of Mr. Maudling's sunshine talk about reviving confidence, the stock market seems to have decided collectively to wait for rather more concrete evidence of expansion'—though 'profit and dividend news seems likely to be good'—the City comment in the *Guardian* of May 28. The City Editor of *The Times* wrote, on June 5, that 'the latest official figures offer disappointingly little evidence for the belief that economic expansion is now firmly under way'—and 'most of the recovery so far recorded seems attributable chiefly to the improvement in the weather'. These verdicts, and the May figures of nearly 600,000 unemployed in the United Kingdom (including Northern Ireland), are sufficient evidence of what *The Times* calls a flagging economy—out of which the small class of monopolists are still doing very well. No wonder the National Opinion Polls published by that newspaper (June 15) showed a steady rise in Labour support from 44.6 per cent in early May to 51.4 per cent on June 13 and 14, and a fall in Conservative support from 36.3 per cent to 33 per cent.

World-Wide Trend

This, by the way, is not a trend peculiar to Great Britain. Look round the world, and you will see more than one indication that the 'successes' won by the cold-war propagandists and restorers of capitalist prosperity with American dollars have begun to turn the

stomachs of the bamboozled. There were plenty of voices to blame Pope John for having by his Encyclical *Pacem in Terris* encouraged a million more Italians to vote Communist. It is much more likely that the Encyclical itself was inspired by the knowledge that the peoples were revolting against the threat of nuclear annihilation and the economic consequences of war preparations, and in Italy turning to Communism as a result. It is a sign of the new spirit rising when the *Daily Telegraph* (June 11) has a double-column headline 'Popular Front Crushes Gaullist Candidate', announcing the striking Communist by-election victory at Beziers in Southern France, in which the Communist candidate's vote went up by over 1,000, while the supporter of de Gaulle lost 6,000. The resignation on June 11 of the reactionary Prime Minister of Greece, ground between the millstone of his Nazi-minded Royal family and rising popular fury against the corrupt dictatorship of police guns and faked elections which rules his country, was no less significant—and so was the victory of the left-wing candidate, supported by the Communists under the most difficult conditions, in the elections for a President of Peru. A Labour attack on the Tories all along the line, as the enemies of peace and *therefore* of any restoration of Britain's economy, as the brazen champions of unlimited profit for monopoly capitalism and *therefore* responsible for all its manifestations of immorality in public policy as well as private life, would be in line with worldwide change in opinions. Last month the Editor drew attention to the obvious unwillingness of the Labour Party leaders to break away from the bipartisan policy, imposed on the movement by Bevin and Attlee, which has for years drawn Britain into the anti-Soviet camp, wrecked its chance to lead the world towards peaceful co-existence, brought it into subservience to America, and thereby distorted and frustrated its economy. Whether the opportunity is seized over the Profumo crisis or not, the break will have to be made if the true Socialist lessons of that crisis are to be drawn, and the nation rescued from the mire and morass into which the Tories have led it.

June 19, 1963

HAIL AFRICAN UNITY!

R. Palme Dutt

THE Addis Ababa Conference of thirty African Heads of State establishing the Organisation of African Unity is an event of historic importance in the advance of African and world liberation.

Only two years ago President Nkrumah of Ghana wrote in our issue of July, 1961, in his Message welcoming the fortieth anniversary of *Labour Monthly*:

The imperialist colours of the political map of Africa are radically fading away, and soon the artificial boundaries which divide Africa will be completely obliterated.

In this melting pot of change only one sublime result will emanate from the political forge: the effective political union of African States.

Today at Addis Ababa the Heads of thirty of the thirty-two independent African States meeting in the first All-African Summit Conference have signed (with full concurrence of the other two not represented by Heads of State at the Conference) the Charter establishing the Organisation of African Unity with an agreed Constitution providing for an Assembly, a Council, a permanent Secretariat, special Commissions, a financial budget, and a programme of action, including for the liberation of the remaining minority sector of territories of Africa still to win freedom.

This is a tremendous development, not only in the age-old history of Africa and the lightning advance of Africa in the modern age, but in the advance of the national liberation movement and anti-imperialism throughout the world.

May 25, the day of the signing of this Charter, is to be celebrated henceforth as Africa Solidarity Day. It may be recalled that May 24 used to be proclaimed Empire Day (now dimly renamed Commonwealth Day, and passing with scarcely an echo of the old fanfare this year). The celebration of May 25 is likely to last longer.

Tribute must be paid to the statesmanship of the African Heads of State who, despite all the difficulties and differences, on which all the 'well-informed' imperialist press commentators had so confidently counted at the outset to predict an inevitable deadlock, found the way to overcome these obstacles and reach this common positive outcome.

It is appropriate that at this moment should be published Dr. Kwame Nkrumah's new book *Africa Must Unite* (Heinemann: 21s.), which throws a flood of light on all the problems and the aims of African unity. Since the pioneering labours of Dr. DuBois few

African political leaders have given such untiring, devoted and indomitable service and creative leadership, both before and after the victory of independence in Ghana, as Kwame Nkrumah to the cause of African Union. His book can be confidently recommended to all readers who wish to understand the new Africa that is arising.

* * * * *

No continent has been so ravaged by imperialism as Africa. This range of over one-fifth of the land surface of the earth, so rich in natural resources, so favoured by geography and climate over wide regions, inhabited by peoples so quick and lively in spirit and intelligence, so warm-hearted and creative in artistic impulse, with such ancient civilisations, and indeed, according to some theorists, the cradle of human civilisation, has been plundered and devastated for close on five centuries by the European marauders, and robbed of human and material wealth to provide the foundations of the American capitalist 'miracle' and British family fortunes. This is not merely the ancient record of the horrors of the slave traders, but has continued to our day with the butchers of the Congo, the Nazi torturers in Algeria or the Apartheid Legrees of South Africa. The resultant wreckage of life and society has then been termed by the disdainful bandits a region of natural darkness and backwardness.

Nkrumah vividly describes the heritage of generations of colonial rule when the national leadership took over Ghana:

The destitution of the land after long years of colonial rule was brought sharply home to us. All over the country great tracts of open land lay untilled and uninhabited. Our roads were meagre, our railways short. Over eighty per cent of our people were illiterate. . . . Trade and commerce were controlled, directed and run almost entirely by Europeans. Of industries, we had none except those extracting gold and diamonds. We made not a pin, not a handkerchief, not a match. . . . Though there had been geological surveys of our sub-soil, the reports had been scrupulously withheld.

When the new rulers took over the residence of the former British Governor

we were struck by the general emptiness. Not a rag, not a book was to be found; not a piece of paper. . . . That complete denudation seemed like a line drawn across our continuity. It was as though there had been a definite intention to cut off all links between the past and the present which could help us in finding our bearings.

In the departmental offices they found

gaps in the records, connecting links missing which made it difficult for us to get a full picture of certain important matters. We had an inkling

of material withheld, of files that had strayed, of reports that had got 'misaid'. We were to find other gaps and interruptions as we delved deeper into the business of making a going concern of the run-down estate we had inherited. That, we understood, was part of the business of dislodging an incumbent who had not been too willing to leave and as expressing a sense of injury in acts of petulance. On the other hand, there may have been things to hide.

Justly Nkrumah stresses that freedom has never been given as a gift by the imperialists anywhere, but has always only been won by the struggle and sacrifice of the people. Justly he also stresses that independence from imperialism is not yet complete with the establishment of sovereign states, but that the imperialists still strive by every means to maintain their domination and exploitation, and even to extend their economic penetration, through all devices of neo-colonialism, and that therefore the struggle for independence from imperialism has still to be carried forward also in the newly independent states, as well as in the still subject territories of Africa.

* * * * *

This is the background against which need to be seen the problems of the newly independent African states meeting at Addis Ababa, and which makes so important the achievement of African unity, not as a distant dream of the future, but as an urgent practical need of the present.

The living body of Africa has been torn and carved up by the imperialists as by vultures quarrelling over carrion. The artificial frontiers scrawled by rival greedy bargainers at European conference tables for the partition of the spoils of Africa bear no relation to history, tradition, popular sentiment or ethnological or national groupings of the people. But the national independence struggle has necessarily had to be conducted first within the existing state boundaries against the given imperialist power ruling a particular segment. Hence the newly independent states have necessarily arisen in the first place on the basis of the divisions originally imposed by imperialism. The new rulers have in consequence inherited a terrifying complex of frontier and regional problems, all the more acute as popular consciousness grows in strength. With unconcealed satisfaction the imperialist experts have counted on these complications to disrupt the new Africa, paralyse the new states with internal regional discords, set them at loggerheads with one another, and thus create a happy hunting ground for renewed imperialist influence.

To counter this menace, the wisest leaders of the African freedom struggle, from the great DuBois onwards, had always insisted that the aim must be an All-African struggle against imperialism. This would need to lead, as Nkrumah was the most active pioneer to emphasise through all the developments since 1945, to the establishment, with the advance of African independence, of a Union of African States. Only within such a context, following victory over imperialism, could the frontier and regional or national questions or possible realignments of states or regrouping of states be peacefully settled, without offering advantage to imperialism. Hence the urgency of advancing towards this goal already today. It is this situation that makes the achievement of Addis Ababa so important.

* * * * *

Within the short space of the past six years the speed of advance has been amazing. When Ghana won independence in 1957, this was the first African colonial territory south of the Sahara to win independence. Within four years eighteen more had won independence. From the outset Ghana has made the pace in insisting that the victory of independence in any given territory should be regarded, not as a narrow national victory, but as a stage in the battle of African liberation. Nkrumah writes:

When I returned to West Africa in 1947, it was with the intention of using the Gold Coast as a starting-off point for African independence and unity. With the mass movement I was able to build up in the Convention People's Party, the Gold Coast secured its freedom and emerged as the sovereign state of Ghana in 1957. I at once made it clear that there would be no meaning to the national independence of Ghana unless it was linked with the total liberation of the African continent. While our independence celebrations were actually taking place, I called for a conference of all the sovereign states of Africa, to discuss plans for the future of our continent.

Hostile critics have sought to find in the characteristically personalised expression, illustrated in this passage, on the problem of African unity nothing but the ambition of Nkrumah to play a role on a larger stage. This petty approach only betrays the smallness of the critics. Vanity alone can never make history. The battle for All-African liberation and unity is a great political movement of our time, and the courageous and resourceful role of Nkrumah in advancing this battle will always be justly recognised.

The road has not been easy. When Guinea and Ghana proclaimed their union in 1958 (amplified in the Ghana-Guinea-Mali Union in 1960), contemptuous commentators pointed out all the practical obstacles to hinder such a union becoming a reality. These

comments only revealed ignorance of the strategic plan. This Union was intended, as Nkrumah points out, not as a supposedly self-sufficient answer to the inadequacy of small states, but as 'the first step towards African political union . . . a nucleus for a Union of African States'.

When the first Conference of Independent African States met at Accra in April, 1958, there were only eight, of which five were North African Arab States (including Sudan) alongside Ethiopia, Liberia and Ghana. The first All-African People's Conference in Accra in December of the same year united the delegates of 62 African national movements. In 1959 the representatives of African trade unions meeting in Accra formed the All-African Trade Union Federation. By mid-1960 the second Conference of Independent African States, meeting at Addis Ababa, represented twelve States.

Imperialism took alarm in face of this rapid development of African unity for liberation. Every calculation was now openly made to seek to find grounds of division between varying political trends of different African States. In 1960 the organisation of the 'French Community' was constituted to include the majority of the former French colonial territories in West and Equatorial Africa as twelve sovereign independent republics, in practice closely linked economically, diplomatically and in respect of the initial political apparatus, with France. Nkrumah, while supporting the British Commonwealth and sterling area as 'an association of sovereign states, each of which is free from interference from the others', sharply criticises the 'mistaken claims that the French Community . . . is taking on the character of the Commonwealth'. In the autumn of 1960 Nigeria, the largest state in Africa, in whose constitution the relatively conservative Northern People's Congress holds at present the predominant position, became independent; and the anticipations of British imperialist commentators were eagerly expressed that this should serve as a counterweight to check the upstart pretensions of Ghana and the more militant national elements in Africa.

These hopes of imperialism to foment division between the African States found expression in 1961 in the attempt to counterpose and incite rivalry between the so-called 'Casablanca group' and 'Monrovia group' of African powers. At Casablanca in January, 1961, seven States (Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Libya, Egypt, Morocco and the Algerian Provisional Government) adopted an

African Charter to establish joint institutions of independent African States, including an Assembly, functional committees and a joint African High Command. The French Community States were not invited; and seven other States, including Nigeria, Liberia, Ethiopia, Tunis and Sudan, though invited, did not attend. At Monrovia in May, 1961, twenty African States, including the eleven French Community States other than Mali, met under the chairmanship of the President of Liberia. The close links of Liberia with the United States are familiar. Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Morocco, Egypt and Sudan, though invited, did not participate.

In practice the resolutions of the two Conferences expressed considerable common aims for African unity and liberation. The stress of Monrovia was on more gradual measures by way of economic co-operation in the first place. The stress of Casablanca was on the necessity for political union as the indispensable starting point. But the tactics of imperialism were conspicuously directed to focus attention on these divisions, and to express on this basis confident anticipations that any dream of speedy African political unity would founder on these divisions and at the best be relegated to the role of utopian aspirations for the indefinite future.

* * * * *

The outcome of the Addis Ababa Conference has delivered a check to these hopes of imperialism. Thirty of the thirty-two independent African States were represented by Heads of State; Morocco, which was concerned to challenge the position of Mauritania, was represented by its Foreign Secretary; Togoland was temporarily unrepresented owing to the question of the recognition of the new President still requiring agreement. Certainly the proceedings at the outset revealed the difficulties; and the dispatches of the imperialist press correspondents on the first day betrayed their anticipations of deadlock. But on the second day the Declaration of the twenty-two national movements in the still subject territories, who had met alongside under the chairmanship of Oginga Odinga, exercised a profound influence in stimulating the sense of urgency for united action. Nkrumah's tactics in presenting the maximum programme for immediate full political union, so far from exposing him to impotent isolation, as the imperialist critics hopefully prophesied, fulfilled its aim of forcing the pace, so that the most moderate felt compelled to table their positive proposals for advancing the aim of unity, rather than take refuge in objections and procrastination.

The result represents the unanimous adoption of a very considerable programme for establishing united African political institutions as soon as ratification has taken place by two-thirds of the States. The Organisation for African Unity replaces the separate groupings of 'Casablanca' and 'Monrovia'. The ill-favoured example of the 'Organisation of American States' has not been copied, as some American imperialist advisers sought to recommend; indeed, one of the most effective arguments of Nkrumah for speedy political union has been to emphasise the danger that an Africa of a congeries of weak separate states, each in isolation at the mercy of imperialism, might otherwise share the unhappy fate of Latin America during the past century.

A giant step has been taken, although the test will come with practice. It would be unwise to assume that the course will be smooth. But the decisions of Addis Ababa should certainly not be dismissed as a mere paper blueprint for a constitution for African unity. A practical programme was simultaneously adopted alongside the constitutional decisions; and this practical programme is directly related to the struggle for liberation in the rest of Africa. The decisions for the diplomatic isolation and trade boycott of Portugal and South Africa will not only be a guide to action for the African Governments, but will be presented to the United Nations, and will be an inspiration to the democratic movement everywhere. No less explicit is the warning to Britain against handing over Southern Rhodesia to the dictatorship of the White racialist minority in place of granting democratic independence.

Principle 6 of the Charter adopted at Addis Ababa lays down: 'Absolute dedication to the total emancipation of the African territories which are still dependent'. A Liberation Bureau has been established, entrusted to the charge of seven States (Algeria, Congo, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Senegal, Uganda, United Arab Republic), with headquarters at Dar-es-Salaam, and with an initial fund of one million pounds, to give aid to the national liberation movements in subject Africa, both financially and through military training and the provision of volunteers. Premier Ben Bella, fresh from the victory of the Algerian national liberation movement in the bitter seven years war against the half million army of French imperialism, was the foremost in emphasising the necessity of such practical aid to the national liberation fighters in the rest of Africa. It was Premier Obote of Uganda who declared: 'If the Portuguese can try to shoot Africans, the Africans must also shoot the Portuguese'.

The cause of All-African Unity against imperialism for the fulfilment of African liberation does not represent, as the imperialist racialists try to pretend, a kind of 'black racialism' or 'African separatism' opposed to internationalism. It is an integral part of the international anti-imperialist front. The national liberation movements in Asia and Latin America or the Caribbean, the socialist peoples and the anti-imperialist fighters in the imperialist countries, support the African national liberation movement as ardently as the African national liberation fighters are conscious of their solidarity with all who fight imperialism all over the world. The fight for All-African Unity is a specific form of the national liberation struggle against imperialism in the conditions of Africa. Nkrumah's book *Africa Must Unite*, inspired by a profoundly internationalist outlook, will help to spread enlightenment and understanding of this great aim which is one of the dynamic factors of the great changes of our era.

THIS MONSTROUS LAW

Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

THE Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (known as the McCarran Act) has finally met with a legal setback which indicates a possibility of nullifying or repealing it in the near future. On May 16 the United States Court of Appeals overturned a ruling by the administrative board set up by the Law, which had ordered the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship to register as a Communist-front organisation. A three-judge panel ruled that the Board had failed to establish 'that the organisation was at the time of the hearing substantially directed, dominated or controlled by a Communist-action organisation, a Communist foreign government or the world Communist movement'. This is the first substantial legal victory against the McCarran Act. The Court put it succinctly: 'Probative evidence in this record is negligible'.

There are two more organisations with appeals pending before the U.S. Appeals Court, who have similarly been ordered to register as Communist-front organisations. They are the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign-Born. Also the appeal of the Communist Party is pending against a judgment of \$120,000 fine by a lower court, for refusing to register as a Communist-action organisation. Such registration has nothing in common with routine forms of

registration. It is an admission of guilt of crimes defined in the law.

This monstrous law is unique on our statute books. It is in fact an edict. It freezes the cold war atmosphere into permanent legislation, based on the *big lie* of Hitler. It declares as a fact, established by 'findings' of witch-hunting Congressional committees, a gross libel incapable of proof—that the Soviet Union heads an international conspiracy against the U.S. Government and that the Communist Party of the United States of America is its agent. This is a gratuitous insult to a friendly nation, with diplomatic relations with the United States, a valiant ally against Hitler a few short years ago, with whom there are amicable conferences and negotiations, exchanges of students and delegations. It endangers the possibility of expanding relations and ultimate peaceful co-existence.

The alleged conspiracy is defined as one 'seeking through deceit, treachery, secretiveness, sabotage, and any other means deemed necessary to overthrow the Government and to establish a totalitarian dictatorship subservient to the most powerful existing Communist dictatorship'. The domestic agent was characterised as a Communist-action organisation. Why did the sponsors—ultra-right red-baiters like Senator McCarthy, McCarran, Walter, who died in May, and Nixon, the notorious Republican presidential candidate—fail to name names? Anyone familiar with world politics could readily identify the country and the party implied. They said openly who they meant. But to put names into a law would be a violation of the United States Constitution's safeguards against a bill of attainder, which means any law which decrees guilt and punishment without a judicial trial. Congress deliberately resorted to a tricky device—to write the guilt into the statute, then give a Subversive Activities Control Board authority to name the parties after perfunctory hearings, and order them to register as such.

Hearings are held by the Board when it is petitioned to do so by the Attorney General, Robert Kennedy. When the Board issues its order to register, a failure to comply is punishable by a fine of \$10,000 for each day an organisation does not register and an additional imprisonment of five years for an individual failing to comply. These penalties could result in life sentences, clearly a violation of the 8th Amendment to the Constitution prohibiting excessive fines and cruel and unusual punishment. So far two leaders of the U.S. Communist Party are indicted but not yet tried for refusing to register: Gus Hall and Benjamin J. Davis. Twenty other individuals have been cited, to register as Communist Party members.

In its final report to the U.S. Supreme Court on the hearing of the Communist Party, the Board admitted that in spite of strenuous efforts by the government to prove otherwise, *there was no evidence* that it receives financial support from the Soviet Union or any foreign government; or of foreign training of personnel; or of orders or directives from the Soviet Union to the American party, or that it employs secrecy to conceal foreign ties. With the collapse of these major elements of proof, only one remained—*parallelism*.

Not deeds, not actions, but ideas are the sole proof attempted today against Communists and others. The Act states that 'the extent to which its views and policies do not deviate from such foreign power and foreign organisation', determines whether an organisation is a Communist-action organisation. The views cited have no relation to violence, espionage, sabotage and other crimes attributed to the conspiracy. They are actually views on a highly political level. A 'front' is alleged to agree with these views.

The Government's expert witness on parallelism was Phillip Mosely, Professor of International Relations at Columbia University and Director of its Russian Institute. He testified that on forty-five international issues, starting with the League of Nations in 1918 to the Korean War in 1953, the American Communist Party and the Soviet Union had taken similar stands. These included the North Atlantic Pact; control of atomic energy; seating Communist China in the United Nations; peace in Korea, etc. An amazing reference by Professor Mosely was to an article by George Bernard Shaw, quoted by *Izvestia* but published in the British magazine, *New Statesman and Nation*. He said that while it is not a Communist publication in the sense that it is not issued by the Communist Party of Great Britain, nevertheless in some aspects of its policies and recommendations it tends from time to time to parallel many of the Soviet recommendations. This will surely be news to your readers.

The most recent citation is against a youth organisation, *Advance*. They are accused of a 1963 version of parallelism with the U.S. Communist Party such as opposing intervention in Cuba; nuclear testing; urging the United States to negotiate on Berlin and opposing the Smith and McCarran Acts. This last item has an Alice-in-Wonderland quality—that the targets of the law are prohibited from opposing it on pain of another count in the citation. Recently nine hundred distinguished Americans petitioned President Kennedy to nullify this Act. Under this interpretation, they are violators of it and could be cited by Attorney General Kennedy.

The McCarran Act is a two-edged sword. It punishes for compliance and for non-compliance. Registration requires submitting to the Department of Justice a list of its members, financial records, etc., and would be required to label all mail and publications as Communist. False statements are punishable. Its members are prohibited from working for the Government or in defence facilities, over 4,000 of which have been listed to date; or from securing or using a passport. To admit Communist Party membership renders one liable to the Smith Act as well as to a conspiracy section of the McCarran Act. It is obvious to any reasonable person that no one in his right mind would register under these circumstances and that those ordered to do so properly invoke the Fifth Amendment protection against self-incrimination. The U.S. Communist Party has fought valiantly for thirteen years to smash this vicious attack against a political party, and to protect the rights of all Americans. Support for the campaign is growing as more Americans realise, in accordance with Justice Jackson's words: 'The rights of all are tied up in the same bundle with the Communists'.

While I have been writing this article, the McCarran Act struck again through the Department of Justice in a shocking manner. A shipyard machinist was arrested at work by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (F.B.I.) on May 21. He had been indicted in Seattle, Washington, by a Federal grand jury on the charge of: 'Illegally maintaining employment in a defence facility while continuing to be a member of the Communist Party'. Eugene F. Robel, 52 years old, employed since 1955 in the Todd Shipyard, was jailed overnight in lieu of \$10,000 bail demanded by the government. The next day Federal Judge Lindberg, who had been the trial judge in the unsuccessful Seattle Smith Act case a decade ago, released him on his own recognisance. In a TV interview, Mr. Robel said:

I have a wife and four children. We own our own home and a second-hand car. I have \$300 in the bank and \$26 in my pocket. I have been singled out for a test case because I am a poor man with no money to defend myself. *The only charge against me is that I was working.*

The Federal prosecutor concedes that there are no other charges. In 1955 Mr. Robel was called before the House Un-American Activities Committee (H.U.A.C.) where he refused to discuss his political views. He and several others were expelled by the Machinists Union in consequence, but no attempts were made then to deprive him of his job.

The Todd shipyard may refuse him further employment so as

not to become involved. If he continues to work, this may be considered an additional and continuing violation of the Act. The constitutionality of this provision has not been tested. This adds to the argument that the U.S. Supreme Court should have acted on all parts of the law in 1961 and not merely on the registration provision. They declared all other issues 'premature', thereby creating a situation which was well described by Supreme Court Justice Douglas in his dissent: 'The great injustice in what we do today lies in compelling the officials of the Party to violate this law before their constitutional claims can be heard and determined. Never before, I believe, have we forced that choice on a litigant'. If the U.S. Supreme Court had passed on the McCarran Act in its entirety, this country would not now be faced before the world with the disgraceful fact *that a man is arrested for working*, not for any misconduct on his job but solely because of his alleged ideas.

There are many encouraging developments. There is a greater interest, especially among the youth, in what the American Communists really believe and do—in contrast to the big lie. Leading spokesmen of the Party have spoken to thousands of students in the last two years. The labour movement is increasingly alert to the danger of new anti-labour legislation which would cripple its activity and destroy its rights. A militant fight-back spirit is developing and many organisations are on record against the McCarran Act.

We deeply appreciate the support of the British Committee for Democratic Rights in U.S.A., of a similar committee in Germany, the active campaign conducted in Canada, and numerous protest actions in various parts of the world. The deputations, resolutions, letters and telegrams addressed to President Kennedy are extremely helpful, expressing world opinion to which our government is sensitive. The excellent pamphlet, *Liberty in Chains*, by D. N. Pritt, Q.C., shows the danger of the McCarthyite infection spreading to your country in the proposals of the Radcliffe Committee on Security in 1962, accepted by your Government. The fateful words, all too familiar to us—'Communist infiltration, espionage, security'—appear in their report as reasons why Communists cannot act as negotiators for trade unions. As with us, it is 'plain unadulterated nonsense', and a 'licence for McCarthyism', as Mr. Stanley Mayne and *The Tribune* have stated. It is good that you are alert to these dangers, warned by our experiences. Together, as our united peoples helped to defeat fascism, so today we will defeat its evil spawn—McCarthyism and the McCarran Act.

VICTORY I

Letter from Greece (*Athens, May 29, 1963.*)

Yesterday afternoon a tragedy ended in triumph: the tragedy of the death of Grigoris Lambrakis. The outburst of the Greek people, their triumph, the shock we had all been waiting for so long: it came.

Lambrakis' funeral was the catharsis of the tragedy of the Greek people, because yesterday the people won, and a new era started clear for all to see. The past week has been the Greek people's Lent Week. But yesterday was not their Good Friday—that went by untouched. Yesterday the first signs of Easter began to appear. Let us wait for it. The past week has been the most moving we have experienced in all the past fifteen to twenty years I can remember since I was a boy. What started with the murder of Lambrakis will remain written indelibly in everyone's memory, enemies as well as friends.

For the first time, *all* the Greek people felt the dirt that had been hidden from them all these years; for the first time they realised, and above all felt, the terrorism weighing down on our country. For the first time the whole press spoke of the widespread terrorism, and the struggle waged for so many years by *Avghi*¹ was justified. Even *Akropolis*² urged 'Don't let us destroy Greece!' Never before such seriousness, such solemnity, such silent pressing grief as you felt and saw here these last few days. Little groups gathered round the newspapers on display at the kiosks, or as they were being read by ordinary readers, secret, impassioned glances over other people's shoulders, trying to follow the last of Lambrakis' wounded spirit, as if they were breathing with him. Was not that spirit their own? In factories, shops, everywhere, no one talked of anything but the murder of Lambrakis and the terrorism, because the people have realised at last the full extent of the filth which had been hidden from them so long, so deliberately and carefully.

And then the funeral came. You have never seen so many people. All the way from the Cathedral to the cemetery the two pavements were thick with people. We had never seen anything like it. People from every class, even though it was 4 o'clock in the afternoon. All Athens was there. For a whole hour the procession passed by with as many as two thousand garlands from every corner of Athens, from all over Greece. There cannot have been a single tree in Athens that did not have a blossom to offer to the hero Lambrakis. When the flowers went past the people looked on in passionate grief without speaking or moving. Sometimes they clapped. They were clapping the victor. When the coffin came, after the Philharmonic, the people were no longer weeping. They were not emotional and they were not sad, they were triumphant. They were shouting and clapping. The coffin was covered over with flowers in the national colours. The people had embraced it and would have lifted it up in the air. People, people, people, a countless throng of people, perhaps 400-500 thousand singing the National Anthem and shouting: Democracy! Fascism will not pass! Lambrakis has conquered! It was not a funeral, it was a mass meeting of the people. The people's outburst, the beginning of the Resurrection, though the price paid was dear.

¹ *Avghi* (Dawn) is the only left-wing newspaper.

² *Akropolis* is the extreme right-wing newspaper.

MOURNING



The Funeral of Grigoris Lambrakis.

THE CASE FOR THE FORTY HOUR WEEK

J. E. Mortimer*

THE introduction of a maximum working week of forty hours has for long been the aim of the trade union movement. It is, in fact, embodied as an objective of the Trades Union Congress in its published constitution. The importance of an eight-hour day and forty-hour week has always been recognised not only in Britain but wherever workers have become organised in trade unions. It is sufficient to recall that the modern celebration of May 1 as a day of workers' solidarity started as a result of a big strike in Chicago in May, 1886, in favour of an eight-hour day.

The need for the forty-hour week without reduction in wages has been supported not only by trade unionists but by enlightened opinion from among other sections of the community, including some employers. As long ago as 1935, for example, the International Labour Organisation, representing governments, employers and workers from many countries, adopted its historic Convention in favour of the forty-hour week. The I.L.O. has returned to this same subject more recently. In 1962 it adopted a Reduction of Hours of Work Recommendation. The preamble of this recommendation refers to the forty-hour week, without any reduction in wages, as a social standard to be attained by member States. The operative part of the recommendation provides that normal hours of work should be progressively reduced and it is deliberately worded to cover the different situations in the various member States. This is why it did not specify in what precise way—whether by legislation or by voluntary collective agreements—the maximum forty-hour week was to be achieved.

Needless to say, the British Government have rejected this I.L.O. Recommendation. In a White Paper published in April of this year (Command 1993, price 8d. H.M.S.O.) they say:

The provision of the Recommendation which requires Governments to formulate and pursue a national policy designed to promote the progressive reduction of hours of work is not consistent with the methods by which conditions of employment are normally determined in the United Kingdom. The Government, therefore, does not accept the Recommendation.

This statement is hypocritical. Rather than disclose their basic

*Mr. J. E. Mortimer is Editor of *The Draughtsman*.

opposition to the introduction of the forty-hour week they have employed the argument that in Britain it is not the practice of governments to influence the determination of conditions of employment. This is plainly untrue. The National Incomes Commission was set up by the government as part of its policy to hold back wages and to resist the introduction of a shorter working week.

The rejection of the I.L.O. Recommendation by the British government calls for co-ordinated action by the trade union movement to achieve the forty-hour week. The first breakthrough has already been achieved. The forty-hour week has been secured in printing, and agreements for its introduction at some time in the future have been obtained in sections of the building industry, including the Scottish plumbers and builders, in the heating industry and in electrical contracting. Claims for the forty-hour week have been submitted, or have been decided upon, in a number of other industries. In engineering the claim was submitted to the Engineering Employers' Federation on May 30.

The claim for a maximum working week of forty hours rests primarily on the right of workers to share in the benefits of increased productivity and to take part in this share in the form of increased leisure. In many industries hours of work have been reduced on three occasions since the end of the first world war. The first reduction was to 47 or 48 hours. The second, in the period immediately following the end of the second world war, was for a reduction to 44 or 45 hours. The third, bringing hours down to 42 or 43, and secured at the end of the 1950s or at the beginning of the 1960s, was accepted by the unions as an interim measure towards the early achievement of the forty-hour week.

Productivity in British industry has risen per person employed, on average, by nearly 50 per cent since 1948. The year 1948 is a convenient one to use as a base because by that time most industries had readjusted themselves to peace-time production. Moreover, by 1948 most industries had introduced the shorter basic working week secured during the immediate post-war period. It is often argued that because the increase in workers' earnings in the post-war period has risen more sharply than the increase in productivity, workers have obtained an increasing share of the product of their labour. This is not so. What really matters is not the relationship between productivity and the rise in wage earnings, but the relationship between productivity and trends in real wages (*i.e.*, the relationship between the rise in wages and the rise in prices). On this basis

it can be shown that the workers' share in the product of industry has not increased. On the contrary, the rise in profits has been substantially greater than the rise in wages. This has, for example, been a constant theme in the statements submitted by the engineering unions in their successive wage claims.

In their report on the forty-hour week agreements for the Scottish plumbers and builders, the National Incomes Commission said that despite the agreements the actual hours of work were likely to remain unchanged. They felt that this robbed the unions of many of the arguments they had used for the forty-hour week. The difference between basic hours and actual hours worked is one of the problems which has to be faced. The persistent overtime which has been worked in many sections of British industry has undoubtedly tended to make it more difficult for the unions to attain a forty-hour week. For a period, at least, some employers were able to argue with some justification that a reduction in the basic week merely meant more hours would be worked at overtime rates.

Without in any way condoning persistent overtime there are a number of points to be made in reply to these contentions of the employers. In the first place, the attempts made by unions to regulate overtime have often been rejected by employers on the grounds that this would represent an interference with their so-called managerial prerogatives. In the second place, the readiness of many British workers to work persistent overtime is a reflection of the scandalously low basic rates which exist in many industries. Thirdly, there are now clear signs of a decline in the amount of overtime worked in British industry. In engineering, for example, the average hours actually worked have fallen by about two per week, which is the same as the reduction in the basic week secured by agreement in 1960.

If the employers were really concerned to ensure that a reduction in basic hours should be followed by a corresponding reduction in actual hours worked, there is no doubt that they would find the trade unions willing to co-operate. This would not prevent overtime being worked where it could be shown that it was essential to meet special circumstances. A curb on persistent overtime, together with the introduction of a forty-hour week, would help to stimulate the efficiency of British industry. Persistent overtime and long hours of work often provide a façade behind which there is managerial incompetence. The highest standards of management are to be found generally in the countries where the working week is shortest.

The growth of unemployment during the past twelve months provides an additional argument for the forty-hour week. It is clearly ridiculous that workers in industry should continue to be employed on long hours—and the Government and employers should resist the introduction of a shorter working week—whilst hundreds of thousands of men cannot find jobs. That this paradox should exist is itself a biting comment on the kind of industrial system under which we live. Unless the developments in production technique are accompanied by corresponding improvements in the conditions of life of the working people, unemployment is bound to grow. If the productive capacity of society expands, so too must the volume of demand if workers are to be kept in their jobs. Those who are always prattling that to improve workers' conditions would threaten Britain's economy, might reflect that hundreds of thousands of workers are unemployed and productive capacity is not fully utilised, because of insufficient demand for all the products of industry.

In recent years marked progress towards a shorter working week has been made in many different countries. In the United States where the basic forty-hour week was obtained in most spheres of employment many years ago, some progress has more recently been made towards an even shorter working week. A working week of 35 hours is observed for the majority of organised workers in the manufacture of ladies' garments. In printing most of the workers are on a basic week of less than forty hours, and standards below forty apply to substantial numbers of workers in other industries. In Canada too the majority of workers in industry are on a basic forty-hour week or less. In France the basic forty-hour week was introduced in 1936. Actual hours of work in more recent years have been considerably longer, but the trade union movement has made efforts to reduce them and, more particularly, has been successful in securing longer holidays.

In the Soviet Union average hours of work were down to 39·4 hours for all wage earners by January, 1963, or 40 hours in industry alone. A thirty-five hour week was observed in certain arduous occupations. From the beginning of 1964 it is intended that hours of work will be further reduced over a period, with the aim of achieving eventually a thirty-five hour week for most workers and a thirty-hour week for those engaged in specially arduous occupations.

In Germany, agreements have been concluded in a number of industries for the progressive reduction of hours of work. The most important of these is in engineering. This provides for the intro-

duction of a basic 41¼-hour working week next year, and a forty-hour week from mid-1965. In the recent dispute in the German engineering industry the unions were able to defeat a proposal from the employers that the introduction of the shorter working week, as envisaged in the agreement already concluded, should be deferred.

The case for the early introduction of the basic forty-hour week in Britain is strengthened even further by a comparison between the average annual holiday entitlement of British workers and those of workers in other industrialised countries in Western Europe. The comparison is distinctly unfavourable to Britain. In France, for example, the workers receive a minimum three weeks' holiday. Workers under eighteen years of age, and older workers with long periods of service, receive more than three weeks. In addition, the number of public holidays is normally at least eleven days per year, in comparison with six to eight in Britain. The latest trend in France is for a month's summer holiday. In Germany about 85 per cent of the collective agreements provide a minimum annual holiday of eighteen working days or more with public holidays varying between nine and fourteen, according to area.

Manual workers in Italy are normally granted a minimum twelve working days' holiday for up to three years' service, fourteen days for four to ten years, sixteen days for eleven to nineteen years, and eighteen days for twenty years' service or more. In Italy the number of paid public holidays is no less than seventeen per year. In Austria most workers receive more than a fortnight's holiday, together with eleven days' public holidays. After fifteen years' service workers normally receive at least a month's holiday. In Scandinavian countries three weeks' minimum holiday is almost universal. The February, 1962, issue of the *Ministry of Labour Gazette* reported that a Royal Commission is now considering the introduction of a four-week statutory holiday in Sweden, where there are also twelve public holidays.

The achievement of a basic forty-hour week, together with a reduction in the actual hours worked, is an immediate possibility for the British workers. Whether they will win this demand depends, more than anything else, on their determination to achieve it. If the workers, through their unions, press strongly for the maximum forty-hour week and are prepared, if necessary, to take action in support of it, their efforts will be rewarded with success.

SWEDISH LABOUR: THE FACTS

William Menzell

THE main dilemma of British capitalism in the post-war period has had its reflection in the 'stop-go' policies which have brought nothing but discredit to their protagonists. There have been good and sufficient reasons for the maintenance of a high rate of production and expansion giving rise to a condition of generally full employment. The latter condition has given rise to a high level of trade union organisation and activity, so that whenever unemployment has appeared it was immediately seen as a political question. But it is strenuously argued that 'over-full employment' gives rise to wage increases and earnings in greater proportion than any gains in the productivity of labour. This, we are told with many voices, accounts for the persistent inflation and therefore for recurring crises in the balance of payments and the reserves of external currencies.

It is no part of our present purpose to discuss the merits of the case for 'wage push inflation'. It is well known, however, that the introduction of a credit squeeze policy which is intended to halt expansion and create rather more unemployment serves not only to inflame the organised workers against the employers and the Conservative Government but precisely to cause a further and sudden fall in the productivity of labour. In other words, full employment seems to be an economic impossibility whilst greater unemployment is politically dangerous. Hence we have the National Economic Development Council (familarly known as Neddy) the declared objective of which is to indicate the possibilities of expansion of the economy without creating inflation and the National Incomes Commission (Nicky) which is the first step towards the determination of wages centrally by means of a Government-sponsored organisation.

We should not be surprised therefore if the employers and their political supporters show more than ordinary interest in a capitalist country where, as a result of collaboration between employers and trade unions, there are no unofficial strikes; no demarcation disputes; where the trade unions themselves devote a great deal of energy in showing how a capitalist expansion may be achieved, and where the trade unions say that unemployment must be accepted as a result of what are known as 'structural changes' in the economy.

This very pleasant state of affairs exists in Sweden and it is no accident that there has recently been a fairly steady stream of litera-

ture on the intriguing situation in that country. Mr. Jack Cooper, the General Secretary of the National Union of General and Municipal Workers, published in May, 1963, a Fabian pamphlet *Industrial Relations Sweden shows the way*. In the same month we had the report of the Trades Union Congress delegation (which visited Sweden in October, 1962) and which was entitled *Sweden—its unions and industrial relations*. Dr. T. L. Johnson, whose book *Collective Bargaining in Sweden* was published in 1962, also brought out, in May, 1963, an English translation of *Economic Expansion and Structural Change* (George Allen & Unwin, 25s.). This was a report submitted to the 16th Congress of the Swedish Confederation of Trade Unions, and is described as a 'Trade Union Manifesto'. It presents a systematic exposition of recent trade union thought in Sweden on the problems of economic growth and on the structural changes in the Swedish economy for which it will call.

This report quite clearly states that it is the business of the trade unions in Sweden to help industry to increase productivity and to accept the redundancies and disturbances which may be expected to result. The economists of the Swedish Confederation of Trade Unions have gone to great lengths to prove that a 'flexible' labour force is one of the main ways of promoting growth. According to the T.U.C. report the Swedish Confederation assumes the continuation of a mixed economy, and regards competition as one means of securing structural adaptation. Furthermore, its policy for wage stability rests in part on the assumption that under full employment, profits (before tax) tend to be too high and *that this makes employers too generous*. 'Profit margins should therefore be compressed so as to avoid inflationary competition for manpower.'

The *Daily Mail* devoted a full-length leading article to the T.U.C. Report on Sweden and said it was a hopeful sign that Mr. Cousins, who was a member of the delegation, is also taking a vigorous part in the National Economic Development Council here at home. Then the *Daily Mail* showed clearly what is in the mind of employers:

The Swedish drill offers one valuable lesson. The delegation found that the Swedes had suffered serious industrial strife until both employers and employed were given a virtual ultimatum: Govern yourself properly or there will be legal intervention. The warning was quite enough. This could not easily be done here. Any intervention that was hostile to the aims and strength of the trade union movement would be disastrous. But, if the motives were right, it might genuinely enable the trade union movement to do what it is perhaps powerless to do on its own.

(*Daily Mail*, May 14, 1963.)

The fact is, however, that in Sweden there are laws to limit disputes.

Once an agreement between employers and trade unions has been concluded it becomes a contract binding on both parties. Under the Labour Collective Contracts Act of 1928, 'the parties to a collective agreement are under an unconditional obligation not to resort to a strike or lockout during the period of validity of the contract, irrespective of any alleged or even real breach of the contract by one of the parties'. (Mr. Jack Cooper, *op. cit.*)

According to the T.U.C. report, the reconciliation between Swedish employers and the Confederation of Trade Unions in the 1930s did not necessarily take place because the Social Democratic Party was then in office. The point is made, however, that the continuation of such Governments since then is the key to a major difference between the Swedish and British economic environments—'the explicit commitment to full employment accepted not only by the Government and the unions but also by the central employers' federation'.

During the past twenty years the Swedish unions have been operating in comparatively favourable circumstances. The country has avoided involvement in two world wars and is still regarded as the classically neutral country in international conflict. According to the T.U.C. report the Swedish Government is not strongly in favour of extending public ownership.

In this as in other respects the LO (the Swedish Confederation of Trade Unions) prefers to concentrate on what it regards as the primary purposes of trade unions—the improvement of wages and conditions and the provision of jobs—and adopts an almost completely pragmatic approach to the choice of instruments to secure these objectives.

Mr. Jack Cooper says that the Swedish Democratic Party was following a policy on Keynesian lines before Keynes' *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* was published and since then the Party has pressed on with a programme of full employment and social welfare. Two tests may be applied to see whether these policies have been attended by success. It is appropriate to ask whether the close accord between employers and unions in Sweden has been successful in avoiding what is known as 'wage drift'—*i.e.*, the tendency for earnings to advance, in a period of relatively full employment, beyond the levels set by agreements. This is the test which capitalists would tend to apply and the *Daily Mail* (May 14, 1963) is quite clear on this:

. . . the Swedes have had no more success than we have in keeping wage increases contained within the growth of national productivity.

Then we are entitled to ask whether the policies spoken of have been successful in maintaining growth in the Swedish economy and in

avoiding the recessions to which the rest of the capitalist world is subject. There is a negative answer to this also. Growth in Sweden during the last decade has been somewhat better than the United Kingdom but less than that of Western Germany, Italy or the Netherlands. Along with many other capitalist countries, Sweden suffered from a recession in 1957-58. According to an article in the Banking Supplement to the *Financial Times* of May 27, 1963, the current outlook for Sweden is far from clear-cut. Some of the large export industries have been experiencing difficulties since 1961; more recently there has been a weakening in foreign demand for the products of the iron and steel industry and there have been signs that certain parts of the engineering and metal-working industries are about to be affected.

It is clear that Sweden under its present system cannot be insulated from what is going on in the rest of the world. If there is a generally expansionary climate then Sweden may expect to expand too. Per contra if the capitalist world enters a period of recession, Sweden will feel the effects. It is impossible to be completely neutral without a radical change in the social system—and without the introduction of real planning.

In the meantime how have the Swedish workers fared? They have done about as well as they would have managed to do in Britain. In the period 1953-61 (says the T.U.C. report) consumer prices rose slightly more than they did in Britain. In the same period, hourly earnings rose slightly less, but the Swedish gross national product rose in those years by 35 per cent whereas in Britain the increase was 21 per cent only.

It is true that the general standard of living of Swedish workers is higher than the general standard in Britain, but this is due to the sum of the conditions of the Swedish economy and not solely to the structure of the trade union organisation. The economists of the Swedish Confederation of Trade Unions have gone to great lengths to prove that a 'flexible' labour force is one of the main ways of promoting growth. The parts of their policy which infer a better 'discipline' on the part of the trade unions has undoubted appeal to British capitalism and to the right wing of the labour movement. The T.U.C. delegation declares that 'they were not looking for, and certainly were not offered, a formula for reproducing in Britain the Swedish pattern of trade unionism or industrial relations'. It is just as well to remember that.

BOILERMAKERS' CONFERENCE

Finlay Hart

THIS year's Conference of the United Society of Boilermakers, Blacksmiths, Shipbuilders and Structural Workers, held at Largs, Ayrshire, maintained its established reputation of being one of the most progressive in the British trade union movement. Affected by the forthcoming amalgamation with the Shipwrights which necessitated postponing consideration of a number of alterations to existing rules, the Conference nevertheless dealt with policy questions affecting every aspect of its members' lives.

The Executive Council was instructed to refuse to co-operate in any way with the Government's policy on national incomes, but to continue to press for a substantial increase for all members, to raise their real purchasing power. The demand was made for the immediate introduction of a shorter working week without loss of wages, and very strong criticism was expressed of the failure to make full use of production units within the British Isles. It called on the Government, the Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress to institute schemes for full employment; declared its support of work-sharing as an alternative to pay-offs, and decided that overtime should be strictly limited by the unions.

A strong case was made for the defeat of the present Tory Government. The Executive Council submitted a resolution declaring that the failure to maintain full employment and improve living standards was due to Tory restrictions. It demanded policies based on planning and public ownership. The needs of youth were stressed and the scandal of the treatment of school-leavers was dealt with, but, new for this predominantly 'men's' union, a resolution, noting that the vast majority of industrial women are still a long way from getting equal pay, instructed the Executive Council to adopt a policy in all wage negotiations of closing the gap between men's and women's wages.

The Conference had something to say on all the social issues. The Government's new housing measures were anticipated as falling short of what the Conference considered the minimum needs for the working class. It first of all demanded the repeal of the 1957 Rent Act, in order to restore rents to a level workers can afford, and check the private landlords. The Conference estimated the minimum immediate needs for new houses at no less than 400,000 a year, whereas the Government proposes 50,000 less or 350,000 some time

in the dim and distant future, and a case was established for higher housing subsidies and lower rates of interest. The needs of the owner-occupier were taken into account too, with a demand for low interest rates on mortgages.

It does not always follow that a union that is progressive on economic and social affairs is always so in relation to peace and international affairs. It is also true that there are those in the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths who would like their union to pursue right-wing policies. A great deal of the credit for the strong unflinching militancy of the Boilermakers is due to its General Secretary, Mr. E. J. Hill, who will now become the President of the new amalgamation.

The Conference was held near to the Holy Loch, which was the destination of a national protest on the Saturday following the close of the proceedings. Those of us who went straight from Largs to the Holy Loch were armed with the Conference decision stating that peace is vital if the peoples of the world are to progress towards a better and happier life. It demanded the withdrawal of the Polaris Base in Scotland; the withdrawal of all foreign bases throughout the world, and that Britain should renounce the manufacture and testing of all nuclear weapons. The recognition of East Germany was called for; a Security Pact in place of Nato and the Warsaw Pact; a condemnation of American action in Cuba; and admission of China to the United Nations

It was only natural in these circumstances that the delegates agreed that there should be no barriers between workers' organisations throughout the world which could stop them discussing their problems, and to this end recommended the removal of such barriers to exchanges of delegations between unions of all nations, irrespective of international affiliations. Instead of the European Common Market the Conference suggested that the Trades Union Congress policy should be one of international agreements with all countries for freeing and expanding trade.

Whilst being a combination of trades with strong craft traditions, the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths are among the most tolerant in relation to genuine working class viewpoints. The *Daily Worker* posters get equal rights with those of the *Daily Herald*. *Labour Monthly* is accepted as a reputable political journal with its posters alongside the *Sunday Citizen*, and copies on sale in the Conference Room. That is how it should be in all trade unions. It is something all unions could learn from the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths.

NEW WEST GERMAN OUTRAGE

D. N. Pritt, Q.C.

IN the January issue of *Labour Monthly* I commented on some impudent court proceedings brought in West Berlin in November, 1962, calling for the banning of the Union of Victims of Nazi Persecution (V.V.N.). As I pointed out in my article, the object of the prosecution was to silence both the opposition in West Germany to the policies of re-armament and nuclear armament put forward by the militarist government of that country, and the exposures of the hordes of Nazis holding high military and government posts there; and I asserted that that country was becoming more and more Nazified, and that civil liberties there were being more and more restricted.

That particular case was adjourned on the second day of the hearing, as a result of the sensational exposure in open court of the Nazi record of the presiding judge, and it has not yet been resumed. This represents a clear victory for the West German opposition; but the State is still taking on more and more of the character of a neo-Nazi police state, and the already wide and frequent use of its courts for the purpose of suppressing opposition has been further illustrated by the prosecution at Solingen in May, 1963, of one Lorenz Knorr, a Social Democratic journalist of good standing and a prominent member of the peace movement, on a charge of 'insulting' generals of the new Wehrmacht.

Knorr's alleged offence was committed in a speech made to a Youth Forum on June 22, 1962, during the General Election. In that speech, basing himself on the judgments of the International War Crimes Tribunal at Nuremberg, he described the leading generals of the Hitler régime, who now hold many posts in the new Wehrmacht, as war criminals and mass murderers. That was the description given to them by the Nuremberg judgment, which gave full and convincing reasons for holding that they had to share the guilt of Hitler for the war crimes both of waging aggressive war and of committing innumerable murders and other barbarities in the course of the war.

Within a short time of his making the speech, Knorr was prosecuted at the suit of Herr Strauss, then West German Minister of Defence (who has since had to resign on the exposure of his illegal acts against the periodical *Der Spiegel*), and by four Hitler generals and one Hitler admiral, now serving in the West German forces (and

two of them, Heusinger and Speidel, in the Nato forces as well), on this charge of 'insult'.

This direct challenge to the decisions of the Nuremberg Tribunal, and to the 'Nuremberg principles' of international law confirmed and stated by the Tribunal, is more than just shameless impudence; it is a breach of the West German Constitution, which lays down in its Article 25 that the general rules of international law, which clearly include the Nuremberg principles, form a positive part of the law of the State, and override all other laws of the State. And the whole insolent enterprise was made a little more sordid and contemptible by a cunning trick, which fortunately failed; the prosecuting authorities thought that by selecting the particular charge of 'insult' instead of some rather graver charge they would exclude any investigation of the truth of Knorr's description of these Hitler leaders, since—they erroneously thought—the law did not permit truth as a defence on a charge of 'insult'.

The scheme was thus at one and the same time to challenge and set aside the Nuremberg decisions and to avoid the horrible crimes of the Nazi high command being related in detail to a public which has been largely trained to forget them. In that way, they hoped to carry several stages further the suppression of freedom of expression, and the exculpation and rehabilitation of the Nazis and their retention in public life. This plot was particularly serious, since the openly declared aim of the Adenauer state to recover by force the territories which formed part of Germany in 1937 in fact amounts to planning aggressive war, which was clearly established at Nuremberg to be a war crime; if it could be established that it is a criminal offence to call proved war criminals by their proper Nuremberg names, the business of preparing new war crimes with their help will be much easier.

The West German government no doubt thought that it was on 'an easy wicket', for it can generally rely on its courts to give almost any decision it wants in any of its myriad political prosecutions; but it ran into certain difficulties. First, it soon leaked out that the public prosecutor in charge of the case was himself 'wanted' in Czechoslovakia for trial as a war criminal, and he could take no part himself in the actual trial.* Second, courts in Frankfurt and Munich took courage to refuse to try the case, and it had to be sent to a court in Solingen. Lastly, and above all, Knorr himself and his defending counsel, the well-known, skilful, and courageous political advocate Dr. Ammann, turned the trial into a formidable counter-

*It transpired later on that the presiding judge, too, had been a Nazi judge!

attack on the Hitler generals, setting out to prove that Knorr had spoken the truth, and that the complainants were in fact what Knorr had called them. They persuaded the court to rule that it was open to them in law to do this, and on the basis of that ruling they put in a formidable body of cogent evidence, which was of the greatest value both for the immediate purposes of the defence and for the wider political aims of the struggle against neo-Nazism. The government was thus 'rewarded' for bringing the case by having to submit to a convincing public demonstration of the horrible crimes of the Nazis and their high officers—including many holding high office today—which West German propaganda, including even rewritten schoolbooks, has been working hard for some years to efface from public memory.

The prosecutor was furious, but he could not stop the demonstration. He demanded that Knorr should be sent to prison for three months and ordered to pay the costs; but the court, which would normally pass a sentence not very different from that demanded by the prosecution, had to admit that Knorr's assertions about the generals were broadly correct, and merely imposed a modest fine of Mks. 300 (£27) saying that Knorr had not fully established the truth of his charges against all the complainants.

Knorr gave notice of appeal at once, and the case, which took nearly two years to come to trial, may drag on from court to court for some time yet. But the lessons are clear; and it must not be forgotten that the governments of Britain, the United States and France have to share the guilt of the West Germans for this sort of scandal, for they are accomplices in the creation of the Wehrmacht in defiance of Potsdam, they have made no protest against this defiance of the Nuremberg principles, and they acquiesce in the employment by Nato of Nazi war criminals in positions of command over their own troops.

In a previous article we showed the influence of American capitalism on the policy of the Canadian bourgeoisie, and indicated that this was due not so much to the geographical situation of Canada and racial differences within as to the increasing hold of United States capital upon her rapidly-developing industries. This last development has resulted in a conflict of interest with British Capitalism and has also provided an impetus to the nationalistic feelings of the Canadian bourgeoisie—their desire if not for a complete break with the British Empire at least for a greater degree of independence within it.

(‘The Dominion of Canada’, H. P. Rathbone, *Labour Monthly*, July, 1923.)

Document of the Month

HOW CUBA WAS SAVED

(from the speech of Fidel Castro in Moscow, May 23, 1963.)

When, midway through last year, the Governments of Cuba and the Soviet Union decided to take appropriate steps to prevent the invasion of our country which was being prepared, our policy was based entirely on the principles of international law and the United Nations Charter. Cuba could see a threat to its security, and had every justification, arising out of its sovereign rights, to take steps to reinforce its ability to defend itself. Without any legitimate foundation, the imperialists established a naval blockade which brought the world to the brink of war. This crisis was the result and consequence of the aggressive policy of the United States, the culminating point of which was to be armed invasion. None the less, the Government of the U.S.A. denied that it was preparing for aggression against our country and strove to shift responsibility to Cuba and the Soviet Union for the tension it had itself created.

Today the whole world knows those who were really guilty of bringing about this crisis. Thanks to the contradictions which have arisen between the U.S. Government and the Cuban counter-revolutionaries, the truth has become known. The main leader of the counter-revolution, appointed by the American Government itself, has recently proclaimed, in a letter widely known throughout the world, that the United States were really preparing military aggression against Cuba. The solution of the October crisis, which obliged the United States to renounce their plans for aggression, gave rise to quarrels among the enemies of our country—and this, in its turn, facilitated discovery of the truth. The lapse of time has thrown light on those events. The imperialist plans for invading Cuba collapsed. It proved possible to avoid war. There remained, however, the danger that the imperialists would not read these events aright. But the timely and energetic warning given by the Soviet Union in March this year cooled down the hot-headed warlike elements.

As a result of the visit of our delegation to the U.S.S.R., the imperialists have been able to see how close is the solidarity of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government and the Soviet people with the Cuban revolution (*prolonged applause*).

In all its grandeur will shine the name of the country which, to defend a little people many thousands of miles away, placed on the scales of nuclear war the prosperity built up over 45 years of creative labour and at the cost of enormous sacrifices! The land of the Soviets, which lost during the great Patriotic War against the Fascists more lives than the whole population of Cuba, in order to defend its right to exist and develop its vast wealth, without hesitation took upon itself the risk of a terrible war in defence of our little country (*applause*). History knows no similar example of solidarity.

That is what internationalism means!

That is what Communism means! (*Prolonged applause. The audience rises. Cries of 'Hurrah!' 'Viva Cuba!'*)

SOUTH AMERICAN JOURNEY

E. J. Hobsbawm

Brazil: Recife

ANYONE who wants to know what an under-developed area is, might as well start with Recife, the capital of Brazil's impoverished north-east—that vast area of some twenty million inhabitants which has given the country its most famous bandits, peasant revolts, and still gives it a stream of undernourished migrants. Recife has 800,000 inhabitants, which is well over double the population in 1940; half of them live in the unspeakable shacks and hutments which surround every big South American city, amid the characteristic smell of the tropical slums: filth and decaying vegetable matter. How they live nobody can tell. As in most other South American cities, there is not enough industry to absorb these floods of immigrants.

There is desperate poverty everywhere. The population looks as though nobody has had a square meal for ten generations: stunted, undersized and sick. At the same time there are signs of rebellion. The news-stands are full of left wing literature: *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, *China Reconstructs*, and the newspaper of the Peasant Leagues, which are strong in these parts. (But there are also plenty of bibles.) The state of which Recife is the capital has just elected a fairly left wing governor, mostly by the votes of the city's workers. The country people—former slaves on the sugar and cotton estates, small peasants in the back country—are largely illiterate and so voteless. The strength of the peasant leagues is patchy and one does not get the impression that they have made much progress lately, but the potential of peasant organisation is immense.

The peasant leagues here have learned to talk to peasants in their own language. They use the travelling guitarists who make up their own songs as propagandists, and their newspaper prints a weekly 'peasants almanac' with the saints' days, religious and lay 'holidays' (such as the anniversaries of the Russian and Cuban revolutions), a weekly ballad, horoscope, medical advice and proverbs or 'famous sayings'. This week they come from the Bible—the one about the camel and the eye of the needle—from St. Ambrose, and Fidel Castro. St. Ambrose, we are reminded, said that God created all things to be common to all men, Fidel Castro that the workers must fight not just for improvements, but for power. If any part of the world needs such useful advice it is this terrible area.

Sao Paulo

It is astonishing to think that I am in the same country as Recife. The skyscrapers sprout, the neo-lights glow, the cars (mostly made in the country), tear through the streets in their thousands in a typically Brazilian anarchy. Above all there is industry to absorb the 150,000 people who stream into this giant city *every year*—North-easterners, Japanese, Italians, Arabs, Greeks. Sao Paulo is a sort of nineteenth century Chicago: brash, fast, dynamic, modern—anything over twenty years old is ancient history—and corrupt. A leading local politician, now cherished by the Americans for his anti-communism, used to campaign under the disarming slogan: 'Of course I steal, but I deliver the goods too'. At the same time Sao Paulo is the capital of the militant labour movement, in which the Communist Party is powerful, especially among the best organised and most skilled. But the party is technically illegal: it cannot put up its own list of candidates, though in fact—such are the complexities of Brazilian politics—some candidates advertise themselves as having the backing of Luis Carlos Prestes, the party's famous leader.

Sao Paulo's industrialisation—a unique case in South America—is leaping ahead. But one cannot help being struck by the slenderness of its basis. The home market for Brazilian industry is desperately poor: here even shirts and shoes are sold on the never-never. The export market does not exist. Inflation keeps the expansion going, but while it makes the rich richer, it impoverishes the poor. Here in Sao Paulo, where the workers are by Brazilian standards quite well off, this is not so obvious, because the big firms seek to strengthen their monopoly by giving regular wage increases which the lesser firms outside cannot afford. But the whole business still has the air of a pyramid balanced on its point. The one thing industrialisation has definitely produced is a national bourgeoisie confident in Brazil's future, and of its power to overcome the feudal estate owners and make itself independent of the U.S.A. They are even prepared to make common cause with labour and the peasants for this purpose, for, of all the rich in South America, the Brazilian industrial interests are the only ones who do not appear to be afraid of social revolution, or of Castro. They may be too optimistic, but at present imperialism is what they are worried about and not expropriation from below. In a way, they remind me of the old Radical industrialists of nineteenth-century Britain, who had the same driving sense of having history with them. Until independence

from U.S. imperialism is achieved, it looks as though this alliance between the national bourgeoisie and the left will continue; but Brazil is too strange a country for predictions by casual visitors.

* * * * *

Peru: Cuzco

It has been said before, but it needs to be said again: if any country is ripe for and needs a social revolution it is Peru. Down in Lima the luxury hotels among the shanty towns, the Peruvian landed aristocracy, which flies over to the South of France for brief holidays; up here, 12,000 feet in the thin air, the tourists arrive by the daily flights to gaze at the cathedrals built by those heroic ruffians, the Spanish conquerors, and at the relics of the Inca empire. Half the population of Peru consists of Indians, like those who pad through the Cuzco mud barefoot in ragged coloured homespun, the women wearing men's hats over the regulation two black plaits, with babies on their backs. The tourist agencies advertise them as picturesque, but they are as poor as any people I have ever seen.

Indians have been serfs for as long as man remembers. Any landlord can beat them or take their wives and daughters, anyone wearing European dress treats them like dogs, every policeman or official is their enemy. Yet now they are stirring. Nothing is more impressive than the long queues of Indian men and women waiting silently inside and outside the Cuzco Peasant Federation at night, waiting for the offices to reopen the next morning. They are delegations, come from distant *haciendas* and communities, to ask advice, to report injustice. A few days ago 300 of them—as usual men and women in compact columns—invaded the estate of Dr. Frisancho to divert the irrigation canals which ought rightly to serve their common lands. The landlord had mobilised the police, who used tear-gas, but the Indians advanced, protected by improvised gasmasks made from rags soaked in water. The police then fired and shot Clara Huaranca Puclla and her baby, and the peasant Guillermo Huamán Huamantica. Three policemen were wounded—with stones. Every day there are such incidents. The Peasant Federation (aided by the strong and militant Cuzco Labour Federation) has organised the Indians, and for the first time in history they have discovered that union is strength. Indians are not helpless.

A hundred miles along the narrow-gauge railway which the Japanese are now completing, past the gorges, into the long winding subtropical valley which leads towards the remote Amazon river, lies the valley of La Convencion, where 110 out of the 160 estates

now have union branches and the owners have fled to Lima, leaving estates of up to 400,000 acres in the hands of their stewards. Quillabamba, the capital of the province, is a wide, dusty, rotting market town linked to the world by the trucks which leave at 4.30 a.m. and return at night. Here the real lords of La Convencion have their offices: El Banco Gibson, Glayton Anderson, Coffee Buyers. Our truck is stopped by policemen, for there are armed peasant self-defence units in the region and the authorities are tense,

A discussion. Most of the peasants cannot speak Spanish, or talk it hesitantly with a slurred whistling Indian accent which is hard to follow. The faces are surprisingly Japanese looking. Luckily there is a local carpenter who can help with the translation. I ask: why have the peasants started to organise? Because they are unjustly treated, like beasts. Why now? Because the trade union movement is now active. Are there not any problems in organising for the first time? A quiet, flat-faced, tough man intervenes, explaining patiently. 'No, it is quite simple. You see, there are two classes. One has nothing, the other has everything; money, power. The only thing the working people can do is to unite, so that is what they do.' I ask: 'But are you not afraid of the police and the soldiers?'. 'No, not now,' says the carpenter. 'Not any more.'

* * ■ * *

On the railway from Peru to Bolivia

My neighbour is a sharp young man with a briefcase. 'I am an insurance agent, cattle is the main business here, so I get around the country a good bit. If you ask me, these estate owners have brought it on themselves. They do not invest anything. They think because they are *duenos de vida y hacienda*, lords of life and livelihood, they have nothing to worry about. Now the hour is striking they run to Lima weeping. There are the Indians walking barefoot, even in the houses of the estate owners, and sleeping on the floor while the lord blows 2 or 3,000 Soles a night on a party. There are the clubs: cards—more whisky, boy! And they are not even aware of the contrast. Now the chickens are coming home to roost. Now there is nothing except the troops and the jails between them and the Indians. But it will not last for ever.'

No, it certainly will not. All over South America the poor and the oppressed are stirring. What form their awakening will take, one cannot yet tell. But the hour of the lords on their estates is indeed striking. When it does strike there will be great changes in Peru, and all over South America.

BOOK REVIEWS

Signposts for Scotland

Labour Party. 24 pp. 9d.

WHEN THE UNEMPLOYMENT figure in Scotland reached 136,045 in February of this year it was the highest number of Scottish workers unemployed for 23 years. This meant 6.2% of the insured population out of work as against 3.9% in Britain as a whole. It is no wonder that there is widespread alarm and concern in Scotland at this situation, especially when it is understood that the industries most seriously affected by Tory economic policy are coal, rails, shipbuilding, steel and heavy engineering, industries which play a dominant role in Scotland's economy.

The reaction in Scotland has been a development of militant Anti-Tory feeling and numerous articles, speeches and pamphlets advancing possible solutions. The latest in the field (that in itself is a criticism) is the Labour Party's *Signposts for Scotland*. The pamphlet opens with this paragraph—'Unemployment with its deep rooted underlying causes, is one of the most serious economic problems in the United Kingdom today. Scotland has for years borne the brunt of this problem'.

One might have, from this, high hopes that here at last was a Labour Party pamphlet that was going to propose drastic action along Socialist lines. Such high hopes are completely unjustified. On the key questions of Scotland's economy it avoids saying anything at all or is deliberately vague. There are no proposals to halt pit closures and increase the output of coal in Scotland, only the very general statement that a national fuel policy is necessary. It is even worse when we come to the railway industry and shipbuilding. Again there is no suggestion that the Tory closures in rails be

opposed with the power and strength of the working class movement; and the almost impossible is achieved in a pamphlet posing to deal with Scotland's problems—shipbuilding is not even mentioned!

A crucial question for Scotland is direction of industry. The Scottish Trades Union Congress has debated this question over many years and for the last four years has come out decisively in favour of direction of industry rather than the Tory policy of 'persuasion', 'encouragement', 'inducement' etc. This pamphlet dodges the issue completely and so raises sharply for trade unions in Scotland, who represent with their affiliations between 80-90% of Labour Party membership in Scotland, the question—What are they going to do to win the Labour Party for S.T.U.C. policy on Direction of Industry?

Just as the pamphlet dodges the difficult problem of direction of industry similarly on self-Government for Scotland, it tries to pass it off with the following: 'Parliament itself must continue to exercise full powers over the broad outlines of policy, but much of the detailed work will have to be delegated to other authorities. This will involve further measures of devolution in Scotland and a major increase in the powers of the Scottish Office.'

One must conclude on the basis of examination of this pamphlet that like most documents issued by the Labour Party today the signposts in 'Signposts for Scotland' do not point in the direction of Socialism. 'Signposts for Scotland' will not inspire a mass movement against Tory policies in Scotland, nor will it be of very much assistance in ensuring the defeat of the Tories when a General Election takes place.

G. McLENNON.

Just Published

Britain Divided:

**The Effect of the Spanish
Civil War on British
Political Opinion**

K. W. WATKINS

A searing analysis of how the Civil War made Munich a possibility, why Hitler and Mussolini wanted Chamberlain as Prime Minister, and of the bitter cleavages created in both Conservative and Labour parties.

‘Mr. Watkins analyses shrewdly and spiritedly the conflicting views held by the right and left and the clashes, no less violent, within each camp. He is a most stimulating interpreter.’ *The Times*

‘Invaluable.’

Sunday Telegraph

‘The work is well done. A balanced account.’

Earl Attlee

‘Impartial. Most interesting.’

Daily Telegraph

‘To anyone who lived through these years, almost unbearably disturbing.’

Kenneth Younger

30s

NELSON

Laval: A Biography

Hubert Cole

Heinemann. 314 pp. 35s.

THIS IS A WELL-WRITTEN and in some ways valuable account of the life—to some extent of the ‘life and times’—of Pierre Laval, who was executed for high treason in Fresnes prison in October, 1945. Its main interest and importance lie in its exposure of the utter rottenness of French bourgeois politics and politicians (including Laval himself) in the first 45 years of the present century.

The appalling depths to which these politicians sank in the particularly horrible—and particularly difficult—Vichy period is shown in detail; it could not be a biography of Laval if this were not so. They betrayed and double-crossed each other as readily as they betrayed their country. Mutual back-stabbing, external baseness and treachery, readiness to collaborate with the Nazis in the belief that they would win the war and that a Nazi victory was preferable to a Nazi defeat (achieved at the price of increased strength and prestige for the U.S.S.R.) were their guiding prin-

D. N. PRITT.

ciples. The main lesson for us to draw from all this, today, is to remember once again into what endless evil anti-Communism leads all its devotees and dupes.

Mr. Cole seeks to exculpate, even to whitewash Laval, on the footing that he acted as a sincere patriot, believing that he could save France, and that collaboration with the Nazis was the best way to do so. If that thesis could be made good, it would be little excuse. But Mr. Cole does not quite convince me; too much of his evidence consists of statements by Laval, whom he shows to be neither truthful nor honest.

✿ HAVING IT NOW ✿

*There will be quite a large attendance
When we Declare our Independence.*

SO wrote G. K. Chesterton on 'Americanisation'. This July throughout the 'Free World', as those who uphold their freedom to force others to create wealth for them like to call it, there have been startling things to be seen and heard. The peoples of the whole African continent show no inclination whatever to wait until their paternal white tutors regard them as 'ready for nationhood'. They are having it now. The very phrase formerly so favoured by Whitehall and the Royal Circus perambulating the Commonwealth reeks of mothballs. Now the President of yet another new state takes office, whilst those who once gaoled him a few short years ago look the other way with practised tact and admire the smartness of the guard of honour. Like the American Negro a century after his slave-owner lost the freedom to buy and sell him, these peoples want their Inalienable Rights of Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness *now*. Remember how that famous Declaration continues? 'To secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it and to institute new government.' On this 187th Independence Day there will be pious Americans intoning these words with all the embarrassment of a Church of England parson trying to swallow the 39 Articles of Religion 'in the true, usual, literal meaning'. But there will be others shouting them aloud, with enthusiasm and determination. We in Britain might well adopt them ourselves, and declare our independence—before we find ourselves in an election trying to choose between 'the independence' of an H-Bomb proudly wrapped up in a Union Jack by Harold Macmillan and the H-Bomb wrapped up in the Stars and Stripes on which Harold Wilson has so far invited us to rely. It is time to say: 'Come off it, Harold! We're accepting no such false choice'. We have been warned; as a Canadian reader writes: 'I hope the British voter won't be like those here. Although I think the majority were against nuclear weapons they found themselves voting for them, and I'm afraid the new Government will let the Yanks dominate us even more than they do now'. A fellow countryman from the West Coast writes: 'Your remarks about the imperialists using the desert lands to test H-

bombs reminds me that the people of Uzbekistan have built 74,000 miles of canals to irrigate their desert lands. An example of Lenin's remark: "Progressive Asia and Backward Europe". Today he would have added: "and Backward U.S.A." What a contrast! An American friend writes about the effect of military spending, already resulting in a serious 'drag on our overall economy. With arms production concentrated almost wholly in California and two or three other states 3,000 miles east, our great central plains are left with only a smattering of production, bled by onerous taxes to finance the arms, with their scientists and engineers drawn off to the "vital" installations and research centres. I could match the anxiety here that you feel in Britain. Keep up the good work with *L.M.*!' She goes on to stress how vitally important the written word can be in awakening people to truth and stirring them into action: 'The printed word, whether published here or abroad, has the first claim to our support'. We would ask every one of our readers who is 'fund-conscious' to try to win others also to show their support by donations, especially those who have begun to read the magazine for the first time. Below is the total of donations received during May—very welcome as we approach the half of the year when the curve of donations always droops.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

Yorkshire.

After reading all the distorted facts and half truths in the capitalist press, I turn to *L.M.* for the truth. I wish it every success in its fight.

D. Sandwell.

£93 4s. 4d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: 'Daisy Bell', £10; 'Windfall', £10; 'H.H.', £10; G.F., £10; L. Bates, 5s; H. Brindle, 5s; Oldham Branch, 1s; Blackburn Branch, 2s; E. Strachan Rogers (Extra May Day Gift), £4 4s; M. Illing, £1; 'Backslider', 12s 6d; R. McLeod, 10s; K.R. (U.S.A.), £4 2s; B. W. Mackay, 4s; G.I., 1s 3d; 'Pax', 2s 6d; R.F.B., £3; Highgate Reader, £3; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; J. Tarver, 10s; 'S. Mill', £1; D. H. Strathern and friends, 10s; S. Turner (for Daisy Mendez, Cuba), 5s; 'In memory of Joe Brien', 3s; S. Townsend, 10s; 'L'Humanité', 4s; 'Oliver Twist and friends', 15s; D. Sandwell, 4s 6d; R. Dodd, £1; 'Anon', Whitechurch, 2s; N. Usher, 2s 6d; B.J.M., 10s; S. Morrissy, 10s; F.G.A., 10s; J. A. Smith, 6s; 'The Butcher family', 10s; 'The Humphreys' family', 5s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; E.J.B., 10s; A.M.T. for Fernando and Guilherme, 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: R. M. Lang, 19s; B. Shore, £1 5s; A. W. Boyd, 5s; G. Davys (for Portuguese friends), 3s; C. G. Roberts, 14s 6d; W.H.S. (Canada), £1 2s; J.B. (Canada), 2s 2d; A. Corbett, £1; F.S. (U.S.A.), £1 14s 5d; H. C. Smith, £1 17s; G. Cunelli, 9s; E. M. Berlyn, 2s; K. A. Harling, 5s; S. Jones, £1; 'Grateful Reader', £5; C. M. Dunman, 4s; J. Craven, 19s; A.S. (Canada), £1 6s; Mrs. R. Herring, 3s; R. N. Milton, £1 9s; P.J. (Australia), 16s; Finchley C.N.D., £2 18s 6d; M. Edwards, 4s; John Morris, 7s; A. W. Elliot 2s 6d; Miss A.B.D. (Canada), 2s 2d; W.C.B. (Canada), 5s 10d; R.L., £1 2s.

ANGELA TUCKETT,

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

Our thanks to you all.
Co-op. No. L.99482.

FINchley 5135.

INSURANCE EXPERTS LTD

are independent Insurance Brokers dealing with all insurance companies and Lloyd's. Our full-time job is to keep abreast of all developments and to apply our knowledge in your interests. We represent YOU, and use our expertise to select for you the best policy to fit your individual needs. Our remuneration comes from the company which we select for you, so our advice to you is free. It costs no more for you to avail yourself of our knowledge, and often costs much less. Please give us the pleasure of quoting for all your insurance and mortgage needs.

1a Well Road, London, N.W.3.
HAM 5421, Evgs. HAM 6269.

Kindly mention *Labour Monthly* when enquiring.

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating
by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

For all interested in the fight for Peace and Progress in the Countryside and the problems of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.
Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or
Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD
27, Bedford St. Strand, London, W.C.2.

L.R.D. PAMPHLET

'The Case Against Beeching'

Foreword by S. F. Greene

6d. or 8½d. post free

Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

WHY NOT BY POST?

NAME

(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS

.....

I enclose 21s. (Overseas, 24s.,
Canada and USA, \$3.50), for
year's subscription from the

.....issue.

(SIGNED)

To **LABOUR MONTHLY**
134, BALLARDS LANE,
LONDON, N.3.

A HISTORY

of Twenty, Thirty and
even Forty years ago!

We have a few
BOUND VOLUMES
of earlier years for sale.

Apply to:

THE MANAGER,
134, Ballards Lane, N.3.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class Ads.', *Labour Monthly*, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

DUPLICATING, tape-typing, verbatim shorthand translating. Mabel Eyles, 10, Beaconsfield Rd., N.11. ENT. 3324.

WE BUY books, pamphlets, Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: RIV 6807. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6.
URGENTLY REQUIRED—All back numbers of *Labour Monthly* from 1921-1930 inclusive and 1939.

**THE
LABOUR GOVERNMENT**

1945-51

D. N. Pritt

The first systematic history and critical analysis of what the last Labour Government did - and failed to do.]

37s 6d

SOCIALISM IN BRITAIN

A. L. Morton

The growth of Socialist ideas in Britain from the Middle Ages to the present day.

5s

**DOCUMENTS OF
THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL**

***Minutes of the General Council
1864-1866***

This is the first of a series of volumes prepared for publication by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to mark the centenary, in 1964, of the foundation of the International Working Men's Association (the First International).

This volume contains the minutes of the General Council, including those of the London Conference of August 1865, and documents issued by the Council, from 1864 to 1866.

21s

LAWRENCE & WISHART

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor : R. Palme Dutt

THE PROBLEMS OF AUTOMATION

WILL PAYNTER

★

TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS

Quaestor

★

MORALITY AND POLITICS

The Editor

★

British Guiana, Jack Woddis — The Third
Labour Government, William Gallacher —
The 'Confed' and the Right to Work, Vulcan

AUGUST 1963

Two Shillings

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL. XIV

No. 8

AUGUST . 1963

CONTENTS

- Notes of the Month: Morality and Politics.** *New Problems for Old—A World Turning Point—Where Stands Britain?—To See Ourselves as Others See Us—Three Schools of Thought—‘Security’ Angle—There are No Non-Political Questions—Tory Cabinet and Call-Girls—Social Corruption and Fascism—A Political Battle* **R.P.D.** 337
- Problems of Automation.** The General Secretary of the Mineworkers looks at the social consequences of technological advance
Will Paynter 349
- Test Ban Negotiations.** The background to the test-ban conference and a warning of the death-trap of Nato.....**Quaestor** 354
- A Page of History.** The Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party. 358
- The ‘Confed’ and the Right to Work.** Our industrial correspondent sums up the unions’ attitude to redundancy.....**‘Vulcan’** 360
- British Guiana.** An examination of the recent crisis.....
Jack Woddis 364
- Delegates at Conference.** Summary of the Builders’ and Railwaymen’s conferences by two trade unionists...**P. Ryan, Bob Smillie** 369
- Document of the Month: Trade Union Fraternal Relations.** A telling answer to the opponents of international trade union unity. 372
- The Third Labour Government.** A Review of D. N. Pritt’s important new book.....**William Gallacher** 375
- Book Reviews:** ‘The Appeasers’, M. Gilbert and R. Gott, ‘Vneshnaya Politika Anglii’, V. G. Trukhanovsky: *Clemens Dutt*; ‘Economic Growth and Underdeveloped Countries’, M. Dobb: *H.R.*; ‘Bolshoi Ballet’, Yuri Slonimsky: *Joan Lawson.* 379
- Brave Moments**.....**Angela Tuckett** 383

Notes of the Month**MORALITY AND POLITICS**

**The whore and gambler, by the State
Licensed, build that nation's fate.
The harlot's cry from street to street
Shall weave old England's winding sheet.**

WILLIAM BLAKE.

July 8, 1963

We are on the eve of fateful decisions for the future of the world. Two meetings of crucial importance open in Moscow this month. One is the lower-level pre-Summit East-West conference of representatives of the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union on a nuclear test ban. Speculation is widespread whether this climax of a prolonged and weary discussion might reach at any rate a partial test ban agreement, and so lead the way to a future top-level Summit Conference to consider further measures for disarmament or relaxation of tension. The other is the preliminary meeting, on a high level, but also not yet on the topmost level, of representatives of the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and China to consider the tactical problems and differences which have arisen in the present stage of the international communist movement. These differences are (unlike the contradictions of imperialism) tactical differences within the context of a basic common outlook and objective. But they have already caused harmful friction; and their continuance and extension could endanger that unity which has always been, remains and must remain the indispensable strength of the international communist movement, and the most valued treasure and safeguard for the future of mankind.

New Problems For Old

That the two groups of problems are interwoven is widely recognised. It is a measure of the new balance of the world that the internal questions of the international communist movement should now be endlessly reported, probed, expounded, interpreted and dissected by a horde of self-appointed anti-communist experts, strategists, intelligence agents, wiseacres and busybodies, whose ignorance of Marxism is only equalled by their arrogance. A change certainly from the old-style contemptuous silence and complacent blindness, which was in some respects less objectionable. But the truth is that there are new and serious problems of universal

significance in an unprecedentedly new world situation, and all mankind is engaged in searching out the path forward. This type of problem and sharp controversial confrontation of alternatives in new situations and previously uncharted territory is not in itself new. Every advance and turn of the world socialist revolution since 1917 has been marked by sharp problems and controversies. Each new turn has equally overthrown the blind dogmas of those who sought to turn Marxism into a set of ready-made formulas, and has at the same time rejected the cowardly surrenders of those who, proclaiming the new situation to be a refutation of all that Marx had expected, have slithered back into the capitalist morass. With each new turn the world revolution has gone forward; Marxism has gone forward, has been confirmed anew in its capacity to grapple with concrete new situations, has advanced in new forms to meet new problems.

Not the First Time

It is only necessary to recall the controversy (not yet over) let loose by the Bolshevik Revolution itself, which aroused the horror of the then supposed grandmaster and high prophet of Marxism, Kautsky, as a violation of all that he fondly imagined to be the rules laid down by Marxism. Or the Brest Treaty with German imperialism, which was not only denounced by all Western Social Democracy as a betrayal of international socialism (Brailsford at the time, who later, like so many others, sought to boast falsely of his early 'support' of the Russian socialist revolution until, etc., proclaimed that the Bolsheviks had thereby placed themselves outside the pale of the ranks of the international socialist movement), but also aroused sharp division among the Bolshevik leaders, and the opposition of Trotsky to Lenin. Or Nep, that is, the 'New Economic Policy' (the first English publication of Lenin's famous speech explaining this was in the pages of this journal forty-two years ago), which was universally described in the Western press as the end of communism and the surrender of Soviet Russia to capitalism, both to the restoration of Russian capitalism, and to foreign capitalism through the offer of concessions to be leased to foreign capitalists for the establishment of profit-making enterprises in Russia. Or the theory and practice of 'socialism in one country', which was so scorchingly denounced at the time also by many would-be communists or adepts of Marxism as the abandonment of the world socialist revolution and the teachings of Marx, and which

the historical event (not least the war against fascism) has long since proved to have been the most heroic path of advance of the socialist revolution in the difficult conditions after the first world war, following the betrayal of the Western European working class by social democracy.

Marxism Invincible

Every time Marxism has been proved anew in the outcome, ceaselessly new and creative in each new world situation, and defeating the prophets of doom. The world revolution has gone forward. In the face of threats of disruption the international communist movement has maintained its unity and strength, and gone forward to ever greater strength. Therefore, at the same time as we must treat the present difficulties with the utmost seriousness, we must never be dismayed by new difficulties arising. The path of the movement has never been smooth and straight and easy. We have no cause to be surprised at fresh controversies arising, even though we cannot but be gravely concerned that these have taken the form of differences between parties with denunciatory public polemic, in the present unprecedented world situation, when new paths are once again being explored and audacious new goals have been set for the achievement of peaceful co-existence, the ending of the cold war, and the prevention of a nuclear third world war as tasks achievable in the present balance of strength.

A World Turning Point

In this summer of 1963, half a century after the outbreak of the first world war, and a quarter of a century after the second, we appear to be reaching a moment of decision in the development of the world today. The balance in the scales is close. The prospect of the extension of nuclear weapons to a widening series of countries, with all the consequences to which this may give rise, is within view, unless very urgent steps are taken to change the path of direction. In particular, the thread which still holds West German militarism from the final open possession and power of use of nuclear weapons is now very thin, and becomes thinner with each fresh step of the Western powers to offer further concessions to Bonn in this direction as a supposed alternative to the final step. President Kennedy's tour of Western Europe (omitting France and treating Britain to a somewhat furtive peep), described by an imaginative correspondent as giving the impression, with its massive

retinue of over a hundred security bodyguards, aides and outriders, of 'a modern Roman Emperor visiting some of his outlying provinces', has in fact only demonstrated the deepening gulf between the United States and the West European powers, the growth of new imperialist challenges, the obsolescence of Nato, and the increasingly confident arrogance of the West German heirs of Hitler.

Towards New Goals

All Africa is on the move. The African, Asian and Latin American revolutions, so far from reaching completion, as the reformists imagine, with the establishment of sovereign states, are only now stirring to advance to their full scope in the coming years. Corresponding to this transformation of the world, and the first cracks in the colonialist foundation of Western imperialist parasitic 'civilisation' (only the first cracks so far—neo-colonialism is still flourishing and even expanding, and the big battles to destroy it are still in front), there is also a stirring, as Lenin predicted would follow, in the West European working class and political situation, testified in the advancing communist mass support in France and Italy, the revolutionary rumbling in Spain and Portugal, the instability of the régime in West Germany and the sweeping anti-Tory popular wave in Britain. In the United States the militant revolt of the Negro population has torn the mask from the Republican-Democratic façade of 'democracy' covering the denial of elementary democratic rights, which the Trumans and Achesons and architects of the Nato Pact had the insolence to present to the world as the only true democratic model for imitation by all the lesser breeds and benighted inhabitants of socialist countries.

Where Stands Britain?

But in this moment of world stirring and world decision where stands Britain? The people of Britain are on the move. Of that there is no doubt. They are sensing and responding to the new conditions and the new opportunities. The anger against the imposition of state visits of monarchical fascism, the robust repulse to the attempted resurgence of Mosleyism and Nazism, the response to every peace activity, the slump in Tory electoral support are all evidence of this. Nevertheless, there are negative sides to the picture. In the industrial field the elaborate combined offensive of the government, the big industrialists and those trade union leaders who have chosen the path of close collaboration with them, has in-

flicted certain setbacks, notably at Fords with the American-inspired blow against trade union rights. In the economic and social field the expansion of profits, the increased exactions of rents, rates and fares, and the burdens of the rationalisation drive, with resulting unemployment and redundancy, have far outweighed the limited advances won in wages and salaries. Above all, in the political field there is the tendency, encouraged by the all too clever Labour Party strategists and tacticians, to await with complacent confidence the coming general election at the moment of the Government's choosing, without recognising the urgency of achieving a change of government now, at this moment of world decision, not to speak of the tactical wisdom of striking while the iron is hot and not letting your adversary choose his most favourable ground.

Contrast of Two Worlds

In consequence we have to suffer the humiliating situation that at this moment of world decision the present ruling régime has brought Britain down to the lowest point of impotence and degradation, a cipher in the world scale, and an object of sniggering contempt by all articulate opinion abroad as a scene of ruling class social corruption and political incompetence without parallel since the Restoration, with all the juicier details fed out through the most elaborate large-scale mass propaganda mechanism of any country in the world, as supposedly appropriate provender for the populace to take their mind off their own troubles or dangerous thoughts. It is inevitable that public opinion in every country and continent should have taken note of the contrast; that on the very same day on which the new advancing world of socialism and human progress was illuminated for all by the joyous visage of the first woman cosmonaut, the mill girl to whom socialism had opened every door, as would never be possible in Britain or America, speeding forward in the conquest of space alongside her brother cosmonaut and comrade, the face of Britain, once the vanguard home of advancing capitalism, now the cesspool of capitalist decline, should have been displayed for all to see in the persons of a Keeler and a Ward. Two worlds.

To See Ourselves As Others See Us

At the very same moment the Negro revolt in the United States was revealing to all, the still unvanquished slave basis of American civilisation in the midst of the pompous centenary celebrations of

the civil war, and only the indomitable mass struggle in face of barbarous repressive violence compelled the authorities to make a hasty scramble to endeavour to put through some beginnings of legislation for elementary democratic rights. In that week in June reality, as always, surpassed every fiction writer in thus dramatically symbolising the contrast of two worlds. It might be well if the Mayhews and their like, or their American counterparts, could learn a little modesty, to realise how their societies look to the majority of mankind, before adopting such a comically patronising tone of superiority and condescension to the socialist world.

Storm in a Teacup?

Miss Keeler and the irrepressible urchin 'Mandy' (both of course now limited companies in the higher income brackets, in accordance with the ethic of British capitalist society), with the aid of Dr. Ward and others more highly placed, but mostly un-named, have succeeded in creating stormier explosions in the professedly respectable teacup of the British political scene than many more assiduous exponents of the political art. The whole Conservative Party, which swallowed Suez and the fiasco of Suez, the Common Market and the fiasco of the Common Market, Skybolt and the fiasco of Skybolt, not to mention innumerable economic false starts of expansion and restriction, with scarcely more than a murmur and an occasional rumble, now finds itself rocked to its foundations, supposedly over the ramifications of 'the affair', and prepares for a prospective battle over leadership. Nor are the effects only national. There have also been extending international repercussions. Pakistan was dragged in through the person of President Ayub Khan, and the High Commissioner had to issue an official explanatory statement. Canada was dragged in through the person of Diefenbaker. President Kennedy, who sought to make a public festival of his visits to other countries in West Europe, ostentatiously took care to keep down to a minimum his physical contacts in a country in such bad odour. The distinguished portrait subjects of the accused extended to all the reaches of the highest society from royalty and Churchill onwards. Even India was affected, in the sense that the elaborately prepared state visit of the saintly deep-scheming Adenauer of India, President Radakhrishnan, which was intended to have been a grandiose public occasion to counter the extending American embrace of India, was turned into a flop because the more titillating details of the high class scandal stole

the headlines. Quite a wide range of achievement, corresponding to the present era of 'palace politics'.

Three Schools of Thought

In the vast sea of commentaries and repercussions which followed 'the affair' and momentarily engulfed the British political scene, three schools of thought may be discerned. First there are the Moralists, with *The Times* in its present Savonarola mood in the van ('It is a Moral Question'), Donald Soper and a vast body of religious and normal serious opinion, who justly reflect the sense of outrage of the overwhelming majority of ordinary decent people at the nauseating spectacle revealed in the highest ruling class circles, where the Tory ethic of the commercialisation of human relations and the sanctity of the highest profit is brought to its logical conclusion, but who then seek to draw well-meant, but somewhat too simple and unhistorical conclusions about the absolute identity of personal and public morality. Then there are the Anti-Moralists, who ostentatiously disclaim 'Puritan' attitudes, insist that an individual's personal morality is his private concern, and that somebody's peccadillo should not be made a political issue, and who therefore deprecate any attempt to make 'political capital' out of the moral aspects of the affair.

'Security' Angle

A special branch of this category is represented by the Labour Party Front Bench, who in the most gentlemanly fashion insist that they have no concern with the moral aspects of the case (Macmillan unkindly hinted, possibly having in mind the notorious circumstances of the killing of a recent Chairman of the Labour Party and the acquittal of the boy concerned, that any enquiry on such lines might affect both sides), and with single-minded zeal devote all their energy to searching out a 'security', *i.e.*, cold war anti-Soviet or anti-communist interpretation as the only issue that interests them. Indeed, to judge from their scathing denunciation of the inefficiency of the security services and the lax incompetence of the Premier's control of them, not to mention Lord Morrison's stern warning to Fleet Street newspapers to beware of employing journalists with suspect left tendencies, it is evident that they consider that the Security Services should be placed under the control of Transport House, which has alone in their view proved its efficiency in nosing out Reds everywhere.

'Politics' versus Triviality

Finally there are the Pure Politicians, who insist very justly that all this sordid sensation-mongering is being played up by the press in such a way as to distract attention from all the big issues which are of real practical concern to the people, and on which popular opinion, discussion and activity should be concentrated, such as rents, housing, unemployment, wages and education, not to mention peace and foreign policy. This observation is very just and pertinent, is keenly understood by all militant sections and socialists, and correctly exposes the well-tried methods of the ruling class in moments of manifest economic and political bankruptcy and discredit to dangle prominently any red herring for the delectation of the vulgar. But from this just general observation the conclusion is sometimes offered that a line of division should be drawn between such trivial and sordid irrelevancies and serious political issues, and that earnest devotees of politics should sternly call on the people not to allow their attention to be distracted by such red herrings, but concentrate on the big issues of the Government's record and the programme of the labour movement in order to win the coming general election. Here it will be seen that this trend among sections of the militant rank and file reaches somewhat similar results to the line of the Labour Front Bench (apart from the 'security' obsession).

Morality and Politics

With all respect and sympathy for all three schools of thought (apart from the official Labour witch-hunters) it might be suggested that there are grounds to disagree with all three. The well-meant desire of the Moralists to make an absolute identification of personal and public morality simplifies what is in practice a much more complex question. Lenin long ago used to point out that the leaders of Social Democracy might be the most worthy and impeccable husbands and fathers of families, but this did not prevent them being politically monsters of betrayal and inhumanity with the blood of imperialist war and counter-revolution on their hands. On the other side of the medal, while every failing of personal character is a minus for political value, and, if carried to an extreme, can be an absolute bar to political integrity or usefulness, nevertheless in real life this undoubted inter-relation cannot be too rigidly applied like a slide-rule. The extreme case of an Aveling, who can never be forgiven for the suffering he caused Eleanor Marx, but who nevertheless made his contribution to the early socialist

movement, inspired Shaw to paint his portrait of Dubedat as the expression of a genuine 'doctor's dilemma'.

Lincoln and General Grant

Since the question of 'morality' is too often considered in current discussion in a one-sided fashion as having relevance to one side of life only, it may be more useful for purposes of clarification deliberately to shift the ground of discussion to a different sphere. For example, drunkenness. It is obvious that extreme chronic drunkenness, alcoholism, delirium can be a bar to any political or practical usefulness. Even within such limits the weakness of a Cassio can be a partial political disability. But the question of degree becomes in practice, not an absolute moral ruling, but a judgement based on circumstances. When Abraham Lincoln was told by censorious critics that his General Grant was too much given to the whisky bottle, he replied in the immortal words: 'Get me the brand, and I'll send a barrel to my other generals'. Or in the words of Kipling, though in a different context: 'They know the worthy General as "that most immoral man"' ('A Code Of Morals').

There Are No Non-Political Questions

On the other hand, the attitude of the Anti-Moralists, who seek to show their enlightened broad-mindedness or to wash their hands of responsibility (except in respect of 'security') by declaring that questions of personal morality are a private matter and should not be treated as a political issue, or who seek to counterpose such trivial scandal-mongering to the real serious major political issues, is even more open to criticism than the attitude of the Moralists. For this is to separate 'politics' as a kind of scheduled area of defined 'issues' from life, from the real life of society, including, not only the conditions of the people, but the character of the ruling class. To the Marxist, as to the artist, nothing is trivial. Indeed, the attempt to fence off 'moral' questions as a non-political area of only private concern, is precisely similar to the parallel attempts to fence off questions of art and literature as a non-political area of private personal taste and judgement without any responsibility of social assessment. In practice, the most clamorous champions of 'pure' 'non-political' art and literature are thereby expressing a political attitude no less than their opponents; just as the current predilection of Wall Street millionaires to patronise the most extreme examples of so-called 'abstract art' is no mere arbitrary whim

of fashion, but the most eloquent expression of the panics here of the living real world which now obsesses American capitalism.

Tory Cabinet and Call-Girls

When in January of this year we were the first press organ in this country to write publicly of the links between the Tory Cabinet and call-girls (six weeks before the hullabaloo began), we did so, not as a question of individual scandal-mongering, but as an indictment of the legislative and administrative record of the entire Tory Cabinet (including Lord Hailsham) and a political judgement of the true essence of their social 'reform' programme. We were concerned to bring out the fact that, just as their predecessors in the government of Britain had conducted the opium wars against China to force opium at gun point on the Chinese people for their enslavement, so this modern 'enlightened' 'broad-minded' Tory Government had accompanied its cruelties of the Rent Act, its wage freeze, its swelling of dividends and exploitation of the people, with 'enlightened' 'reform' measures to proliferate betting shops and gambling hells all over the country, extend drinking hours, introduce special legislation to facilitate the sale of obscene literature (always of course in the name of 'freedom' and the 'highest standards', using as cover a famous literary work which as a result of the boost given by the Government's action obtained a highly profitable sale of three and a half million copies, perhaps not always entirely on literary grounds), and through the lash of the Street Offences Act harrying the unhappy lower strata of the oldest profession to play into the hands of the pimp and the procurer and 'ensure the maximum profitability of the call-girl racket'. This political judgement published in January, based, not on keyhole peeping, but on a plain estimation of the evidence, turned out within a few weeks to have hit a bull's eye. As often happens, practice confirmed the preceding theoretical analysis with a dramatic individual symbol which focussed public attention on the problem, drew aside for a moment the curtain from the dark underworld and its connections with the top, and shook the Tory Cabinet.

Morality of Reaction

It is obvious that what is here involved is not the question of an individual. It is the character of a régime. These phenomena are not new. They are the characteristic outward signs of a period of reaction, of the stifling of revolution, when healthy popular advance

is frustrated, while the discredited old order seeks to cover its sores with a mask of gaiety and licence. Such were the symptoms of the period of the Restoration in English history (enshrined in literature in the artificial Restoration comedy of glorified immorality and cynicism, possessing undoubted literary significance and grace, but faithfully reflecting a corrupt society)—that is, the period of the strangling of the English Revolution, when the organ voice of a Milton had to give place to the pirouettes of a Wycherley. Such was the character of the later period of Louis XV presaging revolution, or of the Second Empire after the frustration of 1848. Such was the character of the years immediately following 1907 in Russia, after the defeat of the First Russian Revolution, with the sudden outburst of wholesale pornography and literary-artistic nihilism, and of the final Rasputin years of Tsarism. The camps of Denikin, Wrangel and the White Guards were notorious dens of infamy. Such was the old Shanghai of imperialism, until the heroic Chinese Red Army arrived and cleaned it, to the eternal regret of the Old China Hands and journalists longing for the days of their Long Bar; or Havana until Castro and the revolution arrived.

Social Corruption and Fascism

The most dangerous feature of this social corruption of a reactionary régime is that, if the working people do not act in time to change conditions, the next stage can be for the ruling class to take advantage of the justified moral indignation of the people in order to swing to the alternative path of violent repression in the name of 'morality', just as the obvious laxity and corruption of the Weimar Republic, reflecting in fact the stifling of the working class revolution in Germany, paved the way for fascism. Let us make sure we act in time in Britain to prevent such a next stage being reached here. The role of a Savonarola rebuking sin, now so eagerly taken up by *The Times*, Hailsham and the most modern Conservatives to replace the previous 'never had it so good' opportunism is also a warning signal.

A Political Battle

The instability of the Tory Government, highlighted by the so-called 'Profumo affair', which may itself soon pass into relative oblivion, but which has certainly intensified the discredit of the Government and Toryism, is at once a signal and an opportunity for speeding up and raising the level of the popular fight in Britain.

The smallest and most 'trivial' and 'sordid' issue teaches the same lesson as the largest. History has known not a few examples where some particular scandal has brought down a régime, not because it was in itself of such decisive weight, but because it proved the spark to set alight the long smouldering anger from years of oppression and misgovernment. It would indeed be an ironic act of poetic justice if Macmillan, who has been at such pains in his later career to perform the part of a synthetic Old-Time Edwardian Grandee loftily above all the sordid trafficking of the lower world, should at the last moment find the final stage of his career inseparably yoked for all eternity with the name of Christine Keeler. Evidently he is determined to struggle to defeat this last ignominy at all costs, and to add some other culminating episode, something that is not a failure, perhaps with hopes in Moscow negotiations to save him, or to hold on till the election. Whether he will be vouchsafed his aspiration is now being thrashed out in the high cabals of Toryism and among the at present confused ranks of the Tory 'rebels'. We are certainly not interested to ask the Tory 'rebels' to do our work for us. Britain needs a new Government, and not a Tory Government. We need this new Government now, and not waiting until next year, now in this present moment of fateful world decisions. We need a new Government and a new policy (both have to be fought for), in order that Britain may play a fruitful part in the fateful decisions for peace which are now arising, and in order to begin to tackle the urgent problems of the people at home. This aim is within reach of achievement, but only to the extent that we fight for it.

R.P.D.

WE WERE THE FIRST to write publicly of the links between the Tory Cabinet and call-girls, as the Editor recalls. There have been other occasions, too, when we have forecast events. YOU NEED *Labour Monthly* to be abreast of the times. Take out a Subscription now, and be sure of your copy.

Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties

THE PROBLEM OF AUTOMATION

W. Paynter

General Secretary, National Union of Mineworkers.

WITHIN the next five years, whatever Government is in power, there is going to be a dramatic development of technological change. If there is not to be widespread suffering in Great Britain caused by unemployment, an equal measure of social advance must synchronise with technological advance. The impact of the technological change will be revolutionary; so must the social changes.

It is not only in a single industry or in a single country that there will be a greatly increased tempo in the application of mechanisation, of new methods such as the use of computers, of automation. A brief study of the background to this development in one industry already nationalised, the coal industry, should be of value to the working class as a whole. But it is first useful to note the results of general studies which have been made.

In the 'New Society' magazine (No. 32) (May 9, 1963) under an article headed 'Machines and People' by Stephen Aris, it was stated that the Department of Applied Economics in Cambridge, working on the basis of the Government's estimate of 4 per cent rate of economic expansion being necessary, say that there will be 1,350,000 less jobs for the unskilled in Britain, although they claim that there would be 1,395,000 more for the skilled workers.

It will be useful to study the experience in other countries. For instance in the *Daily Express* on June 22, 1963, under the column 'This is America' it was stated: 'Automation will eliminate 22,000,000 jobs by 1970', the Labour Department reported to the Senate today. 'Not all of these people will become unemployed', said the Department, 'but the workers with little education and skill will be affected because they do the simplest jobs and robots are taking these over.'

In the United States a Foundation has been set up to look into the impact of technological change; it finances a similar Foundation in this country. Its purpose is to examine and advise, and the chairman is John Snyder, a tycoon who produces automated machines. Here are some of his conclusions which he made in an Address entitled 'Obligations of the Makers of Machines' in Geneva, December 13, 1962. (It is important to note that John Snyder is

Chairman and President of the U.S. Industries, Inc., and Co-Chairman of the American Foundation on Automation and Employment, Inc.)

The first myth that I would like to talk to you about concerns the employment situation. Recently in America, anyone who says that automation is going to put people out of work has been considered a 'prophet of doom'. Some experts say that automation actually creates jobs—that everyone will always be employed because it takes people to make machines and to keep them running.

Well I disagree. That might have been the case in the long run, but as Lord Keynes suggested, in the long run we are all dead. Today, Detroit is one of the centres of automation and it is also one of our country's largest and most critical areas of unemployment. In Detroit, at least, automation has not created jobs.

Another naïve concept is that we cannot only put people to work running automated equipment, we can also use them in the building and maintaining of this equipment. The hard truth here is that after the initial 'debugging' has taken place, there is relatively little maintenance work to do. If this were not the case, it would not make sense to automate. And if the equivalent number of workers replaced by automation were required to build the machines and systems, there would also be no point in automation.

Another interesting comment comes from A. J. Haynes, International President of the International Association of Machinists and Co-Chairman of the American Foundation on Automation and Employment, Inc. He made this comment in an address called 'The Labour Viewpoint on Automation', in Geneva, December 13, 1962:

It is truly an ironic paradox that we should allow technology to destroy purchasing power at the very time that the same technology is creating an ever greater need for more purchasing power.

Unless industry, government and labour solve this paradox, then automation can only degenerate into an exercise in futility.

For these reasons, we in the A.F.L.C.I.O. are convinced that a 35-hour week is a national imperative in the United States.

What is the attitude of the U.S. trade union movement? President Kennedy set up a Commission on which a number of trade unionists served, including George Meany. They had to make minority observations, because they were concerned with the social problems which were bound to arise in the U.S., in a 'free economy' with no overall plan. This Commission became known as the 'President's Advisory Committee on Labour Management Policy' and they issued a report in January, 1962, called 'The Benefits and

Problems Incident to Automation and other Technological Advances'. Now even they have hardened their position to insist that technological changes should be synchronised with social changes; and they are pressing hard for the 35-hour week to accommodate the people displaced by new machines and techniques.

Now let us look at developments in coalmining in Britain and the background to it. First a few facts. Last year 58 per cent of output was power-loaded, today it is 66 per cent. Output per face was 312 tons, and is now 352 tons. In the first 25 weeks of 1963 output per manshift on mechanised faces was 129 cwts. compared with 74 cwts. on other faces. At the Union's recent Annual Conference, some of the new mechanical systems that were already being tested in pilot pits were described by delegates. It was reported that a very considerable increase in the application of mechanisation at all stages was taking place in the East Midlands and Yorkshire. Delegates from two pits in the East Midlands that were the first to become automated addressed the Conference. One claimed that the automated system was now operating on a coal face that had been abandoned some years earlier due to geological conditions, proving that automation can operate in the less favourable mining conditions. On the other automated face the system had resulted in a big reduction in face manpower with a big increase in output potential. The general effect of increased mechanisation and automation is thus to reduce the labour force whilst at the same time increasing production and productivity.

These changes will continue and the tempo of their introduction will increase. The effect measured over the next five years will be dramatic and will reduce job opportunity in the industry far below any of our previous estimates. We must try to avoid in Britain what appears to be the position in the American mining industry. A recent report reveals some of the big technical changes that are taking place in America. These are described by George Tugendhat in an article called 'When Robots oust Men' written for the *Statist* in the June 7, 1963, issue. He writes of a Washery Plant that washes and dries 38,000 tons of coal a day. The plant is operated by only two men with fifteen men standing by for maintenance. In another colliery a manless coalface is operated from the surface of the mine. The operator sits in an air-conditioned cabin, and with the aid of a radar screen is able to tell whether the machine is cutting into coal or rock. The same reports state that there are 150,000 American miners unemployed.

Let me, however, make it absolutely clear at this point, that the policy of British miners is not that of opposition to mechanisation even to the stage of automation. We are for increasing efficiency, based on mechanisation. In the Miners' Charter, a first demand was the modernisation of the industry, but we have to concern ourselves with the aim of automation and the social consequences.

What is the background? In the past year the trends have not altered. Coal consumption fell slightly, to 196 million tons during 1962. Production rose by 3·7 per cent, although there were 4½ per cent fewer men employed. Productivity increased between 8 per cent and 9 per cent. The demand for coal is strangled as a consequence of the absence of any growth of the economy, with severe recession in iron, steel and associated industries, whilst over 1½ million tons less were used by the railways *before* Beeching's cuts come into effect, and by the competition of oil.

The Minister of Power and the Government have refused the demand of the National Union of Mineworkers to amend the financial structure of the National Coal Board, to reduce its financial liabilities substantially and write off an old £90 million deficit. Instead, the Tory Government has imposed upon the industry a target of breaking even, after paying interest—some to former owners as compensation for pits long since closed—and after setting £10 million towards depreciation. This would only be possible if there were an operational profit of £53 million. Last year the operational profit was in the neighbourhood of £44 million.

This is the background, and their aim is to change the character of the industry from a labour-intensive industry to a capital-intensive industry. Capital is to be the biggest factor in cost, rather than labour. We are not opposed to this, but we are concerned with safeguarding our men, and their sons. Vast changes are not only being applied in the coal industry, but also in railways, shipbuilding, textiles and other industries. Its social consequences are not the problem of a single industry. It must be integrated in an overall economic and social plan covering the whole country.

Hitherto our policy in the coal mining industry has been for :

- (a) measures capable of stimulating general economic growth of our total economy;
- (b) co-ordination of the national fuel industries as part of a general fuel policy;
- (c) more rapid progress in modernising distribution;
- (d) changes in the financial structure of the National Coal Board;

- (e) alternative industries in areas where contraction is inevitable, which are concentrated precisely where unemployment is high owing to similar contraction in other industries.

Within the next five years we shall have to face the impact of high mechanisation amounting in parts to automation in our industry. We are cushioned at present by 'natural wastage' from the full social consequences. But we cannot look at it only from the point of view of the mining industry, because it is already in other industries and beginning to produce the same social consequences there. Opportunities for alternative work in these industries is also declining. What has to be faced up to is a reduction of the total job-opportunity for the whole population of Britain.

No single industry must be allowed to contract out of its social responsibility. We must insist that these technological changes are only used to the advantage of the mass of the people. Such changes can only be accommodated in a planned economy. Such planning is not possible in a capitalist free economy and is only possible by extending public ownership to the vital sectors of the economy.

It is an urgent challenge to the whole labour and trade union movement. A Labour Government is needed without delay committed to an economic and social plan, capable of maintaining full employment and enabling the people as a whole to share the benefits of these changes. The only complete answer to the challenge of this technological revolution is socialism.

LABOUR MONTHLY

FORTY YEARS AGO

Fascism . . . viewed objectively, is not the revenge of the bourgeoisie in retaliation for proletarian aggression against the bourgeoisie, but it is a punishment of the proletariat for failing to carry on the revolution begun in Russia. The Fascist leaders are not a small and exclusive caste; they extend deeply into wide elements of the population. . . . We have to overcome Fascism not only militarily, but also politically and ideologically. The reformists even today consider Fascism to be nothing else but naked violence, the reaction against the violence begun by the proletariat. To the reformists the Russian Revolution amounts to the same thing as Mother Eve's biting into the apple in the Garden of Eden. . . . Fascism, with all its forcefulness in the prosecution of its violent deeds, is indeed nothing else but the expression of the disintegration and decay of capitalist economy, and the symptom of the dissolution of the bourgeois State. This is one of its roots. . . . The second root of Fascism lies in the retarding of the world revolution by the treacherous attitude of the reformist leaders.

(From 'Fascism', by Clara Zetkin, *Labour Monthly*, August, 1923.)

TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS

Quaestor

ON July 14 Lord Hailsham and Mr. Harriman flew to Moscow to start test-ban talks with the Soviet Government. Once again there was a great opportunity to start on the way back from the ever-rising threat of a third world war. There have been many such opportunities recorded over the last fifteen years by this journal, and every time they were thrown away by the capitalist governments the return became harder. Today the menace is more grave than ever because it involves the possibility of the large-scale nuclear armament of West Germany, *i.e.*, of the country where declared Nazis control the armed forces (of course they were farcically 'denazified' by Allied or West German courts), declared Nazis are in high civil office, great business concentrations which served the Nazis exercise decisive influence throughout public life.

Why 'large-scale' nuclear armament? Because, on the testimony of a British Minister who ought to know, 'Germany is already a member of the Nato nuclear committee and *today possesses nuclear weapons*' (Thorneycroft, Minister of Defence, in the Commons on July 3). Today, therefore, it is a question of a further step. Harold Wilson stated the consequences of such a step in the same debate. 'Any proposal to arm the Germans with nuclear weapons' (Mr. Wilson meant nuclear arms other than those to which the Labour leaders have already agreed, but of that more later) 'would mean the end of any hope of easing East-West tension. . . . This really would mean the end of any policy of constructive co-existence. It would be as much a turning point in history, as fatal a milestone on the road to World War 3, as Hitler's march into the Rhineland was towards the last world war'.

It is said that warnings like these led President Kennedy reluctantly to agree at his meeting with Mr. Macmillan on June 30 to postponement for further discussions, of his scheme for a 'mixed-manned European nuclear force', which was to be the selected cloak for West German nuclear armament. British Ministers agreed in principle with the scheme, but thought it untimely at the moment, their mouthpieces explained to the diplomatic correspondents. But this did not deter the West German Government. Its Minister for Economic Co-operation explained at Munich on July 2 that 'Europe needed its own nuclear force, equal to Russia's and America's, and standing on its own feet' (*Guardian*, July 3). For 'Europe', read

'West Germany' which already has the largest army and largest output of heavy industry in capitalist Europe, and would therefore play the biggest part in control of the force. Of course Herr Scheel added that West Germany must not produce its *own* nuclear weapons—and Mr. Macmillan in Parliament the next day said he was sure that its statesmen and people did not want to break their treaty obligations by doing so.

However, neither he nor anyone else could guarantee that some future Government might not see things differently. And for good reason. In the Brussels Treaties of 1954 West Germany had accepted 1,500 tons as the ceiling for its warships. It has raised this figure to 6,000 tons with the consent of the British and U.S. governments. In the same treaties, she accepted a top limit of 450 tons for her submarines—but on July 8 the West German Ministry of Defence disclosed that it asked nine months ago for the right to build 1,000 ton submarines, and that although this had not been agreed, talks are now going on about 700 tonners, and there has been no objection to the 1,000 ton vessels on principle (*The Times*, July 9) Evidently both promises and principles have to be understood in a Pickwickian sense, as Dickens would have said, where West Germany and her patrons are concerned. In any case, we now have the evidence mentioned by Quæstor in these pages last month, and the admission by Mr. Thorneycroft, to remind us of what West Germany's Nazi generals could do with the information they would get by being admitted to a fully-fledged 'European' nuclear control staff, as the Americans propose.

So Harold Wilson's warning was completely justified. But that immediately raises two questions of the utmost importance, which the labour movement can only ignore at its peril, and at the peril of losing world peace. The first is, what are the prospects of an honest attempt by the British and American governments to seize the new opportunity which Khrushchov offered them in his Berlin speech of July 2, when he indicated that the Soviet Government had once more taken the western Powers at their word—as on so many previous occasions—and was ready for a test-ban on land and sea and in the air, especially if it were reinforced by a non-aggression pact between the eastern and western military alliances, Warsaw and Nato? The question is justifiable, after so many occasions when they 'welshed' when taken at their word on disarmament problems (Mr. Philip Noel Baker wrote a whole book of examples, a few years ago, and he is no Communist).

Sure enough, the British and American press began to put out assiduous suggestions that meant, at the very least, preparations for another 'welshing' act. On the one hand, it appears that de Gaulle insists that any tripartite ban 'should not be allowed to interfere with France's own nuclear programme' (*Guardian* diplomatic correspondent, July 5)—and of course the British and American governments are quite powerless when de Gaulle defies them or are they? On the other hand, it turns out that 'the United States would not sign a formal non-aggression treaty as it would involve diplomatic recognition of East Germany' (*Telegraph*, July 8)—and of course their ally West Germany, over whom they equally have no influence whatever, would not stand for it either. So all the pieces are in position for a neat little backward move, should the capitalist powers think it necessary and possible. And it is the Nato alliance that gives them the chance. Without Nato, both de Gaulle and Adenauer would sing a very different tune, since the resources of neither are sufficient *at present* really to play the independent part they aim at, especially in defiance of their Anglo-Saxon allies.

Consider, too, apart from formal questions like 'recognition' (the German Democratic Republic does not need 'recognition' in order to exist and grow stronger, as recent articles in *The Times* itself have admitted) what the signing of a non-aggression pact between east and west would mean. First, the use of continuing underground tests, on which the western Powers insist if there is no inspection from outside, would become more blatant a signal of war preparations than they are at present. Secondly, it would create an international atmosphere of moral condemnation for such a warmonger as the Republican Congressional leader, Senator Dirksen, if he really made the astonishing statement reported by *The Times* Washington correspondent (July 12), that he feared Kennedy's speech at Washington University on June 10 was 'a departure from a policy of strength' and the beginning of a new policy of 'making the world safe for co-existence'. In other words, peace with the Socialist world might break out. And thirdly, it would answer the question of countless millions in all countries, which the *Daily Herald* for once put very aptly on July 4, 'Why not? Have not the West always said they will not attack Russia?'

But there is a second question. This is not the first time that a turning was reached in world affairs over the issue of arms for West Germany. The first was in 1955, when by minority votes in the British and French Parliaments (260 in London, 287 in Paris), West

Germany was allowed to rearm—although the Soviet Government had given a solemn warning that this meant an end of any prospect of German unity, and that it would start a new and dangerous stage in the arms race. The warnings were ignored, even jeered at—though they were couched in terms as weighty as those of Harold Wilson on July 3, 1963. The consequences are clear enough today.

But on whom does the responsibility rest? First and foremost on the leaders of the Labour Party, who in February, 1954—both the Parliamentary Party and the National Executive—voted for German rearmament, then defied clearly expressed rank and file opinion against them at regional conferences all over the country, and finally by a series of disreputable manoeuvres at the Scarborough Conference in October that year (also involving brazen defiance of members' opinion) carried rearmament by a tiny majority. Thereby they not only weakened, they paralysed the opposition in the country which the subsequent voting in the House of Commons showed could have won the day. And Britain's opinion at that time was at least as weighty in Europe, especially in France, as it is today. And the decisive argument was loyalty to Nato. Yet in the same speech in which he warned against the disastrous results of giving Germany nuclear weapons, Harold Wilson showed not the slightest recognition of the glaring fact that it is the principles underlying Nato—a capitalist alliance against an imaginary 'Russian Menace'—which today, as nine years ago, provides the justification and the pretext for nuclear armament of West Germany today as it did of conventional armaments for her in 1954, as well as steadily increasing them and providing her with American nuclear weapons since then. Moreover, if he did not repeat on this occasion his now customary declarations of loyalty to Nato, his lieutenant Mr. Gordon Walker more than made up the deficiency. Thereby he destroyed nine-tenths of the effectiveness of his solemn warnings. Why should the Tories and the Pentagon, not to speak of the West German Government, be afraid of Harold Wilson's words, when he calls for loyalty to a war bloc for which nuclear arms for West Germany are only one more powerful weapon against the U.S.S.R.?

If Harold Wilson's words are not to remain empty talk, the members of the Labour Party themselves, individual and affiliated, will have to see that their (and no doubt his) wishes are not thwarted as they were in 1954. The wish to let West Germany have access to the hydrogen bomb is a death-wish because Nato is a death-trap for Britain. That is as true today as it was in 1954.

A PAGE OF HISTORY

SIXTY years ago the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (then illegal), which had begun in Brussels, had to leave owing to the attentions of the Belgian police and held its last 24 sessions in London from August 19-23, 1903. The Congress proved historic.


It adopted with one abstention a Programme which proclaimed the aim of 'replacing private ownership of the means of production and distribution by common ownership, and introducing planned organisation of the process of social production to ensure the welfare and all-round development of all members of society'. The essential condition for this social revolution was, it declared, 'the dictatorship of the proletariat, *i.e.*, the proletariat winning such political power as will enable it to suppress all resistance by the exploiters'. In his comment as chairman of the Congress after the vote was taken (August 14, 1903), the veteran Marxist George Plekhanov said: 'We can with justifiable pride say that the Programme we have adopted gives our proletariat a firm and reliable weapon in the struggle against its enemies'. It was this programme which began to be put into effect directly the Russian workers took political power in November, 1917.

The Congress also discussed the Party's rules. A sharp difference emerged at once on clause 1, which dealt with Party membership. Lenin put forward a draft which laid down that this required, in addition to acceptance of the Programme and financial support of the Party, also 'personal participation in one of the Party organisations'. Martov put forward an alternative wording—'work under the supervision and guidance of one of the Party organisations'. Intervening in the debate to support Lenin's draft, Plekhanov said: 'Workers who want to join the Party will not be afraid of membership of this organisation. Discipline has no terrors for them. Many intellectuals soaked through and through with bourgeois individualism will be afraid to join. But that is just what is good about it. These bourgeois individualists are usually also the representatives of all kinds of opportunism. We should keep them out. Lenin's draft can serve as a barrier to their invasion of the Party, and for that reason alone all opponents of opportunism should vote for it.'

Martov's draft was adopted by a small majority. But its success was short-lived. By the time both wings of the Russian Social-Democrats held their Unity Congress at Stockholm in April, 1906, practical experience had shown that Lenin was right; and despite the fact that Martov's followers, now called Mensheviks, were in a majority at the Congress, Lenin's 1903 text was now accepted. The division between Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, however, had now gone too deep to be really healed. The Bolshevik Party which led the Russian workers to victory in November, 1917, had been built up since 1903 on the basis of that principle of organisation.

The little Congress held obscurely in London sixty years ago (there were only 43 delegates in all, and no-one now knows just where it was held) played a decisive part in world history. Its ill-printed little report, the title page of which is reproduced here, appeared in Geneva in 1904.

Report of the Second Congress of the
Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party



THE 'CONFED' AND THE RIGHT TO WORK

'Vulcan'

TRADER unionists are now preparing for the last round up next month after the annual conferences, in the patient expectation that the Trades Union Congress at Brighton will be the last before a new Labour Government is in power. Yet enthusiasm is muted, and not only because of bewilderment at the spectacle of the 'go-slow' from Labour's Front Benches. An icy blast of unemployment, or the fear of it, has been blowing round the seaside conference resorts. The miners at Bournemouth glimpsed bleak prospects with Lord Robens' threat of the completely automated pit coming on top of the suffering caused by ruthless pit closures. Railway workers at Scarborough faced the death by a further thousand cuts of the railway system as a social service. Even the builders at Clacton were well aware that their jobs are built on the shifting sands of capitalist economy, under which there are no solutions without problems.

But most significant of all were the ice and frost warnings at the Annual Meeting at Margate of the 1,800,000 affiliated members of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, base of Britain's economic strength.

Of the secretaries of the 49 'Confed' District Committees, only three could record any satisfaction with the employment situation: 'steady' but not 'booming' (Crewe); 'stable' (Yeovil); 'still more favourable than most places' (Lincoln). Elsewhere the story on unemployment ranged from 'disastrous' (Manchester) to 'an extremely high level' (Coventry). Background to every topic debated by the 200 delegates from the 37 unions and 49 'Confed' District Committees was the need to fight for the right to work and to strengthen the unions for that struggle, rather than to 'streamline' them as efficient pipelines for policy dictated in Whitehall.

The most significant debates, apart from that on redundancy, were on the powers of District Committees to campaign and the challenge to the York Memorandum 'for the avoidance of disputes'—a weapon which for 40 years in engineering only the employers' side has found favourable. The 'Confed' Executive was instructed to

renew their efforts to replace the York Memorandum with a procedure more in line with present-day requirements . . . (which) must provide for District representation at all levels.

Ted Hill (Boilermakers) spoke of taking part in the 1922 'managerial functions' strike from which the York Memorandum arose; he had always pressed for a 'status quo' clause, which would keep a sacked shop steward at work until the Central Conference stage, but the employers would never have it.

The Conference confirmed support for the *Plan for Engineering* now under revision, declared its 'serious concern' about the aircraft industry, and told the 'Confed' Executive to convene a meeting of affiliated union executives to decide on next action if employers did not concede the *40-hour week* without loss of pay.

They debated three resolutions on *wages*. A composite moved in a vigorous Socialist speech by Ted Williams (Boilermakers) rejected 'any system of wage-freezing', deprecated the employers' 'delaying tactics', called for back-dating in all cases and rejected

the assumption that wage increases should be related solely to increased productivity, and believes the cost of living and level of profits should be taken into account.

It was seconded by Sir William Carron (Engineers) with somewhat different overtones, perhaps not surprising in one so dedicated to his members increasing their productivity. 'The Tory form of wage-freeze', he said, 'would defeat its own ends'. This led John Dutton (Scientific Workers) to remark that apparently Sir William, like Neddy, would not oppose wage-freeze if profits were also frozen? The fight to stop the scandal of *women's low wages* was taken a step further when Marion Veitch (General & Municipal) successfully moved a resolution that the Executive should work out a three-grade system for women, the lowest based on the male labourer's rate, and two higher grades established in the same way as the male semi-skilled rate, subject to local negotiations. On *wages structure*, a composite adopted a demand from the Transport & General Workers' resolution to treat

the raising of minimum rates as a matter of immediate urgency.

Their representative, Les Kealey, spoke with passion, arguing that both sides underestimated the immense number actually on present minimum rates of £12 or even £10 10s. He made a scathing reference to unions which insisted on resorting to ballots without giving their members guidance. At this Sir William Carron decided the cap fitted and replied bitterly that *he* was not one to try to 'brain-wash' his members. (We tactfully looked the other way to avoid the expression on the faces of half a dozen of his members present whom he had carpeted and harried over the past few years.) How-

ever the resolution was not passed unanimously, because it had imported into it an A.E.U. commendation of

a policy of progressive wage increases on a long-term contract basis.

This, A. D. Day (Draughtsmen) described as inviting us 'to take a quick gallop up the garden path and jump into the cesspit at the bottom of the garden'. Trying to undermine the next Labour Government, the Tories would seize on it, he said; the best victories could only be obtained by a policy of struggle.

There was considerable disagreement when J. Scott (Plumbers) moved a resolution calling for a *national agreement for redundancy payments*. Objections came from C. Berridge (Engineers) who thought it would 'damp down enthusiasm on the workshop floor'; D. McGarvey (Boilermakers) who said our clarion call was full employment, but this would 'give employers the green light'; Les Kealey (Transport & General) thought it wrong to share poverty. But Clive Jenkins (Supervisory Staffs) argued that to press for money compensation for 'loss of office' was an important recognition that his job belonged to the worker, while the new Contracts of Employment Bill was going to bring the principle in nationally, willy nilly. But Chapman (Clerks) answered that each redundancy should be tackled as it arose, and all members should be advised to fight against the Bill anyway. So the resolution was referred; and again the 'Confed' has no common national policy on redundancy.

This has far-reaching effects. It was because of the absence of a common policy on unemployment and redundancy that the rules and constitution could be brought into play to check 'Confed' District Committees who had joined with others to combat local unemployment, notably in connection with the great Mass Lobby to Parliament on March 29 last. Following upon 'a complaint received' (sounds like a police court, doesn't it?) from an affiliated union, George Barratt, the 'Confed' General Secretary, took steps to rebuke several District Committees, amongst them Manchester, of which the secretary was then the left-wing engineer Hugh Scanlon (who had not at that time been triumphantly installed in his union's executive seat to which he had been elected, after two years' battle). A circular instructing all District Committees to take no part in calling or associating themselves with the membership of affiliated unions in connection with action on unemployment, aroused deep and widespread resentment. George Barratt defended it but no one from the floor was ready to come to his rescue for whilst executives of the 37 unions had disagreed over the respective

merits of work-sharing, overtime bans, or redundancy payments as grand national strategy, down below the lads on the stones had not the slightest difficulty anywhere in thrashing out a common approach when unemployment hit them. Their policy was to fight for the right to work, with tactics varying according to local circumstances and the strength of the movement there. So the District speakers told the platform that the Circular was 'undermining the growing influence of the 'Confed', and don't treat us like delinquents' (F. Turner, Merseyside); 'your heads are in the clouds' (F. A. Baker, Nottingham); 'a ridiculous limitation of powers' (R. Wright, Manchester); 'we did the same and were not rebuked, and we're building unity of purpose' (D. Fairbairn, Coventry); 'don't castrate the Districts or it will be 'Confed' which will be impotent' (W. R. Green, Gloucester). Some said bluntly that for their part the rules could go hang (J. Morrow, Belfast). In fact the debate could have been led off into one of constitutionalism, for or against the rules, but it was brought right back to the point by Reg Birch (London). In his mild mannered way which nevertheless cuts deep, he said he was not disputing that the 'Confed' Executive, not the Districts, had the powers. The question was: what were the powers to be used for? To help or impede the struggle for the right to work? If anyone had the intention to shut down on the clamour of the unemployed they were like King Canute. The powers had to be used; if they wanted to treat unemployment as a regional matter, use the powers regionally; if as a general policy, then use the powers nationally—for unemployed workers were going to lobby Parliament whether the 'Confed' led them or no. There was nothing unconstitutional about lobbying. Turning to the unsmiling Sir William he said:

Don't be quite so Olympian. You have all the powers; use them. You can have the credit and carry the banner; we don't want the limelight. But if we won't fight unemployment, there is nothing real that we do as a Confed; and as for the long-term contract we are going in for, the question the lads will ask is: how long shall we have the job?

It was not a matter on which a vote could be taken. The debate was nonetheless telling for that. Amongst the distinguished guests were a number of retired general secretaries all agog. They ranged from men with distinguished records of service to the movement like Jim Gardner (Foundry Workers) and Harry Brotherton (Sheet Metal) to an ageing figure, once redder than the rose and now as blue as the iris. Employers' representatives too. They have been warned. Leadership, democracy, a policy of struggle—or something will have to give.

BRITISH GUIANA

Jack Woddis

WITH the calling off of the 'General Strike'—after mediation by the British T.U.C.'s special emissary, Mr. Robert Willis—the left-wing Progressive Peoples Party Government of British Guiana has temporarily surmounted another great test in the battle against imperialism and for independence. It was in 1953, after only 133 days of rule, that the P.P.P. Government led by Dr. Cheddi Jagan, was removed from office by the British Tory Government and the constitution suspended. In 1957, and again in 1961, despite the pouring in of funds from Britain and America to stir up anti-P.P.P. feeling and to provoke racial strife, the P.P.P. won the elections again and was allowed to hold ministerial posts under a form of internal self-government which denied full power to the people's elected representatives, and fell short of political independence. In 1962, and now once again, reaction has been on the rampage, trying to achieve by violence, looting, economic sabotage, rumour, corruption and racial war what it could not achieve by ballot.

Cedric Belfrage has remarked of the recent conspiracy against the P.P.P. Government that 'in many ways it recalls the international strangulation of Republican Spain' (*National Guardian*, June 20, 1963). American press attacks on the P.P.P. have talked of 'the dangers of another Cuba' and have called Dr. Jagan 'another Castro'. These references, from friend and foe alike, to Republican Spain and to Castro and Cuba are significant, for they show, in a nutshell, what has been at stake these last few weeks in embattled Georgetown. As so often in the past—and one recalls the young Soviet Union, Spain, Czechoslovakia, China, Korea, Hungary, Tibet, Cuba, Ghana—reaction has scored a temporary ideological success in Britain, owing to its enormous press and propaganda power, and has buried the imperialist attack in a fog of lying misrepresentation and distortion. This makes it all the more necessary that the true facts should be known and that they should be conveyed as widely as possible to the British labour movement. The immediate occasion or excuse for the latest attack on the P.P.P. Government was the Labour Relations Ordinance. That this was simply a pretext by reaction has now been amply demonstrated by Mr. Robert Willis's sharp rebuke to the organisers of the strike and his revelation that no matter what concessions Dr. Jagan might make, the anti-

Government forces, and especially the British Guiana T.U.C. President Mr. Richard Ishmael, and his backers, would not call off the strike. It was only when Mr. Willis threatened to return to London and expose this clique that they immediately climbed down and declared the strike over.

The Labour Relations Ordinance (modelled, incidentally, on the Wagner Act of the Roosevelt Administration, which enabled the American workers to smash the gangster and company unions in the U.S.), has been falsely depicted, repeatedly and deliberately, by the British press, as a Bill which would give Dr. Jagan's Government power to decide to which unions workers must belong. The truth is that, as things stand at present, the workers are often compelled to belong to the union of the *employers'* choice. In the all-important sugar industry, for example, this is done by the simple act of compulsory deductions of union dues from workers' wages, the dues then being paid over to the employer-backed Man Power Citizen's Association, the most notorious company union in the Caribbean and even beyond. The overwhelming majority of the sugar workers vote for P.P.P. candidates in the elections, but, under existing conditions, they are denied the right to join their own trade union, and are forced into a union controlled by the most fanatical anti-P.P.P. elements. Everyone knows that if, as the new Ordinance proposed, the workers were able to have a secret ballot to decide which union they preferred, then the M.P.C.A., led by Mr. Richard Ishmael and claiming 25,000 workers (equivalent to the overwhelming majority of all sugar workers and giving Ishmael the dominant voice in the 40,000 strong British Guiana T.U.C.) would be exposed as the unrepresentative body it really is, and the domination of Ishmael and the right-wing in the T.U.C. would be ended. This is the crux of the opposition to the Ordinance.

And this is largely why the strike was called. It was one of the strangest 'strikes' in history, being supported by practically the entire American press, backed, according to *The Times*, by large weekly sums from the United States, supported by local employers and accompanied by a large-scale lockout by the big monopolies controlling sugar, shipping, civil aviation, and oil.

The character of the opposition to Dr. Jagan's Government was already revealed last year when the British Guiana T.U.C., backed by the parties opposing the P.P.P., staged demonstrations against the Budget. On that occasion the demonstrators, following a meeting between the T.U.C. President, and Mr. d'Aguiar, leader of the

United Force (a party, described in the British Government Commission report after the 1962 February disturbances as a party representing 'The businessmen and the middle classes'), were collected in lorries provided by Mr. d'Aguiar (a rich businessman, owning local breweries and acting as Pepsi-Cola agent), and later marched behind banners *opposing* a profits tax and *opposing* nationalisation! Strikes, on that occasion, too, were organised—but with the support of the majority of members of the Georgetown Chambers of Commerce who took a decision to support the strike, and pay their workers to go on strike! Incredible, but true, as a reading of the Commission report quickly shows. This year's anti-Government conspiracy repeated much of the pattern of the February, 1952, events which ended in riots resulting in several million pounds worth of destruction in Georgetown, the capital. But now there were two new factors. The hand of the United States was more pronounced than ever. And racial strife was stirred up to a really dangerous degree. No one knows how much American money has poured into British Guiana to keep the 'strike' going. *The Times* says, 'perhaps \$80,000 a week' (July 5, 1963). *The National Guardian* (June 27, 1963) puts the figure at \$125,000 a week. These are the sums sent openly by the A.F.L.-C.I.O., and take no account of other sums sent by the I.C.F.T.U. and other interested parties in the United States.

It was not merely the A.F.L.-C.I.O. and the I.C.F.T.U. that has been intervening in British Guiana. (And this, incidentally, is in defiance of the undertaking given to the British T.U.C. and reported to the Trades Union Congress at Blackpool, September 3, 1962, that from March, 1962, 'the General Council should take over from the I.C.F.T.U. their responsibility for assistance to the trade union movement in British Guiana over and above the normal educational programme'.) The United States Government, too, has been meddling. The *New York Herald Tribune* reported on July 6 that 'under urgent appeals from President Kennedy, the British Government is undertaking a major new effort to prevent Guiana from becoming a "second Cuba"'. A week previous, Mr. Dean Rusk had urged Lord Home to suspend the British Guiana constitution (see *The Times*, June 29, 1963). A week later (July 6, 1963) *The Times'* special correspondent in Georgetown, revealed: 'The American view is that if such a suspension continued for six or seven years a big investment by an Anglo-American-Canadian consortium would wean the Indian peasantry from the P.P.P. and bring

“moderates” to power’. It is not certain that the British Government will submit to this pressure from Wall Street. It is not that they are any the less anti-Jagan, but that they fear that a suspension of the Constitution would raise a storm in U.N.O., increase popular support for the P.P.P. in British Guiana, and enable the United States opportunities for further intervention.

British imperialist policy prefers its old tried and tested method of divide and rule. How often are they to be allowed to get away with it? Protestant v. Catholic in Ireland, Arab v. Jew in Palestine, Hindu v. Moslem in India, Sinhalese v. Tamil in Ceylon, Malay v. Chinese in Malaya, Greek v. Turk in Cyprus, Ibo v. Yoruba in Nigeria, Ashanti v. the rest in Ghana, Somalis and Coast Tribes v. the rest in Kenya, and now East Indian v. Negro in British Guiana. The nearer a country gets to independence, the greater becomes this danger of racial, national, religious or tribal strife. It has happened too often in British colonial history for it to be simply a coincidence. The *Economist*, July 6, 1963, referring to the events in British Guiana taking on ‘the sinister character of a manhunt’ explains: ‘The target was the Indians, who are in a minority in Georgetown. The crowds do not hesitate to attack them in the streets and squares’.

That it has been deliberately provoked in British Guiana is shown by the distortions that have been spread in order to create the strife. The *British Guiana Graphic*, March 9, 1963, reported that Dr. Jagan’s opponents had accused the P.P.P. of ‘packing the Police Force with officers of Indian descent who form the main support of the P.P.P.’ (Dr. Jagan himself is of Indian descent.) In fact, out of 45 Police Officers only four are East Indians, and in the whole Police Force of 1,552 men, 259 are East Indians. The anti-P.P.P. forces pretend that they are defending the Negro people against Indian domination by the P.P.P. But one-third of the P.P.P. candidates in the last elections were Negroes, the P.P.P. won a number of predominantly Negro constituencies, and of the present Cabinet, five are East Indians and four are Negroes. In Georgetown, where, according to *The Times* (July 5, 1963), the Africans ‘because of their educational advantage and their Creole-British orientation’ are mainly to be found in ‘the Civil Service, skilled work force, middle and junior management, and the police’, there is clearly a *class* reason for the strong antagonism displayed by these strata in the capital towards the left-wing P.P.P. Government. No wonder we are presented, in the *Observer* (June 30, 1963), with the quaint

spectacle of 'Middle class ladies and their servants' walking 'arm in arm . . . to demonstrate against the Government and sing "Solidarity Forever"'. One wonders, after this touching picture of 'class' solidarity(!) just how closely the 'ladies' held their servants' arms!

Throughout all these eleven weeks, when riots raged in Georgetown, when Ministers were being attacked, schools set on fire, bombs thrown at Government buildings, Indians chased in the streets and murdered simply because they were Indians, the British Government, which controlled the armed forces and police, refused to intervene. In the same period a strike took place in far away Swaziland. There it was a genuine strike by the workers in the sugar industry and in the British-owned asbestos mines for a wage of £1 a day, and in protest against the new constitution which the British Government is trying to impose on the people. Immediately, the British Government moved. At the cost of £110,000, it flew troops all the way from the British military base in Kenya, smashed the strike, and arrested scores of workers. What a contrast! And how revealing of the real nature of the British Guiana 'strike'.

This gives added force to the demand of the P.P.P. and the people of British Guiana for full independence. The P.P.P. has been partly in office, but decisive state power has remained in imperialist hands. This anomalous position must be ended. British Guiana has had internal self-government for ten years—and if the United States has its way will wait at least another ten years. Meanwhile other territories have been given independence after two years, or even less (with Kenya it will be only six months) of internal self-government. The British Government must stop its discrimination against the people of British Guiana, grant them independence, and allow the people's elected representatives full power so that they can ensure peaceful conditions in which to build a new prosperous Guiana.

Despite Mr. Willis's warnings that a visit by Mr. Sandys could upset the strike settlement and stir up differences again, Mr. Sandys flew to British Guiana to intervene. He has proposed a coalition government of the P.P.P. and the P.N.C., the party led by Mr. Burnham which has allied itself with the reactionary opposition to Dr. Jagan's government. In the given situation, with added conditions being sought by Mr. Burnham, and threats in the British press that non-acceptance of a coalition by Dr. Jagan might lead to the British Government seeking other measures, the P.P.P. will naturally have to exercise great care in deciding how best to safeguard British Guiana's independence in this new phase of the battle.

DELEGATES AT CONFERENCES:

1. The Builders

The picture given by Tory Government propaganda of building as a boom industry, now the bad winter spell is over, has been shown up as false! The announcement that the industry would face a stoppage if the employers did not quickly change their minds about wages, and the plan of action laid down to render this effective, was a measure of the feeling of the men throughout the industry.

What lies behind this bitterness on the wages question, the shorter working week, overtime, the harassment of shop stewards and Government interference with normal collective bargaining? There are two basic factors at work: the new techniques, including factory made units, being introduced into building, and the impact of Government policies, both economic and financial, on housing. This gave special significance to Conference decisions taken recently at Clacton by the Amalgamated Union of Building Trade Workers. This, it must be borne in mind, is one of the two largest and most influential unions in the National Federation of Building Trade Operatives, the other being the woodworkers.

The large number of motions dealing with wages and shorter hours revealed the dissatisfaction throughout the industry with the present low basic wage—where tens of thousands of workers after deductions and fares, take home less than £10 per week. In the discussion, delegates proved that employers, whilst offering pennies to the unions, will pay up to 10s. an hour when it suits them to attract labour in short supply, and will allow long hours of overtime to be worked to complete contracts. The employers' offer to the union's claim for 1s. 6d. an hour (spread over three years and accumulated to the equivalent of the National Incomes Commission guiding light) constituted a widening of the differential between skilled and unskilled workers, and the locking up of the 40-hour week for three years. The policy of holding down the labourer's rate was described as a device to

introduce the new methods of construction emerging in the industry on a cheap labour basis, and further, to use this position to attack the craft rate.

The issue of State interference into the negotiated victory of a 40-hour week by Scottish building workers, following a number of strikes last year, was the background to a discussion on the National Incomes Commission's lopsided inquisition into the claim. It was with anger that delegates rejected Government interference particularly opposing any attempt to relate wages to productivity alone.

The demand to press for a five-day, 40-hour week for the rest of Britain was passed, delegates showing that we lagged behind a number of European countries on this issue. To achieve a new level of security was the feature of a number of motions. Building workers, in the winter, are

subject to lose months of earnings as a result of bad weather, and only have a partial, limited guarantee, so delegates urged the introduction of a fully guaranteed week. Building employers were attacked by the Conference for shirking their responsibility when operatives are sick. Building workers are forced to return to work prematurely, because of the hardship and debt which accrues after a period on the sick list. A sick pay scheme was demanded by the delegates together with the ending of the three waiting days.

The Tory Government was held responsible for the hard core of unemployment that exists in the country through a policy of false economic cuts and stagnation in our industrial growth. Incidence of high unemployment among building workers on Merseyside was cited, despite the thousands of people who needed homes in that city. Full support for any action by the Trades Union Congress to stimulate the economy was pledged by Conference.

The working of excessive overtime was strongly deprecated as contrary to the interests of trade union organisation, leading to lowering of safety standards, and the E.C. was instructed to tighten up on overtime permits and increase overtime rates.

The victimisation of stewards was vigorously opposed by the Conference. A resolution demanding full protection for stewards and for the inclusion in the National Working Rules that no steward should be dismissed without prior consultation with the unions concerned, was endorsed. Quicker progress towards amalgamation was given a practical angle, for the executive was called on to introduce appropriate terms of activity at all levels.

The changing face of the building industry with its new techniques, and

the development of industrial building arising from factory-made units, was the subject of an important debate. The need for a unified policy by all the unions in the N.F.B.T.O. was stressed, the cardinal question being that of national joint control over the entry of all new materials and methods of production in the industry. A demand for an N.F.B.T.O. National Conference to establish a common approach to new techniques was recorded.

The Tory housing policy came under severe condemnation with its high interest rates and reduced subsidies, together with the iniquitous Rent Acts and the scandalous racket in land prices, creating insurmountable problems for local authorities in their desire to meet the vital social needs of the people. Low interest charges were demanded, an end to the luxury building, and a full-scale programme of housing to be implemented. The public ownership of the building industry, land and materials was re-affirmed by delegates as an essential requirement of a Labour Government, and the T.U.C. and Labour Party Conferences were urged to adopt the policy of nationalisation. Amongst the political resolutions was a call for the immediate resignation of the Tory Government; solidarity with the victims of the South African Bill; and the return of a Labour Government to create a socialist Britain and cement friendship with socialist and progressive governments.

The vital and imperative question of peace has always held a prominent position on past agendas at the A.U.B.T.W. conferences. At Clacton particular emphasis was laid on the dangers to Britain of the Polaris base at Holy Loch, and delegates unanimously supported a resolution calling for the removal of all foreign bases

and a policy of negotiated disarmament.

During the Conference, a Soviet Building Union's delegation, invited to Britain by the Union, arrived, led by Mrs. Shapilov, who is a surveyor and the General Secretary. She brought greetings of friendship and progress from the 5½ million building workers in the Soviet Union. The delegation received an enthusiastic reception and a standing ovation, which expressed the deep feelings of kinship between building workers in their desire for greater understanding between nations.

2. The Railwaymen

Forthright speeches of condemnation of the Beeching Plan were the order of the day at the Annual General Meeting of the National Union of Railwaymen. Perth No. 1 Branch moved 'that an integrated transport system under public ownership and control is essential to the prosperity of the nation' and speaker after speaker from all grades, including dock checkers, clerks, drivers and guards condemned the present Government for transport policies which perpetuated the chaotic conditions in the industry; dealt with the railways in isolation without regard to road and other forms of transport and without any regard for social need or industrial development. This resolution was carried unanimously.

However, a resolution from Croydon came under discussion which sought a campaign of industrial action against the wholesale closures (many of which are already under way) but in spite of some fine speeches for support, it lost by 60 to 17.

It was decided that the time was ripe for a fresh wage claim, as rail-

waymen still lagged behind other workers such as Post Office workers and miners. In view of the rise in the cost of living, the minimum rate for adults, 183s., and the maximum rate for conciliation grades, 284s., were looked upon as unsatisfactory. Many men were going home with approximately £8 in their pay packet. This wages resolution was carried unanimously, calling for a rise of about 9 per cent.

Another interesting discussion was on the N.U.R. attitude to Britain's nuclear policy. Many delegates of all ages spoke very sincerely on this and put the case for Britain to reject any defence policy based on nuclear weapons. The platform spoke against, bringing in the question of Nato and a possible 'split' in the Labour Party, but it was put from the floor that this question of 'splitting' was overstressed. A resolution supporting all genuine moves towards disarmament and that 'this country should take a lead in promoting (with any and all countries willing to co-operate) agreements on nuclear tests and for zones free of nuclear weapons in Europe and South-East Asia' was carried by 55 votes to 22.

Many young delegates kept the debate lively and interesting. Nor were the old forgotten, for a motion was carried declaring that 'nothing less than £4 per week for a pensioner and for adult dependents is sufficient' and that this increase should be financed by the State.

Finally, the N.U.R. called for amalgamation talks with the other railway unions. But above all, an onlooker would have been left in no doubt as to the fighting mood of the meeting and the desire of the railwaymen to rid this country of the Tory Government and their disastrous economic policies.

Document of the Month

TRADE UNION FRATERNAL RELATIONS

[Our readers will have seen references in the press to an attempt by the General Council of the Trades Union Congress to interfere with the Scottish T.U.C.'s decision to send a fraternal delegation to the Trade Union Congress of the U.S.S.R. The following extracts from the editorial in the National Union of Furniture Trade Operatives' Record for June this year gives a telling answer to the arguments habitually used by the opponents of international trade union unity.]

WE HAVE FOR many years exchanged Journals and kept up a friendly relationship with the Upholsterers' International Union of North America. Despite this, because NUFTO sent delegations to the Soviet Union and the GDR, the President of the UIU has, in his Union Journal, carried on a sustained attack on the leadership of NUFTO . . . The following appeared in an editorial written by the International President, Mr. Sal Hoffman: 'They even hypnotised some of our friends among the British Furniture Trade Unionists to take carefully conducted tours of the Soviet Union and their puppet-ruled East Germany, where former key Nazis have not been tried and convicted, as in the West, but have been incorporated right into the Communist Party machinery. After the free tour they were persuaded to issue joint statements to the effect that free Western Germany and West Berlin, our ally, whose present rulers fought against Hitler, are the real enemy! Not one of these befuddled and bemused Western leaders speaks, understands, or reads Russian, or any of the minority languages . . .' (UIU Journal, January 1963.)

We wish first to deal with his

statements to his members about the leadership of NUFTO and with the way he has, without giving a direct quotation, garbled the statements made on behalf of the delegations . . . Bro. Hoffman has concealed from his members the fact that the USSR delegation was led by our General Secretary, A. G. Tomkins, the respected and experienced Senior Officer of our Union. He has not told them that, on his return from the USSR, Bro. Tomkins wrote: 'The NUFTO delegation during its visits to places of *their own choice* witnessed the overwhelming volume of reconstruction work being undertaken . . . a multitude of modern homes stand where desolation prevailed.' Then there is the reference to 'joint statements'—again without a quote. There is only one joint statement—that signed by our General Secretary and endorsed by our General Executive Council. The only reference to Germany in that joint statement reads: 'The two Unions believe an immediate solution of the Germany question would be an effective measure against the resurgence of aggressive German militarism' . . . Bro. Hoffman should be aware that, in declaring the need to

take effective measures against the resurgence of aggressive German militarism, our General Secretary and our GEC spoke for our membership. We give you facts . . . Krupp and Thysson and their like, the makers and masters of Hitler, live on in West Germany and their henchmen are again raising the banners of the right of Germany to dominate Europe and Asia . . . Bro. Hoffman, it seems to us that you abuse and denigrate the leadership of NUFTO lest your own members discover that there are serious, experienced trade unionists in NUFTO who cannot be bamboozled and bought and who have come back and reported the facts—and that the facts are not in accord with the fictions you seek to spread about ‘hypnotism’ and ‘carefully conducted tours’.

For the moment we will leave the USSR delegation because we wish to deal with both the delegations before going fully into the questions of policy. In the March issue of the UIU Journal, in an unsigned article, there is the following statement: ‘These delegations were herded into carefully prepared Communist East German show places where, not even knowing the language, they were fed the story of the glories of Communist iron-ruled East Germany’s workers’ clubs, nurseries and housing projects by interpreters. The captive East Germans were shown the happy visiting foreign delegation exhibiting obvious approval of (what they saw as) the East German way of life . . .’ (UIU Journal, March 1963.) Your members have been told, Bro. Hoffman, the delegation was herded into ‘carefully prepared East German show places’. Is East Berlin, where they walked freely, a show place, Bro. Hoffman? Is bomb-shattered Dresden, where they spent the Whit Holiday, a show place, Bro. Hoff-

man? You infer that our delegation were ‘fed the story . . . of workers’ clubs, nurseries, housing projects by interpreters? You know, for you have read the report, that the delegation spent the Whit holiday in Dresden and joined the holiday crowds, mixing freely, without interpreters, talking at random to anyone who could speak English. Your members don’t—for you avoid telling them . . . We make you an offer, Bro. Hoffman (and we have not consulted the GDR or the USSR authorities). We are prepared to ask the Woodworkers’ Unions of the GDR and the USSR to receive joint UIU-NUFTO delegations with their own interpreters, and to let them tour places of their own choice. Will you accept for your Union? Better still—go yourself. If the USSR and the GDR are prepared to rebuild cities, build holiday resorts, etc., etc., as ‘show pieces’ to deceive NUFTO delegations, surely they will build Paradise itself to deceive or convince you! Think how happy you could make millions of workers, just by getting ‘show places’ built on the scale our delegations have seen! . . .

We were puzzled as to why, without prior exchange of views or warning, such a virulent, sustained and vicious attack on the respected leaders of our Union should be made by a Union with whom we had friendly relations. We gave it careful thought. Personal spleen or dislike could not be an adequate explanation. There had to be something deeper and more fundamental. We think a careful examination of our General Secretary’s statements and the items in the UIU Journal provide the answer. One particularly condemnatory article in which NUFTO is attacked has this concluding paragraph: ‘Any individual or group who now knowingly accepts the participation of the

hypocritical Communist in any humane cause is making an alliance with Hell and a covenant with Death for their cause and should now know it. Organised labour's programme of UN hearings will help the heedless know about it this time'. (UIU Journal, January 1963.) We contrast this with a statement made recently by the Reverend Roman Catholic Bishop of Liverpool, Dr. Heenan, arising out of the recent message by the Pope. Dr. Heenan said: 'Where we can operate to the common good we must do so. Christians and Communists can both be sincere in the struggle for Peace.' We believe that the two statements we have just quoted set out in simple terms the real issue that

has led Bro. Hoffman to launch his vituperant attack. The statement by the UIU, if translated into active policy, will in our opinion fan the cold war into a flaming nuclear holocaust. We do not need to share the faith of Pope John and Dr. Heenan to join with them in the struggle to maintain peaceful co-existence. On this issue men and women of many faiths and opinions will be prepared to act and work together to make the voice of reason heard across the barriers of a divided world. We will join them, Bro. Hoffman, no matter how you bark and seek to bite. Nothing can be lost by Peace—all will be lost by War.

BACK IN PRINT

In response to a continuing demand for copies of our collection of papers

The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism

containing contributions by

- Paul M. Sweezy
- Maurice Dobb
- Christopher Hill
- R. H. Hilton
- H. K. Takahashi

We are pleased to announce that a new printing has been prepared and is
now available for \$1.50

Order from:

Science & Society

30 East 20th Street
New York 3, N.Y.

THE THIRD LABOUR GOVERNMENT

William Gallacher

I HAVE been living over again an interesting period of my life. All about the vital five years of the Attlee Labour Government; in a quietly written factual account of how a faithless group of men claiming to be socialists, betrayed their election pledges, betrayed the great labour movement, and betrayed their country, thus serving the interests of monopoly here at home, and more especially, the ruthless, brutal monopoly capitalists of America. Terrible charges: but a reading of this book *The Labour Government** by D. N. Pritt, will satisfy the most reluctant reader to accept that conclusion. In *Let Us Face The Future* which became, in effect, the Manifesto for the 1945 General Election, we get such promises, or a suggestion of promises, as 'but Labour will not tolerate freedom to exploit others', etc. Now all we hear is chatter about 'the Free Nations' and the one freedom 'the Free Nations' are concerned with (and threatened to plunge the world into a ghastly nuclear war to preserve) is the freedom to exploit others'. The nations that are supposed to be unfree, are the very nations that have put an end to the exploitation of 'others'.

In the section dealing with Foreign Policy, we get 'A World of Progress and Peace':

We must make sure that Germany and Japan are deprived of the power to make war again. We must consolidate in peace the great war-time association of the British Commonwealth with the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. Let it not be forgotten that in the years leading up to the war the Tories were so scared of Russia that they missed the chance to establish a partnership which might well have prevented war.

Added to that was the claim that Labour as a working class party could speak more easily and freely with the leaders of the Soviet Union, than could the Tories. Read, stage by stage, how Attlee and Bevin, immediately they took office made it clear that there was going to be continuity of foreign policy, with all the fine phrases of the Manifesto thrown into the scrap-heap. It is, in fact, this decision, based on hatred of Communism and the Soviet Union, that actually determines all that follows in the story of the 'Labour Government'. Attlee was, and is, such a person as could give the

**The Labour Government*, D. N. Pritt. Lawrence and Wishart, 37s. 6d.

impression (in his book mentioned by Pritt, *Labour in Perspective*) that he was an admirer of the Soviet Union, and the leader of a party whose principles were so opposed to capitalism, that it could never take on the job of administering the capitalist system. But all this was sheer political quackery, leading up to an appeal for an independent majority and the defeat of the Communist Party application for affiliation. The affiliation was refused and he got his 'independent' majority.

Here you see how in economic and social affairs one crisis followed another because of the anti-Soviet foreign policy pursued in line with Churchill's notorious Fulton speech. Bevin was just the man for pushing through such an anti-working class line; he was brutal in his hatreds and there was no hatred to equal his hatred of Communism and the Soviet Union. Here were men who had carried through a great, a mighty task; they had completely overthrown the capitalists and landlords; they had laid the foundations of a new form of society that challenged the whole capitalist world; their existence was a living exposure of the fact that he, and the others associated with him, had not the stomach to face up to the task of getting rid of the capitalists and landlords of this country. This feeling of inferiority that ate like a cancer into the ego of this outstanding egotist, was not something new, with the alleged difficulties that arose after the war; it was there eating into him before, and during, the war. His opposition to Beaverbrook's proposal for a campaign for tanks and planes for the Soviet Union was a striking indication of how far his hatred could go. It made him putty in the hands of Foreign Office reactionaries, of Churchill, and worst of all, of the Americans. A pat on the back and 'by God, Ernie, you're the guy that's wanted at a time like this'; "the free" world, Ernie, depends on you'; and 'we know you are not going to let these god-damned enemies of the "free world" put over anything on you'; that sort of thing would swell him up to bursting point. The bursting point was reached when the very Prime Minister whom he had got into office, gave him the sack; all the wind went out of him and the 'so-called strong man' left the Foreign Office weeping like a chidden child. But the unfortunate thing for Britain and the working class was that he ever went there. Dalton was keen for the job; he would not have revolutionised the Foreign Office; he would, to an extent, have taken advice from the high officials, but never, I am certain, to the extent that Bevin did.

When the war ended the Americans, without any period of notice,

announced the finish of lease-lend. Immediately the Labour Government was in difficulties but had its position eased with a substantial loan from the same source. That set them off in fine style, everything in the garden seemed to be lovely. At the Labour Party Conference at Bournemouth in 1946, Herbert Morrison could let himself go with: 'the Government is rapidly building up an overall planning organisation. I compare it with the complete lack of economic planning organisation in the past!' He then goes on to show how they went blindfold into the crisis of 1931, but now no more of that; 'the real problem of Statesmanship in the field of industry and economics is to see the trouble coming and prevent ourselves getting into the smash!' (page 151). It was at that same conference that Dalton caught the headlines with his exuberant exclamation, 'I speak here today, with a song in my heart'. Read what happened to the loan and how it melted away like 'snaaw aff a dyke' and you will understand how such a short time later Dalton, instead of a song in his heart, had to come to the House with a pain in his neck and had openly to bewail the fact that they were plunging into a new economic crisis. So much for Morrison's planning: as a matter of fact the only planning that was done was planning excuses for not planning; how could they plan when policy was decided, not in London, but in Washington? A crippling expenditure in armaments insisted on by the Americans put planning out of the question. Planning! Just take this from page 149, Bevin speaking at a dinner party of the American Legion in the Savoy hotel; read it, and if you get that sick feeling, console yourself, I have it too:

My dear Americans, we may be short of dollars but we are not short of will . . . we will not let you down. Britain is a great bastion of civilisation. Our Western civilisation cannot go, unless Britain falls, and Britain will not fall. Standards of life may go back. We may have to say to our miners and steel workers, we cannot give you all we hoped for; we cannot give you the houses we want you to live in; we cannot give you the amenities we desire to give you, but we will not fail.

This servile assurance to the Yanks explains much of the failures, or worse, that make up most of the record of the Labour Government from 1945-51. The author refers to the cabal that sought to get rid of Attlee, as related in Dalton's book, *High Tide and After*. Let me go into a little more detail. George Brown told Dalton that the rank and file members were all, or mostly all, fed up with Attlee's leadership and wanted him put on the skids. Dalton reported this to his pal Cripps who looked on Attlee for what he was. Cripps con-

sidered it necessary to get Morrison in with them and the three of them would go to Attlee and plump and plain, tell him to get out. Cripps was seeing Herbert that evening and would see Dalton at ten o'clock and let him know the result. At ten o'clock they met; Herbert was all for getting rid of Attlee, it could not come too soon, but not, as Cripps had proposed, to make Bevin Prime Minister. He was only prepared to go with them if they would agree that he, Herbert, should get the job, and, said Cripps to Dalton, Bevin would never agree to that; so, through failure to agree upon a successor, the destined victim remained long enough as Prime Minister and as leader of the party to kill any chance of Morrison getting the job. What a gang!

At the Labour Party Conference in Scarborough in 1948, Morrison, who had been prepared to throw the Prime Minister overboard, if he had been chosen Captain, appealed to the delegates, 'not to rock the boat' as there was likely to be an election soon; that has always been a winner. At the same conference Stafford Cripps, now Chancellor of the Exchequer (Dalton having lost the job through a silly bit of babbling), gave the early indication of his 'austerity' programme and the need for wage restraint; clever, very clever he was; a sample from page 235:

If . . . we were to regard the increased difficulties of paying our way, individually or nationally, as a reason for making the cost of production go up, we should simply be making a certainty that the real value of wages went down.

The moral being do not ask for higher wages to meet your domestic difficulties. When Stafford was on the job, I wrote some verses, a sort of paraphrase of Kipling's 'If', I remember the first and last verses, maybe I will be excused for shoving them in here: 'if you can work until your back is broken, and frozen wages clutch in loyal fist; if you can scorn the rebel word that is spoken, by John Platts Mills, or by the Communist', several more verses with more 'ifs' and then; 'In short, if you believe old Stafford Crippsie that through these means your freedom can be won, then in the Thames you ought to take a dipsie, for you are just a bloody fool, my son'.

But that has nothing to do with this extraordinary history of intrigue and betrayal. It is a history that should provide abundant lessons to all who are truly interested in the advance of the working class movement towards its great goal of socialism. The betrayal in Greece of the working class Partisans and the restoration of the German king; the betrayal of the guerilla fighters

in Malaya, and the restoration of 'the whisky-swilling planters' who had been the first to get out of Malaya when the Japs attacked; and the sacrifice of young British lads in the American planned war in Korea; all of this and the pro-Imperialist attitude of Attlee, Bevin, and Co. in connection with the colonies, is to be found in this searching book; but always as it shows the wrong course these enemies of socialism followed, it points out the correct course that should have been taken and will be taken, when the sham socialists are finally driven out, and a resolute, revolutionary leadership leads the march forward along the British road to Socialism.

BOOKS

The Appeasers

M. Gilbert and R. Gott

Weidenfeld & Nicolson. 380 pp. 42s.

Vneshnaya Politika Anglii, 1918-1939

(British Foreign Policy During the First Stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism, 1918-1939)

V. G. Trukhanovsky

Moscow, 1962. 412 pp.

FEW THINGS IN HISTORY are so incontrovertible as the shameful record of British foreign policy leading to the second World War. But attempts have been made to exonerate the policy of appeasement and even to suggest that Hitler only accidentally drove towards world conquest. It is therefore useful to have this painstaking collection of evidence from documents and memoirs. Perhaps because it is the work of two young historians who were mere babes when the war broke out that they end their foreword by saying 'the story we have pieced together ought to be known'. Actually most of it is well-known, and it is hardly true, as stated in the blurb, that the book 'reveals for the first time the ruthless and unprincipled manner in which the appeasers pursued their policy'.

Besides the well-known events connected with Czechoslovakia and Poland, there are sections on economic appeasement and Chamberlain's policy during the phoney war period. Unfortunately the narrative is all very superficial. The value of the book lies mostly in its detailed quotations. Among these interesting sidelights can be found, for instance, the frank admission by Dawson, the pro-German editor of *The Times*, who wrote to a correspondent in 1937 'I do my utmost, night after night, to keep out of the paper anything that might hurt their (the Germans') susceptibilities.' Or the statement in 1938 of Lord Mount Temple, President of the Anglo-German Fellowship, 'If another war comes . . . I hope the partners will be changed'. Further evidence of the same kind has come to light in the recently published *Documents on German Foreign Policy*. But the present book has serious defects as a historical study. Firstly, the detailed chronological record of diplomatic notes and politicians' statements often conceals motives rather than revealing them. History on this basis is not much better than the old style based on the actions of kings and queens. Secondly, being concerned mainly with the character

of the appeasers, in spite of much chronological detail, it is not a consecutive study of the events. There is nothing about the Nazis re-entry into the Rhineland or the 'Anschluss' of Austria. Most curious of all, the revealing history of the farcical military mission to Moscow is omitted, the only reference to it saying that 'in Moscow on August 15 the Anglo-French military talks with Russia had reached a fundamental problem', because 'Beck's fear of Russia was greater than his fear of Germany'. Thirdly, although the authors say it is not their intention to examine the case against appeasement, their whole story is a condemnation of the appeasers, but it is a condemnation that explains the basis of the appeasers' actions only in moral terms. We are told 'appeasement was an affair of the heart', 'appeasement was an attitude of mind rooted in pro-Germanism . . . it was close to Christian sentiments of fair play and forgiveness' (p. 23), 'appeasement sprang from sympathy as well as fear . . . sympathy for the dynamism of autocracy' (p. 24), 'appeasement was sincere and underhand, it was also muddled and uncertain. The muddle came from a sense of guilt, the uncertainty from the need to work in the dark' (p. 203). True, the authors say 'anti-communism, like anti-semitism and francophobia, was never far below the surface of appeasement' (p. 41). But since this narrative gives no real background of events, anti-communism becomes, as in this quotation, only one factor among many, instead of a basic expression of the whole character of British imperialist policy.

A striking contrast is provided by the work of the Soviet historian Professor Trukhanovsky, the editor of the Soviet journal *Voprosy Istorii*

(Problems of History) which is unfortunately not available in English. Here we have an account of British foreign policy in the interwar years which is not concerned with superficialities, which takes account of all factors in their relative importance, which treats British policy against the background of the general crisis of capitalism and the British capitalist situation, which in short gives a Marxist analysis. He also makes use of the voluminous available documents, but it is interesting to note that he does not rely merely on capitalist sources but makes frequent reference to labour and communist statements, including many quotations from *Labour Monthly*. The first half of the book begins with the creation of the Versailles-Washington system and goes up to the important study of British foreign policy in the period of the world economic crisis. The second half covers the well-known appeasement period. In this review it is only possible to note some features which distinguish this book from capitalist histories. Firstly the author is not deceived by the 'double-talk' of diplomatic language but examines facts behind British policy. Secondly, he analyses the intensified imperialist antagonisms in this period, which expose any pretence that the imperialists (British or other) were trying to pursue a policy of peace. The basic antagonism was that between capitalism and socialism and it determined Britain's bankrupt policy of using Germany against the Soviet Union. The general picture throughout the period is one of British capitalists pursuing an arch-reactionary line at a time when great progressive changes were taking place in the world. They tried to continue an old policy which they were not strong enough to enforce in a world

situation that they did not understand. Trukhanovsky also points out that the British labour movement under right-wing leadership has its share of responsibility for the war, not because it was against preparing for war as the Tories allege, but because it did not fight to change the British policy making for war. Today we are faced with a return to the fatal policy of the inter-war years by building up German neo-nazism as a weapon against the Soviet Union. The lesson of those years still needs to be learnt.

CLEMENS DUTT.

Economic Growth and Underdeveloped Countries

Maurice Dobb

Lawrence & Wishart. 64 pp. 3s. 6d.

IN THIS BOOKLET Maurice Dobb has produced a veritable masterpiece of clarity and conciseness. Despite the mystery-shrouded phrases about 'balance of payments', 'underdeveloped countries', 'aid and trade', and even 'growth', with which capitalist economists love to clothe the relative nonsense they contrive to produce in earning their bread and butter, Dobb has raised the whole subject into an unanswerable argument for Socialism.

It is concise in that Dobb has eschewed all the extraneous by-paths trodden by these same economists: he has concentrated on showing that it is no matter of charity that these ex-colonial countries need—a contention to which liberal economists are driven—thus exposing the emptiness of the general run of the whole capitalist group of economists. For Dobb shows succinctly how this exposes the inevitable imperialist character of the already developed countries. They simply cannot hide the fact that imperialism means ex-

ploitation ever more intensified, for they are incapable themselves of providing aid without strings to any colonial, semi-colonial or ex-colonial country.

The booklet brings out with utmost clarity that the more a country is capitalist developed, the slower it will continue to develop, in complete contrast to the ever increasing speed of the development of socialist lands. The kind of products that are bringing capitalist countries to a grinding halt are the very products that the colonial lands most need—in essence capital goods, machines to make more machines. For it is these goods that capitalists, for fear of competition amongst themselves, just will not supply colonies with, except in special cases, again from fear of competition, but this time from the socialist countries (e.g. the famous case of the steel industries that Britain, U.S.A. and Germany in the end agreed to build for India, but only after the Soviet Union had started to build one themselves for the Indian Government). Dobb shows that the slow ordered progression as advised by the imperialists when they offer their aid with strings, will put off the colony's development almost for centuries, if indeed it does not entirely obstruct it, so perpetuating imperialist exploitation. The real solution for the colonial type countries is not to import primitive hand ploughs or out of date ('second hand') machinery, as seriously suggested by some of the capitalist economists, but rather the most up-to-date machinery they can possibly utilise, consistent with their capabilities. This will economise on their labour power, potential or otherwise, and enable them to start building new machines with the help of those they have bought. Thus they would rely all the time the less

on trying to increase their old time exports of raw materials and food stuffs, each, in effect, a principal source of imperialists' profits—exploitation. Such a process must be intensified says Dobb, by ever increasing their own savings at home on a scale which will bring them to their goal of reasonable development within decades—not centuries, as propounded by the portentous warnings of capitalist economists—and so raise their standard of living.

Dobb brings out clearly that such a policy will need the development of increasingly socialist organisation of their economies and a unity of groups of countries to share the most advanced of the machine products they need. This will enable them not merely to develop their own internal markets but also to organise their mutual external markets, in order to start exporting the manufactured goods that such developments will progressively produce, and raise their standard of living.

Socialism and unity are naturally on the lips of the peoples of all colonial type countries. Dobb provides a full context for the arguments of the rising socialist section of these countries (interlarding his line wherever necessary with simple explanations of the 'mysteries' of capitalist economists), in their advocacy of the proper development of their lands free from capitalist exploitation.

H.R.

The Bolshoi Ballet

Yuri Slonimsky

Central Books. 174 pp. 17s. 6d.

YURI Slonimsky's book is a magnificent introduction to the repertoire and dancers of the Bolshoi ballet. It is virtually a new work, for since it was first published, the author has been able to compare the work of

Soviet ballet with performances by foreign companies. This has given him the opportunity of taking a fresh look at his compatriots and assessing the value of their work before their own audiences. The third chapter entitled 'Our Point of View' is a brilliant exposition of the Soviet view of realism in ballet. It is one that should be read not only by audiences, but also by dancers and choreographers everywhere. It can be said to sum up in the clearest and briefest way, the need for ballet to reflect life as it was, is, and will be lived through the expression of actions, moods and emotions of performers, who live their lives through dance. In ballet the content is all important, particularly when it determines—as it must—the form the work will take without rejecting the valuable elements from the past.

In order to arrive at this clear exposition of Soviet aesthetic principles and the part they play in shaping ballet, Slonimsky carries his readers through a brief historical summary of the long life and performance of the Bolshoi Theatre. He pauses only to stress the importance of some native or foreign artist, whose influence has left its mark on the present day dancer or repertoire, and the training that all working in ballet must undergo. He then analyses the present ballets and the work of the prominent Bolshoi artists, many of whom will be responsible for the success of the London visit.

Slonimsky's book thus covers the factors which mould this great collective and should appeal to all who believe in the art of ballet as an art for everyone. For his last few words are given to the interchange of ideas between dancers and audiences, a most valuable and prominent feature of Soviet artistic life.

JOAN LAWSON.

Brave Moments

To strive is to live, to rest is to decay.

THIS was a favourite saying of a remarkable Englishwoman. Of the blood and bone of Britain's industrial workers, Annie Kenney deserves to be remembered in this year of opportunity, 1963. Very few of the influential fighters for women's rights 50 or 60 years ago were working class women. A married woman's lack of rights over non-existent family property could scarcely be felt as the over-riding anomaly; where no one had more than rudimentary schooling, the right of women to higher education was seldom seen as the first need; if working men had not found a way to use their vote to improve their lot, could much gain be expected from votes for women? But Annie Kenney saw beyond all that. A mass leader of industrial workers and deeply feeling their problems herself, she led by causing activity in others, not by being an admired leader way out ahead. A leading Suffragette, she never allowed the scope of women's rights to be whittled down merely to the suffrage. A lawyer who had had to advise her and other distinguished Suffragettes, when they were under attack before World War I, told me years later 'Miss Kenney was far the best of them, brilliant as they were. She was quite indomitable.'

He should have lived to see another, a Yorkshirewoman, our Betty Ambatielos, put up her brave battle. Last month she brushed aside the painted cardboard figures of royalty and court, their massive forces of protectors, and those tawdry Top People types of a ruling class, 'mostly without honour or honesty, who should be at once deprived of their class privilege, and taught such simple jobs as their capacity and morals make them capable of', to quote a *Scots* reader. In breaking through all barriers she certainly caused great activity in others in the struggle for freedom, democracy and decency in Greece and elsewhere. You follow a fine tradition, Betty—and set one. In the short-lived Paris Commune of 1871, first working class state in world history, if you look at contemporary drawings and accounts, what is striking is the stress laid upon the tenderness of the men and the courage of the women Communards. Such qualities are the natural fruit of equality and comradeship in a great cause. Brave moments bring out a glimpse of what natural relations between people will be universally in the future. That is why young people find them so inspiring. There have been many

brave moments lately. One such resulted in a beautiful letter, fit to frame, from ten members of The Women's Group of the Sydenham Communist Party: 'Greetings to our very own, most feminine of the astronauts, Valentina. We send as a celebration the enclosed for the funds of *Labour Monthly*, with our love.' And we here celebrate with you—Anne, Margaret, Olive, Jennifer, Beulah, Doris, Doreen, Mollie, Mary and Joan.

Amongst other interesting fund letters this month was one from a young Lancashire reader, who has been reading *L.M.* bound volumes of the war years. He sends a donation 'as a small repayment for the enlightenment, intellectual stimulation and thorough Marxist education I got from doing it—brilliant expositions of Socialist theory on problems of war, capitalism and the workers as well as first-rate examinations of current questions. How I envy older readers!' Think of that, older readers; and maybe your own bound volumes might well go circulating amongst the younger people, say, in the peace movement; to cover crucial times you have lived through—like the Popular Fronts in France and Spain; Munich; the Finnish War; the Second Front; Potsdam, Hiroshima and the Bomb; The Yangtse, China and Korea; Congo—what a succession of unlearned lessons! Charge them a few pence for the fund as you circulate, perhaps—but circulate!

ANGELA TUCKETT.

Suffolk.

A small donation in memory of my father, Tom Peppercorn, who died June 29, at 91. A worker in the labour movement since the days of Philip Snowden, he was a reader since the first number; and I am sure he would have supported it financially had he been able.

J. W. PEPPERCORN.

£69 3s. 6d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: 'Daisy Bell', £10; 'Windfall', £10; H.H., £10; G.F., £10; B. Ainley, 10s; S. Turner (for Daisy Mendez, Cuba), 5s; E. Strachan Rogers, £3 3s; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; L. Bates, 5s; H. Brindle, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 2s; Oldham Branch, 1s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; R.F.B., £3; 'Backslider', 12s 6d; 'Anon', Whitchurch, 1s; 'G.I.', 1s; A. Corbett, £1; M. Brandt, 2s 6d; 'L'Humanité', 5s; 'S. Mill', £1; 'In memory of Joe Brien', 3s; D. H. Strathern and friends, 10s; B. W. Mackay, 6s; S. Townsend, 12s 6d; S. Morrissy, 10s; 'Oliver Twist and friends', 15s; B.J.M., 5s; Nellie Usher, 2s 6d; 'Pax', 2s 6d; R. Dodd, £1; F.G.A. (Canada), 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; E.J.B., 10s; R. McLeod, 5s; 'The Butcher family', 10s; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: Mr. and Mrs. E. Williams, £1; J. McKinnon, £1 1s; Marie Philibert, 10s; P. Montebello, 9s; H. S. Harrison, 9s; Gladys Driver, 19s; E. Thomas ('In memory of Julian Grimau'), 5s; C. Eggleton, 9s; D. Brammer, 3s; Coldharbour Communist Party, £2; James Dunn, 5s; E. M. Berlyn, 5s; J. W. Thompson, 4s; F. H. Oldaker, 9s; Mrs. A.B. (Canada), £2; H.J.P. (U.S.A.), 10s.

Our thanks to you all.
Co-op. No. L.99482.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

NEW SUBSCRIPTION RATES

SPECIAL CONCESSION.....

AND DELIVERED TO YOUR DOOR!

(All Post Free)

Second Class Mail (Unsealed Envelope)

Great Britain	One year 21s., six months 10s. 6d.
Overseas	One year 24s., six months 12s.
Canada	One year \$3.50
U.S.A.	One year \$3.50

First Class Mail (Sealed Envelope)

Great Britain	One year 23s., six months 11s. 6d.
Commonwealth Countries	One year 27s. (Canada \$4.50)
Outside Commonwealth.....	One year 35s. (U.S.A. \$5.50)

INSURANCE EXPERTS LTD

are independent Insurance Brokers dealing with all insurance companies and Lloyd's. Our full-time job is to keep abreast of all developments and to apply our knowledge in your interests. We represent YOU, and use our expertise to select for you the best policy to fit your individual needs. Our remuneration comes from the company which we select for you, so our advice to you is free. It costs no more for you to avail yourself of our knowledge, and often costs much less. Please give us the pleasure of quoting for all your insurance and mortgage needs.

1a Well Road, London, N.W.3.
HAM 5421, Evgs. HAM 6269.

Kindly mention *Labour Monthly* when enquiring.

A HISTORY

of Twenty, Thirty and even Forty years ago!

We have a few **BOUND VOLUMES** of earlier years for sale.

Apply to:

THE MANAGER,
134, Ballards Lane, N.3.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class Ads.', *Labour Monthly*, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

DUPLICATING, tape-typing, verbatim shorthand translating. Mabel Eyles, 10, Beaconsfield Rd., N.11. ENT. 3324.

WE BUY books, pamphlets, Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: RIV 6807. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6. URGENTLY REQUIRED—All back numbers of *Labour Monthly* from 1921-1930 inclusive and 1939.

Labour Monthly

Bound Volume, 1962

It's a history of the year and
a permanent record

ORDER NOW

From your usual newsagents,
price £1.5.0d., or send
10s. 6d., plus 1s. 6d. postage and
your loose copies as soon as
possible to:

**THE MANAGER,
134, Ballards Lane,
LONDON, N.3**

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating
by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

For all interested in the fight for Peace and
Progress in the Countryside and the problems
of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.

Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or
Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD
27, Bedford St. Strand, London, W.C.2.

NEW L.R.D. PAMPHLET

'Organising Workplace Safety'

by John L. Williams

1s. or 1s. 2½d. post free

Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

THE ENGELS-LAFARGUE CORRESPONDENCE

Volume III

The final volume of the exchange of correspondence between Engels and the French socialist Paul Lafargue and his wife Laura (Marx's daughter). This volume contains letters from the years 1891-95; letters of an earlier period which came to light only after the publication of Volumes I and II; an essay on the lives and work of the correspondents; and the Index to the entire Correspondence.

9s.

All three volumes: 21s.

LAWRENCE & WISHART

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor : R. Palme Dutt

TRADES UNION CONGRESS EDITION

PROBLEMS OF TRADE UNIONISM

The Editor

★

HARRY WEAVER

A Case for Closer Working

NEDDY & NICKY

J. R. Campbell

★

A Special Article on British Guiana

by

PREMIER CHEDDI JAGAN

SEPTEMBER 1963

Two Shillings

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL. XIV

No. 9

SEPTEMBER . 1963

CONTENTS

- Notes of the Month: Problems of Trade Unionism.** *Structure and Struggle—Shop Stewards and Working Class Democracy—Offensive on Shop Stewards—Lesson of Fords—Working Class Education—Employers' Amalgamation—Swedish Mecca?—Obstacles to Industrial Unionism—'What are we here for?'—Modernisation and Automation—'Planning' and Socialism—Planning for Wage Restraint.....* **R.P.D.** 385
- A Case for Closer Working.** General Secretary of NFBTO argues for amalgamation and strengthening of unions to combat present-day problems.....**Harry Weaver** 400
- The Siamese Twins—Neddy and Nicky.** An exposure of the reactionary wages policy of both bodies.....**J. R. Campbell** 403
- Guiana Crossroads.** Premier Jagan throws light on Guiana's problems.....**Dr. Cheddi Jagan** 410
- The Moscow Treaty.** A call to follow up this success with a non-aggression pact and the dismantling of Nato.....**Quaestor** 415
- Whose Failure in Housing?** President of National Association of Tenants and Residents condemns the Tory housing policy and calls for rent control and public ownership.....**Tom Vernon** 420
- Campaign for Education.** President of the London Teachers' Association calls for a real fight for educational advance.....**A. McMillan** 425
- Illustrations:** The Dublin Strike of 1913. 408-9
- Book Reviews:** 'The Railwaymen', Dr. Philip S. Bagwell: *C. R. Sweetingham*; 'Karl Marx', Arnold Kettle: *Alan Brown*. 429
- 'Relatively Immortal'.....**Angela Tuckett** 431

Notes of the Month

PROBLEMS OF TRADE UNIONISM

The ~~most~~ useful single step to modernise Britain's industrial labour structure would be the replacement of craft unions by unions representing whole industries.

(*Economist*, February 16, 1963.)

August 19, 1963

TIME brings its revenges. Once long ago in the old days of fire and ferment preceding the first world war the most ardent energies of militant trade unionists were directed to transform the crazy anarchic criss-cross structure of traditional British trade unionism into the revolutionary pattern of industrial unionism, organising all the workers in a single workshop or a single industry into one union, thereby to confront the employers with the united mass strength of a single union in every industry and to be the more powerfully entrenched in order to advance to the conquest of industry. Nor have those efforts been without fruits. The National Union of Railwaymen, the Amalgamated Engineering Union and the National Union of Mineworkers are all a partial or more complete harvest of these pioneering efforts of the left. The ideal aim remains as a guiding principle. But now a stage has been reached when, in contrast to the age of *laissez-faire*, during which the self-obstructing sectionalism and confusion of the traditional trade union structure was found delightful and quaint and on the whole profitable by the employers, today the City organ of finance-capital proclaims that the modern business requirements of big monopoly organisation imperatively demand the replacement of the existing anarchic confusion by industrial unionism as a more convenient basis for efficient labour management.

Structure and Struggle

Some of the older pioneers might have rubbed their eyes at this picture. And some of their younger successors may really believe that this is progress. But nowadays it is the most responsible leaders of trade unionism who are compelled to point out, as Harry Weaver (to whom and to the builders everyone will today wish good luck in their battle which is in the forefront of the battle of the whole working class) very clearly shows in the article he has written for our current issue on the 'Case for Closer Working', that the real situation is not so simple. The historically inherited structure can-

not be so easily remodelled by a wave of the hand, like a plasticine puppet in the fingers of a child, to fit some theoretically chosen symmetrical pattern without regard to the living situation and conditions, however desirable an improvement of the present set-up undoubtedly is. The whole history of the trade union movement in this country has shown how structure has grown out of life, for good or for evil. Structure cannot be superimposed from without, but grows out of the struggle and the needs of the struggle.

Shop Stewards and Working Class Democracy

It is of course no puzzle why the modern big business megalithic monopoly combines have grown so tired of the crazy-paving pattern of trade union organisation in so many key industries, and especially in the most modern mass-production workshops, characterised by ceaseless changes of technique, a relentless productivity drive and the beginnings of automation, at the same time as the union organisation may be based on over a score of unions inherited from the days of ancient and honoured crafts, and in consequence requiring negotiation with over a score of executives or district committees. For precisely this multiple organisation in conditions of modern mass production and the conveyor belt has compelled the increasing role of the shop stewards, and of committees of the various shop stewards in a factory, not merely as dues collectors and liaison representatives of each particular union, but as the most direct representatives of the men on the spot, elected most often by them and reporting to them, working under the same conditions and knowing the problems, able to take up day-to-day questions on the spot promptly without the strangling protracted delays of the 'proper negotiating machinery', and expressing the unity of the workers and a kind of natural home-grown democracy.

Offensive on Shop Stewards

Such a situation is naturally horrifying to all the orderly disciplinary instincts of big business management or of the right-thinking class-cooperating conservative elements of the trade union bureaucracy. 'The shop stewards are exceeding their proper functions', we are told. Shop stewards are held up as the villains of the piece whenever any trouble happens. The press pillories the shop stewards and demands that union officials should take more effective steps to keep them in order. 'Communists!' is the abusive epithet hurled at them. In diplomatic conferences after the war, when the

Soviet representative used to quote resolutions of shop stewards' committees as expressions of popular opinion, Ernest Bevin used to dismiss them with a contemptuous wave of the hand. 'Every one knows the shop stewards are all Communists', he would say. A curious judgment, since most of them are more directly elected by the workers on the basis of personal knowledge and estimation of their qualities, and at shorter intervals, than some of the incumbents of life offices in the higher reaches of the union hierarchy. But of course every one knows that only a minority are Communists. What is meant by the abusive epithet 'Communist!' is that they are regarded with suspicion as direct representatives of the workers, of democracy from below, of working class democracy—of everything that is abhorrent to the proper official spirit.

Lesson of Fords

So the offensive is let loose against the shop stewards, not only by the employers, but also by reactionary sections of trade union officialdom joining in the hunt. Discipline. Purges. Victimisation. Dismissals. The infamous case of the dismissal of seventeen shop stewards by the American-controlled management of the giant enterprise of Fords at Dagenham has produced a shameful picture of the infinitely protracted delays, hesitations, cross-purposes, paralysis and final impotence of the existing trade union machinery to secure the reinstatement of the victimised men (the justice of whose case was recognised by the trade union official representatives and leadership) and thereby failure to protect the most elementary trade union rights: a trade union movement of nine millions which can be kicked in the gutter by the first Americanised petty dictator who chooses to treat it with contempt. This is a black episode in the past year's history of trade unionism; and if it is not discussed and thrashed out, with all its lessons and implications, at the coming Trades Union Congress at Brighton, then that Congress is no true assizes of trade unionism; and all the large talk of Woodcock and the General Council majority about profound researches and enquiries into the proper function and structure of trade unionism becomes only a rhetorical cover for the real bankruptcy of servility and humiliation.

Two Methods with Shop Stewards

For of course the direct offensive of victimisation and dismissals is only one side of the strategy of capitalism and its attendant

officialdom to deal with the vexed problem of shop stewards. The other side of the medal is the planned approach to cajole, flatter, wheedle, bribe, train or indoctrinate in the hope to turn them into pliant instruments of those above rather than of those below. After the dismissals have been put through, after the purge has been enforced, so as to get rid of the boldest spirits and to intimidate the remainder with the spectre of the fate that awaits them if recalcitrant, and with the preceding practical demonstration of the inefficacy of the official trade union machinery to protect them, the new motto now becomes the benevolent gospel of the necessity to 'train' the shop stewards, with the due co-operation of enlightened management and right-minded trade union officialdom, in the proper performance of their approved functions.

'Educate Our Masters'

A Liberal Cabinet Minister nearly a century ago, faced with the alarming prospect of the 1867 Reform Bill extending the franchise to an upper section of the working class, declared that it would be necessary to 'educate our masters'. By that he meant to indicate the new aim to replace the remains of Chartist and radical traditions or independent workers' self-education, which had grown up in defiance of the previous policy of the ruling class to keep the workers in ignorance, by a new universal State system of elementary education based on principles approved by the governing class. So the first Elementary Education Act followed in 1870. Similarly today the plan is being pressed forward on all sides to organise systematic arrangements, with the benevolent co-operation of course of the management providing facilities and the sponsorship of official trade unionism, to assist in the selection of candidates and endorsement of projects for the purpose of training shop stewards and young aspirants to trade union positions, in a correct understanding of their duties and equipping the budding future Citrines with a right appreciation of the elementary principles of modern business organisation and labour-management relations.

Working Class Education

Undoubtedly the greatest possible extension of working class education for service in the working class movement is more important than ever. Undoubtedly training, both theoretical and practical, is more than ever needed for the increasingly complicated tasks of trade union leadership. The most progressive trade unions

have led the way in this field. It is only necessary to recall the pioneering work of the South Wales Miners and the Railwaymen who led the way in sponsoring and financing the old Central Labour College (in opposition to Ruskin College which was founded by wealthy American philanthropists to provide the old type of governing class education for selected workers), and the subsequent initiatives of the Engineers, Electricians, Miners on a national scale, Foundry Workers, Agricultural Workers, Fire Brigades Union and many others. From the Workers' Educational Association, founded originally at the beginning of the century in association with the universities and philanthropists, developed immediately after the first world war the Workers' Educational Trade Union Committee in closer association with the trade unions. The co-operative movement has done enormous work of lasting value in the sphere of education. Pressure on the General Council has been continuous, especially since the second world war, to organise and co-ordinate the whole system of working class education on an extended scale; and a very vast all-embracing project is now in process of being developed, to come into operation in 1964. But the key question always remains: What kind of education? Education for what?

Education On Whose Side?

William Morris used to say that it is only necessary to contemplate the social role of some supposedly highly educated people to realise that education alone is not enough 'unless socialistic principles form part of it'. Unless education is directed towards such a reconstruction of society, 'our education', he said, 'will but breed tyrants and cowards' (Letter to Mrs. Burne-Jones, 1883). 'Education towards Revolution' was his slogan. The battle for genuinely independent working class education, that is, education for class struggle (which means in modern terms education on the basis of Marxism) has a long and proud history from the earliest days of the working class movement. In our century it was the revolt of the worker-students and their Principal at Ruskin College in 1909 against being indoctrinated with bourgeois lies which led to the foundation of the old Central Labour College on the basis of militant trade union support, first in Oxford, then (after persecution there by university landlords) transferred to the old Penywern Road address at Earls Court—where in 1919 the writer of the present Notes as lecturer strove to teach the young Aneurin Bevan some of the principles of Marxism (not, it is to be feared, with much success, to judge from the out-

come and the subsequent somewhat turgid hotch-potch of eclectic ideas which scintillated in the brilliant confusion of his agile brain).

From the Old to the New

Independent Working Class Education and its vast array of Labour Colleges and classes, ever at war with the sycophant Workers' Educational Association, and with wonderful teachers like old Tommy Jackson, became a power in the land, and bred many militants. Forty-one years ago this journal became engaged in some controversy ('The British School of Marxism' reviewing the Plebs Textbook on Psychology in our issue of June, 1922, and 'More British Marxism' reviewing the Plebs Textbook on Imperialism in February, 1923) over signs of a trend to the dilution of Marxism in Plebs textbooks and classes. Since then the dilution has gone very much further, and scarcely a breath of the old independent militant spirit remains in what survives of that old movement. And now the Elders of the General Council—bless them all—are preparing to take over and absorb and organise and co-ordinate and control all the old outfits: Ruskin College, and the National Council of Labour Colleges, and the Workers' Educational Trade Union Committee, and possibly also some of the previously separate trade union schemes.

Watch Out!

If the intention is to carry forward the kind of thing that has been already done, to send the young aspirants to that hotbed of anti-Labour Toryism, the London School of Economics, or similar institutions and supposed sources of wisdom, the crop for the trade union movement may prove painful. Alert trade unionists will do well not to let this item go by on the agenda with a yawn, but to keep their ears cocked and their eyes skinned and be ready to raise merry hell if the scheme is going to be to hand over the next generation of trade union officials to be trained by the professional apologists and hired prizefighters (as Marx called them*) of capitalist so-called 'economic theory'—that is, the theory of how to rob the workers most smoothly and efficiently, how to falsify the facts of the robbery, and how to justify the robbery behind a hundred pretexts.

*'In place of disinterested enquirers, hired prizefighters; in place of genuine scientific research, the bad conscience and the evil intent of apologetic' (MARX, Preface to the Second Edition of *Capital*, 1873).

Employers' Amalgamation

In the conditions of modern industry it is not surprising that it is the big monopolists who clamour for industrial unionism, while trade unionists are more aware of the difficulties. Indeed, there is reason to believe that the recent amalgamation of the three previous employers' organisations (Federation of British Industries, British Employers' Confederation and Association of British Manufacturers), has been mainly planned, not so much for the purpose of big monopolist integration on a national scale (the biggest monopolies have their own direct access to government, and have only limited respect for these much publicised organisations), but as a means to stimulate and assist a corresponding reorganisation of the Trades Union Congress. The result of the merger, commented *Commerce*, the official organ of the London Chamber of Commerce in its August issue,

could be a body which embraces more employers and is more fully representative of them, at least in the field of incomes and wages and employer-employee relations, than the T.U.C. can at present claim to be for labour. That in itself could be an advantage if it accelerated the reorganisation of the T.U.C., which has long been recognised as desirable.

Rumour indeed has it that the T.U.C. leadership was not unconnected with the encouragement of this move.

Swedish Mecca?

So long as militant trade unionists were pressing for industrial unionism the main body of the conservative leadership, secure in the status quo, could dismiss their fervour with an indulgent smile. But when now the big monopolists have begun to prod the placid hind-sides of the same conservative leadership and ordered them to be up to date and get busy with reorganisation, a sudden flurry of concern and activity and eager preaching of the gospel of modernisation and setting up of vast processes of enquiry has begun in the highest circles of trade unionism. Only an interim report will be presented this year; the full enquiry will take two years, last year's Congress was informed. Obedient to the new gospel, the pilgrims of the General Council journeyed to the Swedish Mecca, so that the oldest trade union movement in the world could learn from its grandchildren how it all ought to be done. Sweden, the paradise where class divisions have disappeared, where nobody is too rich and nobody is too poor, the paradise of the Great Middle Way. Sweden, where 0.2 per cent of the population own two-thirds of the

entire stock of all companies; where 2.5 per cent own the stock of all companies; where three families (the Wallenbergs, Wehtjes and Wennergrens) own the vastest tracts of land and forest, iron ore deposits and hydro-power resources, and dominate the key sectors of finance and industry; and where the highest suicide rate in the world is not perhaps entirely because people are all too happy. But the General Council delegation soon realised that the highly centralised structure of Swedish trade unionism, built up from above under the guiding control of the Social Democratic Party (the exact reverse of the British experience) could offer little help for the historical ramshackle structure of British trade unionism operating in a different and far more complicated economic set-up. The delegation came back empty-handed.

Obstacles to Industrial Unionism

It is easy for the big monopolists and directors of the modern giant plants to complain of the vexatious multiplicity of unions and demand the elegant simplicity of single industrial unions to parallel their own integrated or nearly integrated monopoly combines. How far more convenient and satisfactory it would be to settle everything in the smooth composure of well-appointed boardrooms, remote from the grease and clamours of the factory, with a handful of skilled negotiators from a single centralised national leadership, without a host of separate executives to consult, and with a permanent official of the single union always on the spot to deal with the questions of the men and nip any trouble in the bud. It is easy for Professor Jack to report, as he did last April, that the 22 unions at Fords in Dagenham ought to appoint a single full-time official to deal with all questions. But real life seldom responds to the naïve tidiness of the academic mind. It did not prove so easy for 22 independent unions to hand over their business to an official of only one of them. The method of the joint shop stewards' committee, elected from below, and responsible to those below, is a far more democratic and also practical method of dealing with the problem of the multiplicity of unions, and fulfilling a realist first step towards the principles of industrial unionism (while needing in the existing conditions to be combined with the proper functioning of the branch and district and executive committee machinery and elections of the separate unions). But the Americanised management threw a spanner into the works of this sensible solution. Such a democratic approach to a solution is of course equally abhorrent to the academic

and to the orthodox official trade union mind. So after the pilgrimage to Sweden the General Council in May finally rejected industrial unionism as impracticable for the reasons summarised by *The Times* correspondent:

It was argued that the differences between industries make the uniformity of industrial unions undesirable. Efficiently applied, industrial unionism would mean the complete transformation of at least 80 per cent of existing unions. It would mean the end of the two huge general unions, and of craft unions, many of them small. Altogether, the unions would not have it.

(*The Times*, May 11, 1963.)

The General Council Report to Brighton has subsequently made this clear.

Amalgamation Offers from Whales

Baulked and blocked by the obstacles from attempting the simplified Swedish approach to a neat symmetrical pattern of industrial unionism integrated with a parallel pattern of the employers, Mr. Woodcock and his colleagues have found themselves compelled to fall back on the old and well tried alternative of endeavouring to promote and encourage amalgamation in the hope to bring some order into the untidy house of British trade unionism. The recent period has undoubtedly seen some useful amalgamations, as among the Printers to form the new National Graphical Association, or between the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths. But there are obvious limits to what this approach can accomplish in relation to the larger general problem. The two general unions, comprising close on one-quarter of total trade union membership, represent a different principle from either craft or industrial unions, and sprawl across a variety of industries. The giant union of the Engineers comprises at the same time an industrial and a craft character, and holds shared territory in, for example, the railway workshops. Nor is the tenacity of life of some of the smaller unions without reasons. It is true that Jack Cooper for the General and Municipal Workers has recently suggested that the solution for the multiplicity of unions would be for his big general union to absorb many smaller unions; and he mentioned seventeen smaller unions which might usefully be amalgamated into his union, or with which he was in negotiations. But it is probable that this solution of the whale swallowing the sprats will not find universal favour. Above all, the principle of the national sovereignty of each union, however small, in contrast to the continental type of centralised trade union federation, is under existing conditions a vital democratic principle, not to be lightly

surrendered. For this sovereignty is the indispensable protection of progressive unions from control by a reactionary centralised trade union apparatus, which under the present dominant leadership, is in fact hand in glove with the employers. Nothing is more obvious than the present unconcealed desire of capitalist policy, of the Tory Government, the employers and the big monopoly press organs to see established a centralised control by the present dominant T.U.C. leadership over the unions and over strike action.

‘What Are We Here For?’

Foiled again in the efforts to find a neat solution for tidying up trade unionism and establishing the authority of the T.U.C. central leadership, either through industrial unionism or through amalgamation, Mr. Woodcock and his enquiring colleagues have returned to the basic question of purpose which he posed at last year’s Congress when he accepted the Post Office Workers’ resolution instructing the General Council to ‘examine and report on the possibility of reorganising the structure of both the T.U.C. and the British trade union movement with a view to making it better fitted to meet modern industrial conditions’. He explained that this would take time, and that after the first year (that is, at this year’s Congress at Brighton) they would only be able to report on the results of

enquiring among ourselves into the purpose of trade unions and the effect of changes in circumstances upon trade union purpose and function. Structure, particularly in the trade union movement, is a function of purpose . . . when we know what we are here for, then we can talk about the kind of structure that will enable us to do what we are here for.

A Curious Dilemma

It might seem odd for the General Secretary of a Trades Union Congress of nine million members to be asking at this time of day: ‘What are we here for?’ One does not imagine the Chairman of I.C.I. clasp a hand to his forehead and exclaiming: ‘What is I.C.I. for?’ The answer is obvious: Profits. In the case of the trade unions the position is more tricky for the conscientious orthodox right-wing modern official. If the old-fashioned answer is offered: Wages, *i.e.*, to improve the wages and conditions of the members, the question may arise whether wage restraint in co-operation with a Tory Government and the employers is really the best way to achieve this aim. But if the new-fashioned answer is attempted, that the trade unions must now rise to think of higher things, of the ‘national interest’ and ‘the requirements of the economic situation’

and 'national planning' with the Government and the employers, then inevitably the questions arise: Planning for what? In whose interest? Planning to pay for an arms bill of eighteen hundred million pounds and debt interest of a thousand millions and inflated profits of thousands more millions? Or planning for the benefit of nine million trade unionists, for the ordinary working people who are exploited? The ghost that Mr. Woodcock has raised may yet haunt him like Banquo.

Modernisation and Automation

The necessity to adapt trade unionism to meet modern conditions, to fit into the ever more rapidly changing process of modernisation and new technique and automation, has now become the favourite current formula on all sides. But what is meant by this is not always so clear. Does it mean the necessity to fight redundancy dismissals, pit closures, rail closures? But these are precisely what are described in the mouths of some spokesmen as the inevitable modernisation of technique to which trade unionism should adapt itself. At the Mineworkers' Annual Conference in July the presidential address of Sidney Ford declared:

To those who are ever ready to applaud and glorify the progress that has been made through the introduction of new and modern machinery and equipment into the pits of Soviet Russia, Poland and other Iron Curtain countries, but would have us believe that similar action in our own industry would spell disaster for our members, I would say that this is hypocrisy in the extreme. . . .

I believe we are far more likely to succeed in achieving our aims as a union if we recognise and accept that great technological changes are taking place and if we make up our minds to take advantage of this to improve the standard of efficiency within the industry.

Thus according to this analysis modernisation is a classless process, whose operation and social consequences are regarded as identical under capitalism or under socialism. Hence it should be a matter of indifference to the workers whether it takes place under capitalism or under socialism. Indeed, those who attack the harmful consequences of capitalist rationalisation (pit closures, restriction of coal output, redundancy dismissals, unemployment), and praise the beneficial consequences of the advances of technique under socialism in bringing new world records of the rate of increasing output and rising standards, are angrily denounced as 'hypocrites'.

A Memory of Herbert Smith

Sidney Ford might with advantage recall the experience of his predecessor in office, the grand old plain-spoken cloth-capped Herbert Smith of Yorkshire. Herbert Smith went on the famous T.U.C. Delegation to the Soviet Union in 1924—the Delegation which reported that ‘in Russia the workers are the ruling class’, and whose experience led the General Council to report in 1925 that in Russia

a Workers’ Republic is rising, Phoenix like, from the ashes of the most despotic régime of history.

(General Council Report to the 1925 Trades Union Congress, p. 70.)

Talking over his experiences on his return, Herbert Smith related how he had been down many of the mines, and that, while he found much to approve and in advance of our conditions, like the six-hour day and holidays with pay, he had pointed out to them that much of their equipment was out of date, worn out, obsolete, far behind British levels. To this, he related, the Russian miners retorted: ‘That may be true; but they are our mines’. ‘Aye’, he chuckled, as he told this, ‘they had summat there’. Of course nationalisation was on the programme of the old Miners’ Federation of Great Britain; this was the era of the battle of the Sankey Commission. But in this characteristic experience was expressed at once the traditional pride of the skilled worker in the tools of his trade and the traditional unconscious assumption of the old trade union movement in practice, whatever programmes might say, of the capitalist environment as the permanent natural order in Britain.

Nationalisation and Socialism

Since then, nationalisation of the coal industry has been won by the battle of the miners and the whole working class movement. The miners have won improvements, thanks to the strength of their union. But bitter experience has brought the keen realisation to miners, as to railwaymen, that nationalisation in a capitalist environment and society, nationalisation of an auxiliary minority sector, exploited and treated as a milch-cow for the greater profit of the main sector of private monopolist industry, is a very different thing from socialism. Robens and Beeching are the expression of this kind of nationalisation. Closures and cuts and restrictions, not for public benefit, but for greater profit become the order of the day. Ah! but, we are told, the replacement of coal by oil is an inevitable expression of modernisation and the advance of technique; it would

be Luddite folly to battle against it. Memories go back to the day a dozen years ago, when Morrison was dispatching the warships to Abadan to counter the shocking outrage of Iranian oil nationalisation, and a Communist member of the Miners' Executive moved a resolution of protest, which was vigorously opposed by Sam Watson on the grounds that Middle Eastern oil was the lifeblood of Britain's economy. Time brings its revenges. But in fact the advance of oil and new sources of power need not bring the decline of coal in an expanding economy, that is, in a socialist economy. British coal output, which was 287 million tons in 1913, and fallen to 194 million tons in 1960, may now be struggling to maintain a target of 200 million tons. In the Soviet Union the Russian coal output of 29 million tons in 1913 had become 513 million in 1960, and in the latest plan, so far from proposing to recede before the parallel titanic advance of new sources of power, has set the target of 700 million tons by 1970 and 1,200 million by 1980. No, Mr. Ford; capitalism and socialism are not the same thing.

'Planning' and Socialism

'Planning' may now be the favourite catchword (picked up like the National Health Service, Holidays with Pay, and so much else, decades late from the Soviet Union) of the Tory Government and their T.U.C. associates in Neddy. But it is impossible to plan for public advantage without public ownership. This is not a question of doctrinaire presumptions. It is plain common sense. You cannot plan your town if you do not own it. The experience of London after the Great Fire, and again after the Blitz, when each time the beautiful plans of the architects have been wrecked by private property interests, have proved this. All the devices to wheedle and cajole, bribe or order the private capitalists, all the tricks of 'incentives' and 'disincentives' to induce them to obey some other law than the search for the highest profit, cannot get round this elementary foundation of capitalist economy. Capitalism can plan for war and destruction. Capitalism can plan for restriction. Capitalism can plan to cut down the standards of the people for higher profits. But capitalism cannot plan for social benefit.

Computer Socialism

Computers are now all the rage as the wonder-working wizards of the modern era of new technique. If fed with the correct facts, in five minutes their metallic mechanism can produce the answer which

it would take a thousand human calculators five thousand working years to reach. It is related that in America, where computers have been brought to the most marvellous perfection, the computer to beat all computers was evolved at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. So the decision was taken, in place of the fallible human mechanism of the Planning Boards like our Neddy, to use this magical computer to guide the new era of planning. All the correct facts were carefully fed into its interior: the national productive capacity in the various spheres; technical possibilities of expansion; future population estimates; consumption requirement estimates; automation and employment problems. What should be the correct answer to guide the planners? For five minutes the machine ground away, digesting the facts; then out came the slip bearing the answer. The slip said: 'Socialism'. The assembled multi-millionaire tycoons looked at one another in wild apprehension. But the biggest multi-millionaire did not hesitate. He drew out a revolver and shot the hundred-million dollar monster in the very centre of its mechanical heart. Once again the free world had been saved by the initiative and enterprise of the great captains of industry.

Planning for Wage Restraint

The essence of the capitalist planning of Neddy and Nicky and all their brethren is wage restraint in the interest of higher profits. All the rest is a flummery of beautiful statistical tables and graphs and hypothetical targets of how much this and that might be increased to achieve a growth rate of such and such—without the slightest sign of a glimmer of understanding of how the capitalist mechanism really works, or the real storms that may blow up, or, indeed, are already foreshadowed by such warning signals as the United States raising of interest rates and the gathering battle of the giants of the jungle over the balance of payments, with each trying to throw the costs of a worsening international economic situation on its rival. The exquisite impartiality of Nicky in demanding sacrifices from both sides, both from capital and labour, was demonstrated in its Report in setting out the new approach required:

It requires on the part of the unions a lesser degree of readiness in times of full employment to exploit their dominant bargaining power, and on the part of the employers a greater reluctance in times of high consumer demand to buy industrial peace and its continued profits at the price of passing on the increase in costs to the consuming public.

Majestic impartiality. The trade unions should be less ready to demand higher wages. The employers should be less ready to concede higher wages. Equal sacrifices from both sides. What could be fairer?

On Guard!

It is no use the General Council trying to pretend that Nicky is the Bad Fairy, but Neddy is the Good Fairy. They are like, as J. R. Campbell unanswerably proves in his article in this month's issue, Siamese Twins. The real object of both is wage restraint. And Harold Wilson's speech to the Transport Workers' Biennial Conference has shown that this is also the line of thought of the prospective Labour Government presented, as usual, under cover of attempts to sugar the pill with proposals for a parallel restraint of profits—proposals which, as the previous experience with the wage-freeze of Stafford Cripps showed, are never fulfilled in practice. Let the unions beware. A sharpening battle is opening before us, already under the present Tory Government, but also under the prospective Labour Government, which the unions are correctly fighting to establish, but whose policy in relation to every class issue they should more actively strive to influence.

R.P.D.

LABOUR MONTHLY

FORTY YEARS AGO

The treatment of unemployment by the General Council of the Congress is a sorry tale. . . . The past policy of letting the unemployed look after themselves should cease. The idea that the unemployed are a class apart from those workers who happen to be at work must be killed. These things and defects in our present methods can be altered by the General Council calling together representatives from all workers' organisations, forming a joint committee, and then using the whole resources of the movement to bring about a successful conclusion to this campaign for 'Work or Full Maintenance for the unemployed'. If this is done we shall find that the ranks are rapidly closed and that complete unity will prevail. Enthusiasm would be roused as a result of the unemployed problem at last being tackled in a practical manner, instead of light and airy talk and resolutions of pious sympathy.

(From 'The Issues Before Trades Union Congress' by Harry Pollitt, *Labour Monthly*, September, 1923.)

Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties

A CASE FOR CLOSER WORKING

Harry Weaver

General Secretary, National Federation of Building Trade Operatives

WHILST writing this article it was encouraging to hear that two printing trade unions had secured a decisive vote in favour of amalgamation. One of the biggest obstacles to establishing a more unified trade union movement is, of course, the difficulty of persuading the rank and file to vote in sufficient numbers to satisfy the requirements of the law—even more difficult in industries like building where the workers are more mobile than in the print. This is a problem requiring urgent action by the Trades Union Congress in an effort to secure changes in the laws governing amalgamations and transfer of engagements.

Judging by declarations of some learned professors and industrial correspondents, the present structure of the British trade union movement should be completely dismantled and re-erected in accord with a pattern similar to that of the Swedish or German trade union movements. Indeed, some of our own amalgamationists think along similar lines. But one of the main stumbling blocks to closer working amongst trade unions is the failure on the part of some people to appreciate that you cannot sweep aside a century and a half of historical growth and tradition by merely passing a resolution at some national conference.

Admittedly the British trade union movement is outdated and is in desperate need of a change in organisational structure and methods of administration. It would be fair to say that whilst there is almost universal agreement as to the need for unification and modernisation, there is considerable difference of opinion as to the methods of achievement. Personally, I believe in the desirability of organisation by industry, but after twenty-five years' experience as a full-time trade union official I appreciate that its achievement in this country within the foreseeable future is extremely unlikely. I cannot imagine that the membership of the Transport & General Workers' Union, the largest and most influential of British trade unions—not to mention the National Union of General & Municipal Workers—whose conception of organisation is diametrically opposed to industrial unionism, would readily agree to their union being dismembered for the purpose of establishing somebody else's conception of the ideal trade union structure. Nor can I observe

signs that a number of general craft unions are as yet ready to shed membership employed in a wide variety of industries, in the interests of efficiency.

If it is accepted that we cannot overnight achieve the ideal, what then can be done? Firstly, as George Woodcock has said, we must identify 'the purpose of trade unions and the effect of changes in circumstances upon trade union purpose and function'. Put in the simplest terms, my understanding of the purpose of a trade union is to unify the workers in common employment to ensure that the right of association is recognised and projected to the right of negotiation, with the object of establishing reasonable standards of living and decent working conditions. The fact that in the process this relatively simple proposition comes into headlong conflict with an economic system that only political action can overcome, is the justification for maintaining the political levy and establishing an alliance with a political party with a socialist policy—but extension of this theme is irrelevant to my purpose in this article.

If my simple identification of the purpose of the trade union movement is accepted, then industrial unionism is clearly the answer to our problems. But we have already accepted the fact that in present circumstances this is an idealist's dream; how else then can we strengthen the trade union movement, operate more efficiently and adapt our union structure to rapidly changing industrial procedures and techniques? I am of the opinion that too much pre-occupation with the possibility of establishing an ideal structure on Swedish or German lines obscures the steps that are immediately possible and practicable.

It is generally accepted that the existence of too many unions results in inefficiency and dissipation of administrative, financial, organising and technical resources. Let us first deal with the basic requirement of any organisation—finance. Competition for membership results in unions not making an economic charge for the services given; this, in turn, has the effect of unions being unable to provide the services essential for the protection of their members' interests in modern conditions. For example, whilst the building unions employ approximately one full-time official for every two thousand members, on the most complex and controversial problem confronting their members—payment by results—they have not one professional adviser employed, despite the fact that half a million members are affected. The basic requirement, therefore, is that the trade union movement as a whole, in order to

eliminate the evils of competition and provide services commensurate with modern industrial techniques, should agree a universal weekly contribution, one hour's pay or its equivalent. In no time at all (as the Amalgamated Union of Building Trade Workers have experienced), the membership would come to accept the idea of a fluctuating contribution and the agonising process of securing alterations to the rules governing the contributions by ballot votes would be ended for all time.

Secondly, on the basis of the recognised need for reducing the number of unions, having regard to existing circumstances, amalgamations of cognate trades, as in the case of the print unions, should be encouraged and expedited. For example, the woodworking crafts have everything to gain by joining forces.

Accepting the principle that the more united the workers are the more effective their approach to the employers' organisation, negotiating rights should be vested in the strongest and most influential unions in the particular industry concerned. Services to members could be considerably improved by recognising that in a given industry or sector of employment the interests of all trade unionists are indivisible, and unification of functions (provided jointly by pro rata payments in accordance with membership involved) could bring tremendous advantages along the following lines:

- (a) Central research, publicity and propaganda department, serving a single industry.
- (b) Central education department for workers in a particular industry.
- (c) Youth section with specialist officers.
- (d) Organising department, to resolve problems of recruitment and demarcation.
- (e) Professional services to meet problems of changing techniques.

The above-mentioned propositions are practical and possible and could be achieved without dramatic and violent interference with the British trade union structure.

There have been many complaints that shop stewards have the habit of usurping the functions of National Executive Committees. If this is so, it is because the shop stewards at shop floor level are capable of establishing that unity of function and purpose that the unions have hitherto failed to accomplish at national level, and who can blame the shop stewards; their theories are not embalmed in outmoded union rules and regulations but come to life in next week's wage packet. It is up to the union Executives to re-establish their authority by transforming trade union structure in accordance with the needs of rapidly changing industrial problems.

THE SIAMESE TWINS— NEDDY AND NICKY

J. R. Campbell

MOST of this year's trade union conferences passed resolutions against the wages policy which the Government is seeking to impose on the unions, and supported the refusal of the Trades Union Congress and individual trade unions to have anything to do with the National Incomes Commission. Yet a majority of the same conferences supported the association of the Trades Union Congress with the National Economic Development Council whose reports, endorsed by the T.U.C. representatives on the Council, advocate a wages policy indistinguishable from that of the National Incomes Commission. Indeed the second report of the National Incomes Commission, published in July, expressly endorses the report of the N.E.D.C. 'Conditions Favourable to Faster Growth' published in March. One organisation (N.I.C.) is condemned for advocating a certain wages policy, another (N.E.D.C.) is defended as a useful and progressive body, although it advocates the identical policy. There is some confusion of purpose here.

The General Council of the Trades Union Congress has expressly defended its participation in the N.E.D.C. on the following grounds

- (1) The representatives of the Trades Union Congress are able to advocate their economic policies at the meetings of the N.E.D.C. and have succeeded in getting the reports submitted to that body amended and improved.
- (2) It is advocating that the British capitalist economy be run all out 'at high level of demand'.
- (3) It acknowledges the desirability 'on social grounds of providing a job for everyone who wants one', and
- (4) that the discussion in the report on balance of payments problems is in line with the views which the General Council has consistently advocated.

In fact the General Council is convinced that this second N.E.D.C. report provides 'some evidence that its work gives us a genuine opportunity to influence Government policy in ways helpful to workpeople' (special issue of T.U.C. Magazine *Labour*, May-June, 1963). 'Workpeople' indeed. Isn't the General Council getting a bit too 'managerial' in the expressions it is using? Anyway the General Council thinks that its representatives influenced the N.E.D.C. policy which in turn was operated in the Tory budget of Mr. Reginald Maudling.

It is significant that much of the analysis and content of the Budget was based on policies advocated by N.E.D.C. and we welcomed in particular the measures designed to promote regional employment and industry, as well as the more general stimulus given to demand by the tax and investment concessions. We noted with satisfaction the Chancellor's intention to safeguard internal economic expansions by the use of reserves and borrowing facilities. There is little doubt that these features represent a marked departure from previous Government policies.

(Labour, May-June, 1963.)

The General Council is obviously flattering and deceiving itself if it imagines that the N.E.D.C. policies were adopted because of its advice. It was obvious that the 'stop-start' policy which the Tory Party had been pursuing since 1952 was leading to a much slower rate of economic development in Britain than was the case in its main capitalist rivals and that a new policy aiming at a faster rate was seen by the ruling class as necessary to maintain its position, economically, politically and militarily against its imperialist rivals, and also against the forces of national liberation and socialism. The N.E.D.C. and the various measures in the Maudling budget, were the expression of this new policy, which had been discussed in the financial press for months previously. Certainly they were not the result of N.E.D.C. acting on the advice of the General Council.

What kind of planning does the N.E.D.C. envisage? We are not told either in the report or by the General Council. Up till now all that has happened is that a number of industries (private and nationalised) have been asked if they could sustain a 4 per cent per annum rate of economic growth if sufficient demand for their goods and services was existing and have answered that they could. This is hardly a new discovery. The merest beginner in economics has known this for years. What people are anxious to know is whether any genuine economic plan, aiming at a faster rate of development exists or not. The answer is no, but the General Council is hopeful that 'from now on constructive planning, based on the generalised conclusions of the N.E.D.C. reports, must shape the raw material in the report into an operational plan'. But that is merely a General Council hope. N.E.D.C. reports are silent about 'an operational plan'. This General Council hope is accompanied by a prophecy that 'sustained economic planning will require adaptations in trade union functions, while for its part, the Government must develop its departments into active instruments for co-ordinated planning'. Again we have a General Council aspiration, which is not based on any decision on the part of the Government or N.E.D.C. It is

hoped that the unions will insist on the General Council disclosing what 'adaptations in trade union functions' it thinks will be necessary under 'co-ordinated planning' in the monopoly capitalist system. It is clear therefore at this moment that N.E.D.C. does not involve any operational planning or any State interference with the monopolists (even under a Government controlled by the monopolists) but it does involve even at this stage, some interference with the functions of the trade unions.

The justification for the 'stop-start' policy which the government is now pretending to discard is that it was necessary to deal with the recurrent balance of payments crisis. Whenever there was an upsurge in the British capitalist economy there was a sharp rise in the imports of raw materials for British industries. The balance of payments became unfavourable to Britain and there was a fall in the gold and dollar reserves, which the Government proceeded to protect by imposing credit squeezes and higher interest rates. The general hunch behind this type of policy was that if activity on the home market was damped down by credit squeezes, the monopolists would be compelled to make a greater effort on the foreign markets, exports would increase faster than imports, and the balance of payments would become more favourable to Britain. In fact it never worked that way. The credit squeezes increased the cost of producing British goods, and exports did not expand to the extent expected. The economy got the worst of both worlds, British production grew at a slower rate than that of its capitalist rivals and so did British exports. Throughout all these abortive exercises the Government propaganda machine was driving home the lie that British wages were rising to a much greater extent than the wages of their capitalist rivals, when in fact, in the last five years they have been rising to a much lesser extent.

The N.E.D.C. reports do not face the question, why the British economy could not be allowed, like the economies of West Germany or Italy, to expand over three or four years without the brake, in the form of a credit squeeze, having to be applied. The usual answer is that the British gold and dollar reserves were smaller than those of other European countries. But in fact they were smaller because the declining imperialist economy was carrying two burdens that were not being carried by any European country. It was maintaining a huge burden of overseas military expenditure, running at the moment around £200 million a year and its monopolists were exporting capital mainly to the White Dominions to a greater

extent than was justified by the state of the economy. Any genuine attempt to alleviate Britain's balance of payments problems must deal with both these drains. Overseas military expenditure and the export of capital must be drastically cut. The N.E.D.C. second report dodges both questions. It admits that overseas military expenditure is a factor in creating balance of payments difficulties, but declares that this cannot be cut 'unless there is a major change of policy in defence', and as for restricting the private export of capital 'a permanent policy of severe restriction is not to be recommended'. So the causes of the weakness of Britain's balance of payments difficulties are to remain.

What can then be done, is divided by N.E.D.C. into temporary expedients and permanent solutions. The temporary expedients are the raising of foreign loans, plus the use of export subsidies and import restrictions. It is recognised that these cannot be repeated. They are purely devices for getting over one balance of payments crisis without having to dampen down expansion. The long term solution is the familiar one of increasing exports by cutting costs.

If the trend of events should be unfavourable, there would be no easy way of improving the balance of payments. Of the measures which could have a substantial effect, only the reduction of the rate of increase of costs and prices in this country is free from serious disadvantages, as far as international considerations are concerned. (Second Report, p. 34.)

So N.E.D.C. policy is the use of some temporary expedients to bridge the first balance of payments gap, coupled with the fierce intensification of the exports drive on conventional lines.

This Second Report of which the General Council is so proud does not conceal its basic aims, namely that British wages must increase more slowly than in the past (page 51); that export prices may have to fall relative to those of Britain's competitors (page 50); that increased production per worker must come to a large extent 'from the more efficient use of labour and existing capital equipment'. This involves the increased use of 'techniques such as work study . . . and of shift working where the gain in efficiency outweighs the social costs involved' (page 53).

It is obvious that increased output per worker, accompanied by wage restraint as advocated by N.E.D.C., can only expand profits at the expense of wages (particularly in the most rapidly expanding industries) and rapidly increase the accumulated wealth of the great monopolists. It is agreed even by supporters that in the absence of stringent control of profits, such unfair results are

inevitable. Both the N.E.D.C. and N.I.C. of course say that they are for restraint of all incomes, including profits. The fact remains however that while precise policies for the restraint of wages and salaries are being put forward, neither N.E.D.C., N.I.C., the Government, the employers nor the General Council of the Trades Union Congress have any policy for the restraint of profits, on the same basis as wages and salaries. Indeed the Federation of British Industries and other employers' organisations deny that any proposals for the strict restraint of profits are possible of application. The Second Report of the National Incomes Commission (July 1963) while being adamant in favour of wage and salaries restraint, spends most of the time in enumerating the problems that are still to be solved, before profits restraint can be applied. The complete one-sidedness of the proposals stand out for all to see.

The attempted contrast between the good Neddy with which the trade unions must associate, and the wicked Nicky which they must repudiate will not hold water. Who fixes the limit of wage and salary increases that are permissible in any given year, which the wicked Nicky uses as its standard in deciding whether a given wage increase is against 'the national interest' or otherwise? This is fixed by the good Neddy with which the T.U.C. is associated.

There is no 'operational plan' devised by N.E.D.C. which is being recommended to a reluctant government. There is only a wages and salaries restraint plan. If N.E.D.C. is a forum, as the General Council claim, it is one in which the monopolists, the N.E.D.C. bureaucracy, and the Government have already got the T.U.C. representatives to acquiesce in a report declaring that excessive increases in wages and salaries are hampering British economic growth and that the workers must accept smaller wage increases in the future. This policy severely limits wage and salary increases (particularly in the most productive industries) thereby sharply increasing profits; it prevents higher than average increases in wages to low paid workers (particularly women) and seeks on the eve of a General Election to put the blame for past failures of the monopoly capitalist economy on the shoulders of the trade unions.

Surely the unions have waited long enough to give N.E.D.C. a chance. In the light of this reactionary wages policy, they must revise their present attitude to this body. It is by its very nature incapable of planning in the interests of the people, but imposes on the wage and salary earners the most restrictive wages policy in the whole capitalist world.

THE DUBLIN STR OF 1913

A SCENE of unprecedented violence in O'Connell Street, Dublin, in 1913. An observer described it thus: 'I saw many batoned people lying on the ground senseless and bleeding. When the police had finished their bloodthirsty pursuit they returned down the street batoning the terror-stricken passers-by'.



KE



FIFTY years ago, a lockout of the tram-workers of Dublin sparked off the six-month long battle between the employers, aided by the police, and the workers led by Jim Larkin. The Dublin Strike of 1913 laid the foundation of the labour movement. The Irish Transport & General Workers' Union emerged from its baptism of fire to become an all-Ireland organisation. Jim Larkin, described by George Russell (*Æ*) as 'a man who has lifted the curtain which veiled from us the real manhood of Dublin', is pictured here addressing a workers' meeting.

GUIANA CROSSROADS

Cheddi Jagan

[We are pleased to publish this article by Dr. Cheddi Jagan, Prime Minister of British Guiana, who has been a frequent contributor to this journal. In this article, specially written for Labour Monthly, Premier Jagan throws light on the present situation in Guiana and on the decisive months ahead.—Ed., L.M.]

THE second phase of the counter-revolutionary battle is over. The first phase began last year with the February disturbances, which ended up in rioting and looting and a large part of the commercial centre being destroyed by fire. In the smoke of battle the main issues became clouded. One heard of the Government's sinister intentions, of fears and suspicions, of racial strife. But the basic causes of the struggle were not brought to the forefront.

For some time, deliberate attempts have been made to subvert my Government. Subversion has now given way to open rebellion. Last year the budget, which was largely influenced by the Cambridge economist, Mr. Nicholas Kaldor, was the excuse for the rebellion. This year the excuse was the Labour Relations Bill.

At the very beginning of the 11-week strike I indicated that it was politically inspired. This was corroborated very early by Mr. Burnham, Leader of the Opposition, and later by Mr. Duncan Sandys. Mr. Burnham put it to me that the Labour Relations Bill was not the *causa belli* but the *casus belli*, not the cause of but the occasion for the rebellion.

The Trades Union Congress of British Guiana denied any political motivation. Note, however, that the Commonwealth Commission, which investigated the riots of February, 1962, sparked off by the T.U.C. and the political Opposition, had this to say of the T.U.C.: ■

There is very little doubt that, despite the loud protestations of the trade union leaders to the contrary, political affinities and aspirations played a large part in shaping their policy and formulating their programme of offering resistance to the budget and making a determined effort to change the government in office.

It has been proved beyond all doubt that the three most important trade unionists, Mr. Ishmael, Mr. Jackson and Mr. Sankar, were deeply involved in politics . . .

*Report of the Commission of Enquiry into the Disturbances in British Guiana in February 1962, H.M.S.O. *Colonial* 354, October 1962.

The story put forward before us was that the unbending and indeed provocative attitude of the government was the sole reason for the decision to call a general strike, or at any rate for precipitating that decision. We find it difficult to believe this version and we are of the opinion that the facts have been greatly distorted by the trade union leaders for the purpose of placing the responsibility of arousing the workers' hostility upon the government. (Paragraphs 63-4, 124)

The main purpose of these counter-revolutionary activities is to do one or more of three things :

- (i) Suspension of the Constitution;
- (ii) Indefinite delay of independence;
- (iii) Imposition of a constitutional and electoral formula which will bring the Opposition into power.

The Opposition has clearly stated that there shall be 'no independence under Jagan'. Using as an excuse a controversial but necessary budget, it fomented disturbances and riots in February, 1962. These disturbances were subsequently used by the British Government, first, to delay independence talks, and secondly, not to grant independence at all. Talks which were to be held in May, 1962, were postponed until October, 1962. Independence was denied in October, 1962, on the flimsy excuse that the Government and the Opposition could not agree; that my Government would not accede to immediate elections under a changed electoral system from the existing first-past-the-post to proportional representation.

Rather than grant independence, the British Government indicated at the conclusion of the talks that should social and economic conditions deteriorate it might have to consider the imposition of a solution. This is now the line which the Opposition is pursuing: to create enough havoc to give the British Government the excuse to suspend the constitution or impose a solution. This was clearly voiced by the Opposition Press during the strike. As to our so-called free press, note that when the T.U.C. call for a general strike closed down the daily newspapers, the T.U.C. immediately ordered the printing workers back to work without even prior consultation with the Printing Workers' Union so that the *Daily Chronicle* and *Evening Post* could continue with their distortions and incitement.

Mr. Duncan Sandys, Secretary of State for the Colonies, on his departure after a four-day visit, proclaimed that the greatest problem in British Guiana was racial conflict. But what Mr. Sandys and others must note is that the spread of the disorders to the countryside and the racial conflict which ensued was due principally to the fact that Georgetown, predominantly Negro, was not pacified

and Indians who were publicly battered and bludgeoned lost faith in the law-enforcing agencies and retaliated. Under the banner of passive resistance the Opposition squatted around government buildings and around government offices, riotously assembled in thousands in open breach of a proclamation prohibiting the assembly of more than five persons, looted stores, intimidated those who remained at work, particularly government employees, and brutally beat up government supporters, particularly Indians. Had the disorders been contained at the beginning and Georgetown pacified, there is absolutely no doubt that the racial conflict which subsequently occurred would have been prevented.

Race is merely superficial and skin-deep. Commenting on the question of race, the Commonwealth Commission said of the disturbances of February, 1962:

We found little evidence of any racial segregation in the social life of the country and in Georgetown. East Indians and Africans seemed to mix and associate with one another on terms of the greatest cordiality, though it was clear that the recent disturbances and the racial twist given to them by some of the unprincipled and self-seeking politicians had introduced slight, but it is hoped, transient over-tones of doubt and reserve. Among the inhabitants of Georgetown there is, of course, always present the danger that hostile and anti-racial sentiments may be aroused by a clash of the hopes and ambitions of rival politicians. We draw attention to this possibility because there have been indications of such friction in the past, although, as will appear in the course of this report, the disturbances of February 16th did not originate in a racial conflict, nor did they develop into a trial of strength between the East Indians and the Africans.

. . . we are merely drawing attention to the circumstances mentioned above in order to show that there is no clear-cut division between the races and that although, broadly speaking, Dr. Jagan's supporters are for the most part East Indians and the supporters of P.N.C. are drawn mostly from the African races, the difference is not really racial, but economic and vocational. (Paragraphs 28, 50.)

Race has never been a serious problem in Guiana. Indians and Africans have for many, many years played, worked and lived amicably together. Underlying the superficiality of racialism is the basic problem of the class struggle and the struggle for land and jobs. Prior to the 1955 split in the People's Progressive Party, the Africans and Indians, who constitute the backbone of the working class and peasantry, were united in their struggles against the capitalists and landlords. On every front—sugar plantations, water front, mines, mills, quarries—the workers battled for improved wages and working conditions. Since 1953, however, this militancy has been dulled. And this is due principally to the 'terror' rule

which followed the 1953 suspension of the Constitution, the 1955 Burnham-engineered split in the P.P.P. and the subsequent alliance of Mr. Burnham and his working class supporters with those reactionary elements who were opposed to the P.P.P. before the 1953 suspension.

The Indians support the P.P.P. mainly because of its socialist beliefs and objectives and because it has always led their struggles against landlords, mostly Indian and sugar plantation capitalists. But the P.P.P.'s support does not come only from Indians. Because it is the most advanced party ideologically, it attracts the more politically conscious, particularly the youth, students and intellectuals of all races. This accounts for the notable shift of young Africans towards the P.P.P., and consequently for the racialist (Negro as opposed to Indian) appeal of the People's National Congress. This has been noted by the Riot Commission and such observers as Professor Peter Newman and Dr. Raymond Smith of the University of the West Indies.

In paragraph 50 of its Report, the Riot Commission said :

The political professions of the P.N.C. were somewhat vague and amorphous. There was a tendency to give a racial tinge to its policy. Mr. Burnham expressed the opinion that it was Dr. Jagan who was responsible for this unfortunate development. . . .

. . . We do not, however, think that there is much substance in the contention of Mr. Burnham and it seems to us that whatever racial differences existed were brought about by political propaganda.

Professor Peter Newman in an article entitled 'Racial Tension in British Guiana' said :

. . . Not surprisingly, this attention to a unified African front led to a need for a common enemy, a rôle which was filled by the East Indians. Operating within the restricted social and economic framework that I have discussed, the main animus of the party (P.N.C.) was focussed on the racial issue, and even official party pronouncements began to take on a racial tinge. Since the P.P.P. continued to maintain a public image of non-partisanship (although its local support was often less unbiased), many African intellectuals, especially among the younger group, began to feel dissatisfied with the racial policies of the P.N.C. Except in a few cases, this did not lead them to the P.P.P., but it did cause them to withhold active participation from the African party; partly as a result, the second-rank leadership of the P.N.C. is distinctly less able than the corresponding echelons of Jagan's party.

British Guiana is the acid test of western pronouncements and intentions. The West, particularly U.S., and Great Britain, has always proclaimed its belief in freedom and democracy, in free and fair elections, in constitutionalism and the rule of law. President

Kennedy, for example, during his interview with the Editor of *Izvestia* in early 1962, attacked the Communists for subversion and condemned Dr. Fidel Castro for denying freedom and not holding elections. In the same interview he said:

. . . the United States supports the idea that every people should have the right to make a free choice of the kind of Government they want. . . . Mr. Jagan who was recently elected Prime Minister in British Guiana is a Marxist, but the United States doesn't object because that choice was made by honest election, which he won.

But what is the reality?

Dean Rusk, U.S. Secretary of State is reported last July to have urged the Macmillan Government to suspend our Constitution or to hold a referendum on a new system of voting. Simultaneously, U.S. citizens, agencies and institutions—the American Institute for Free Labour Development, the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, the International Congress of Free Trades Unions (I.C.F.T.U.) and its Latin-American Regional Committee (O.R.I.T.)—have been actively engaged in subversion. Without the funds supplied by these organisations, the strike would have collapsed in a couple of weeks.

British Guiana may well decide whether the road to the future will be peaceful or violent. For many years, long before the advent of Premier Khrushchov, the People's Progressive Party has been advocating the peaceful parliamentary road to socialism. The dilemma of the imperialists is that it advocates constitutionalism but cannot defeat the People's Progressive Party by its own rules at free and fair elections. It remains to be seen what the final outcome will be. Will the British Government, goaded by the United States, change the electoral system merely to defeat the People's Progressive Party? This in effect would be rigging the elections. If this is done in British Guiana, will it be done elsewhere—wherever Communist, socialist and radical parties, either alone or in alliance, are likely to win elections? Does it mean that the capitalists and their allies will permit elections only so long as they can win? If the West is sincere in its pronouncements, it must demonstrate it by granting unconditional independence immediately. Only independence can permit of rapid social and economic progress and the removal of doubts and suspicions of our intentions. What happens in Guiana may very well indicate whether there will be peace in the world.

CORRECTIONS

On p. 355 of Quaestor's article in the August issue, the words 'the evidence mentioned by Quaestor in these pages' (lines 21-22) should read, 'the evidence by Quaestor mentioned in these pages'.

On p. 358, line 5, for 'August 19-23, 1903', read 'August 11-23, 1903'.

THE MOSCOW TREATY

Quaestor

THE three-point test ban treaty, with its declared exception for underground tests, was signed in Moscow on August 5. It has been welcomed by nearly every State in the world, even by those like France or West Germany which either refused to join it or have haggled over conditions for joining it. Those who oppose it *on principle* need to have their brains tested: Khrushchov is reported to have said this to American Senators, and most people will agree with him.

The reasons are obvious and, one would have thought, simple. First, it ends the poisoning of the atmosphere by the three biggest 'nuclear' States—and if de Gaulle's government continues to do so alone, it will become an Ishmael to which the French people themselves will have something to say. Secondly, it is the demonstration of a new step towards mutual confidence (the first was the settlement of the Cuba crisis last October) which is essential if international tension is to relax. Of course this is not the result of psychological changes among the rulers of the three Powers concerned, nor is diplomacy the biggest factor which brought about the treaty. It has profoundly material roots—the pressure of hundreds of millions of people who want to live, and another element well set forth in a *Times* leading article on August 7:

The idea that the United States should push as hard as possible in nuclear development, in space, in aid to the under-developed, and in raising its own living standards, with the ultimate aim of making the Russian economy crack under the strain of competition, already seems to be losing some of its attractions in Washington.

Naturally *The Times* went on to suggest, as in duty bound, that the same applies to the Soviet Union: but both writer and the more intelligent readers knew perfectly well that the Soviet Union had been pressing for over ten years for the ending of nuclear competition, and had never proclaimed the aim of 'making the American economy crack'.

But at once there arose the question of what should be the next step. On the Soviet side, it was natural that a non-aggression pact between Nato and the Warsaw Treaty States should have priority. The continued authorisation of underground tests means that one form of preparing for nuclear aggression—whatever the importance of that form—continues to exist. A non-aggression pact, in one

form or another (Khrushchov has publicly stated that the form is secondary, if the essence is accepted) would be a moral hindrance to such aggression. It would not of course disarm a potential aggressor, but it would give new strength and authority to the great force which alone can ultimately bridle him: the movement of the working class and its allies for peace. Thus a non-aggression pact would help at least partially to close the gap left in the Moscow treaty.

That is why the West German government has opposed it. But before going on to that aspect of the international discussions since July 25, it will be useful to record other proposals which have been made for further improvements in the world political atmosphere. In an interview with *Pravda* and *Izvestia* correspondents, Khrushchov summarised them as follows:

The freezing, or still better the reduction, of the military budgets of States; measures to prevent surprise attack; the reduction of foreign troops in West Germany and the German Democratic Republic; the dispatch of our representatives to the troops of the Western Powers in West Germany in exchange for the dispatch of their representatives to the Soviet troops stationed in the G.D.R.

No such proposals were published by the representatives of Britain and the U.S.A.; but on July 26, under the influence of the news from Moscow, some of the more responsible British newspapers let themselves go. *The Guardian* proposed discussions on nuclear-free zones, thinning out foreign forces in Central Europe, how to prevent dissemination of nuclear weapons, and the dismantling of missile bases in foreign countries. *The Times*, more vaguely, suggested provisions against surprise attack, European security and control of outer space, as suitable topics.

No lack of proposals for carrying the principle of the Moscow treaty a stage further, therefore! This should be remembered. It should also be noted, in this connection, that on July 26 *The Times* blurted out unexpectedly that 'all but underground tests have been readily detectable for years', which *The Guardian* made more specific, three days later, as meaning 'ever since the negotiations started in Geneva in 1958'. The Soviet Government, in fact, was saying this long before 1958, and the western governments were strenuously denying it. Does this not suggest that the subsequent assertions of the British and American governments that underground tests were *not* detectable may be revealed to be as phoney as their previous assertions about above-ground tests?

But the real new element revealed by these negotiations has been

the exposure of the West German government and its backers in the U.S.A. and France. At first the parliamentary leader of its ruling Christian Democrat party, von Brentano, tried to lay down a ludicrous condition for West Germany signing the treaty. 'The East German régime must not be allowed to gain the title of a State by joining the treaty', he claimed (*The Times*, August 6). However, the G.D.R. did join—and all the Christian Democrat régime had for its pains was the snub to its demand that the G.D.R. should not 'gain the title of a State'. West Germany has had to sign after all. Yet this phrase, it will be seen in a moment, was important in another connection.

Then came the discussion of the proposal for a non-aggression pact between East and West. Straight away Adenauer's government brazenly brought out its old trick—no pact: the German and Berlin questions must first be solved. *The Times* Washington correspondent at first voiced more than his personal irritation when he wrote (July 25): 'This is an impossible demand at this stage, as it was in the 1950's'. Nevertheless, this did not prevent him reporting, a fortnight later: 'Bonn has made it known here that a non-aggression pact is totally unacceptable, and that the United States must obtain positive concessions on the German and Berlin problems before it even contemplates an exchange of non-aggression declarations'. The latter alternative to a non-aggression pact had been put forward by the western statesmen in Moscow to get over the supposed 'peril' of the G.D.R. signing the pact on the same page as themselves, and thus 'gaining status'.

At first the West German government had indicated that it was prepared to accept a 'non-aggression arrangement' by unilateral declarations on the two sides (*The Times* Bonn Correspondent, July 30). But when it found its allies giving way so easily, its appetite obviously increased. As usual, one of Adenauer's own ministers obligingly let the cat out of the bag.

Herr Krone, the minister without portfolio who keeps a special watch on Berlin questions and is nowadays as close to Dr. Adenauer as anyone, has remarked that 'exchanging declarations of non-aggression would come suspiciously near to recognising the Soviet sphere of power'.

(*Economist*, August 3.)

In the West German diplomatic patter, this means: 'near to renouncing any hope of overturning the Socialist States in the G.D.R., Poland and Czechoslovakia by force'. And this is where the protests against allowing the G.D.R. to 'gain the title of a State' come in.

We solemnly renounced any intention of changing the frontiers of Federal Germany by force, its spokesmen were saying all through the discussions. Perfectly true—and *they regard the frontiers of Federal Germany as including the whole territory of the G.D.R.* 'The Federal Republic must be recognised as the sole representative of the German people', explained von Hase, the State Secretary of the Federal Press Office (*The Times* Bonn Correspondent, August 3). Hence armed aggression against the G.D.R. would not in their view be changing Federal boundaries by force: it would be merely 'liberating' a part of the German people, or even 'restoring order'. *That is why they don't want the G.D.R. to 'gain the title of a State'.* That ignoring its 'title' in this way would let loose a world war is not a consideration to stop Hitler's former generals and officials ensconced at Bonn.

Not surprisingly, 'the (West) Germans are much less keen about all ideas of inspection and reducing troops in both parts of Germany' (*The Times* Bonn Correspondent, July 30)—two proposals, it will be recalled, which occur among both eastern and western suggestions. Of course. Such measures would lessen the chances of dragging American and British troops into any conflict caused by 'liberation' plans or 'restoring order': that is the real meaning of what the correspondent describes as the West German authorities' fear that the measures in question would 'risk weakening the western position at its most dangerous point in Europe.'

In short, Bonn wants to maintain tension and the threat of war, not to diminish them. And this desire seems for the time being at least to have been satisfied. Consider the implications of the following report from *The Times* Bonn correspondent (August 12) after a visit from the U.S. Secretary of State on his way back from Moscow: 'No further east-west steps now seem imminent. This has had the effect of dispelling Bonn's fears of an even bigger strain on the Atlantic alliance *if the Russians pressed immediately for further agreement to reduce tension, which, it was feared here, would discriminate against Germany.*' (Our italics). The parallel with Hitler, who was always shouting about 'encirclement' while moving step by step to World War II, is irresistible.

Such a state of affairs makes particularly reprehensible the intention of the British and American governments (as reported in a *Times* Washington message on August 2) to press on with the proposed Nato multilateral nuclear force—which, it will be recalled, would give German officers access to all nuclear secrets, to put it at

its lowest. The State Department's defence is that the 'M.L.F.' would be subject to British and American vetoes—as though that would have any relevance for West German nuclear specialists working in secret, under Hitler's generals, and requiring (to complete their jig-saw puzzles) not United States bombs, but the knowledge of how to make them.

Bonn's behaviour also makes most reprehensible the statement by Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker, the Labour Party's foreign affairs spokesman (reported in a Bonn message to *The Times*, July 24) that he was willing 'to reconsider the Nato multilateral nuclear force project if it was the only alternative to the European nations each developing its own nuclear force'. Such statements only increase the West German government's powers of blackmail. Just as in 1954 the right-wing Labour plea was: 'Arm the Germans, or they'll arm themselves', so now it appears to be: 'Give them access to nuclear weapons—or they'll build nuclear weapons themselves'. Mr. Gordon Walker's statement moreover adds Labour backing to the State Department's pretence that pushing ahead with the multilateral nuclear force 'could not be regarded as proliferation of nuclear power'! Yet he must know, as all the world knows, that that way lies the undoing of the Moscow treaty and the end of hopes for a reduction of world tension (as Harold Wilson has declared more than once in recent months.)

The signing of the Moscow treaty was an important step forward, and a success for the peoples in their struggle for peace. But like all such successes, it must be made the starting point of a new effort, if the impetus is to be maintained and still bigger successes won. The motion before next month's Scarborough conference of the Labour Party, put down by the Sheffield Trades and Labour Council, is of singular importance in this respect. Warning that direct or indirect control of nuclear weapons by Germany will be 'a very serious danger to peace and survival for European States', it urges the National Executive Committee, the Parliamentary Party and the future Labour Government, 'to press for a policy of disengagement in Europe, and the gradual dismantling of Nato and the Warsaw Pact, under effective United Nations supervision and control', with a mutual security pact 'to guarantee the present frontiers of East and West Germany and the status of Berlin'.

In the situation described above, such a declaration by British Labour would be a truly responsible follow-up of the Moscow treaty.

WHOSE FAILURE IN HOUSING ?

Tom Vernon*

IN rented housing, land ownership and town development, private enterprise is struggling to survive, though its death be much overdue, its role outplayed, its survival an encumbrance.

But throughout what is being said and proposed by Tory spokesmen at this time over the whole broad front of housing conditions and town re-planning, there persists as governing purpose the firm retention of a continued, and important, role for private enterprise—an all-out life-saving effort, in fact. The need to bring about public ownership (or, where not, effective control by public authorities) in this particular field is now increasingly recognised, far beyond those who have long accepted socialist proposals wherever private ownership demonstrates failure or incapacity to meet the nation's requirements. Tory policies, therefore, will provoke opposition in many unexpected quarters if we can effectively expose their selfish aim and, above all, their predestined failure to get the intended results.

Most prominent current example of Tory desperation to preserve its patrons' position is, of course, in relation to private landlordism. The general indignation provoked by the exposure of the unlamented Mr. Peter Rachman has forced some show from a plainly reluctant Housing Minister of possible remedial action in a direction, significantly, not indicated at all—and possibly not guessed at even by himself. Revelations, as they seemed, by Ben Parkin, M.P., and many others did not, of course, inform the tenants' movement nor left-wing politicals of anything they were not already bitterly aware of—except, perhaps, that part anyhow of what Rachman and his like have been doing was really aimed to exploit the middle class person, rather than just to grind the faces of the poor, through a rougher expertise than the old traditional landlords possessed. The extortions and forcible methods of Rachman and Co. are, that is to say, a means to an end different from old-style property business as, for example, Shaw depicted in his *Widowers' Houses*.

When a street of overcrowded and sub-standard houses reaches complete decontrol, it is ripe for the swift eviction of all its inhabitants; for the conversion of the properties into smart flats; for their occupation at high rents by the middle class; and then for the re-

*Mr. Vernon is the President of the National Association of Tenants and Residents and for many years was a Housing Committee member in ■ Central London Borough.

sale of them as one lot at a high price to a property investor. This is a rather new feature and derives from careful Tory strategy. Naturally, therefore, the Housing Minister and his supporting chorus are not admitting that what Rachman and others have shown to be easily possible in a system of uncontrolled private ownership condemns not only the 1957 Rent Act, but the system itself. All we can expect from Sir Keith Joseph are yet new devices feigning to restrain really ungentlemanly (letting the side down) methods and excessive acumen in property exploitation. These will be as futile as past legislative devices to thwart the natural urge of a capitalist owner to maximise his profit, just as would be the case if he were trading in goods with no question of his being challenged. What Sir Keith and the rest of them find vexatious is that the 'dynamism' of private enterprise is in irresolvable conflict, where housing is concerned, with moral and social standards defying open repudiation in the mid-twentieth century.

Starting with the first Public Health Act in 1848, there has always been reluctance to make breaches in the dogma of absolute freedom for housing landlords to do what they must to be 'efficient' (*i.e.*, make maximum profit). The very first, and all subsequent Rent Control Acts were for that reason limited in term and, as each expired, only grudgingly renewed though each time weakened. The notorious 1957 Rent Act was blessed as restoring freedom to the landlords, as we all remember, and the provision in that Act for decontrol on vacant possession was the particular freedom required for the Rachman technique. Immediate repeal (if nothing else) of creeping decontrol is the evident step for the Minister to take: not a superfluous inquiry and the concoction of more futile devices to turn property tigers into toothless tabbies.

The Housing Minister's brass-faced refusal to attach blame for Rachman's doings upon the 1957 Rent Act involves not only defence of the Tory dogma of freedom. He must uphold the deliberate Tory plan, conforming to the old classic 'solution' of a housing problem, to re-accommodate town centres in London and elsewhere with the better-off. This necessitated not only an unexpectedly wide range in general decontrol but creeping decontrol as well, though the 1945 Ridley Commission of Rent Control emphatically warned against this (para. 17) and the Government were obviously open-eyed in their defiance of past experience and the advice given in 1945. It was Sir Keith himself, as Henry Brooke's aide-de-camp, who wrote all those nauseating letters to

aggrieved tenants and their associations telling them to cease living beyond their means in town centres and make their selection of a cheaper new home on the outskirts. If his epistles were unavailing, Rachman was an unofficial aide to further the Government's aim.

To scrap the 1957 Act and legislate anew for rent control and security of tenure is the minimum requirement, of course. But this evades the long historic lesson of landlords' success in evading the law, of tenants' weakness under scarcity conditions and inability to invoke their legal rights, evidence of which is decisive enough in the Ridley Report, not to mention much else besides. Full ownership is the only basis for regulating completely the conditions applying to house tenancies and this should be the primary demand. The Labour Party has inexplicably abandoned the plan to municipalise and thereby rather stultified itself from including this in its electoral programme.

To turn to another aspect of our theme, we want to look at the new Housing Minister's personal prospectus, in the form of a White Paper published last May bearing the unadorned title *Housing*, for it amply illustrates the argument. It has overmuch high falutin' talk rather than any substantial proposals, although not so when it reaches, for example, the problem of old houses not denoted as slums, amounting to *near-half* of the total housing stock and capable of improvement (oddly called 'modernisation'). Since 1949 bribes to landlords to bring their sub-standard houses into line with their 'modernised' rents have been enticingly augmented. Yet the Minister is very disappointed: in 1962 merely 115,000 houses earned the improvement grant of 50 per cent of expenditure but few landlords were the beneficiaries from the public purse because the White Paper confesses that 'unlike owner-occupiers, few landlords have taken advantage of the improvement grants system' and we know this was just the same in all previous years. The Minister feels that private enterprise in housing needs yet more blandishment. In addition to the 50 per cent State subsidy towards costs and the right to charge an extra rent equivalent to 12½ per cent of the landlord's own expenditure for as long as the house stands, the local authorities are now to be compelled to lend the landlords the requisite finance. And the Minister pleadingly remarks that henceforth 'it does not seem that any hardship would be entailed in requiring owners to carry out improvements'. Hardship at 12½ per cent per annum! The idea is that the local authorities, maids-of-all work, will somehow assemble a qualified inspectorate (paid for by

all the ratepayers) to examine the houses and then start talks with the indifferent landlords. But why bother with all this, when it would be simpler and more effective to take over houses which landlords have obstinately refused to improve? Answer: private ownership must be cherished.

A marked effort to stake out solid claims for private enterprise is pretty crudely exposed in the White Paper's section called 'Urban Renewal' which describes 'the enormous tasks of replacing the older and depressed residential areas' and says they are ones 'for private enterprise and local authorities in partnership'. The senior partner named first! Private enterprise will often need help in 'assembling a sufficient area of land'—we can believe it. It will also want help in the re-housing of tenants 'who have been living in low-rented houses and who may need assistance towards the rent of a new house'—from the ratepayers, presumably. 'The cost of acquiring and clearing the land may be heavy'—of course it will since the 1952 Tory Act created a free market in land. It is here we reach the nub: it is the City which will want to provide the requisite finance to the developers and it does not intend (with Sir Keith's blessing, too) to be deprived by municipal enterprise of the rich new opportunities of 'urban renewal' with its development increments. The municipal junior partner has a clear enough role: to prostitute for private enterprise enjoyment its statutory powers of acquisition and tenants' re-housing. The senior partner's? To collar all the profits, else he won't play. The Tory Government is quite prepared to deprive local authorities of their proper functions in 'urban renewal' to let private enterprise muscle in.

The 'urban renewal' conspiracy is paralleled by a more advanced Tory racket in the renewal of town centres and shopping precincts, where a great deal has already happened, with much more in preparation, through private enterprise financed by the City, insurance companies and pension funds. This year the Housing Ministry circulated its view that the role of the local authorities is to use their planning and compulsory acquisition powers and then hand over to the private developer, with his greater availability of capital (Clare, Cotton and the rest), market knowledge and 'ability to exploit commercial opportunities'. This scandalous plan to intrude the financiers is fully described in a valuable and comprehensive survey of what is going on in the August issue of *Labour Research*.

Several contradictions emerge over this naked exploitation of the accepted need to rebuild congested and obsolete town centres.

The tasks designated for the local authorities lack sufficient inducement to compensate for the difficult problems they have to tackle, or to furnish surpluses to offset losses on redevelopments of their own, in non-central areas disdained by the property boys. But the property developers need all the main profits for themselves and their backers and would withdraw if the local authorities said 'me too'. To resolve that contradiction the Tories may need to establish their own national corporation to take over the local authorities' powers respecting town centres—or face the fact soon, rather than later, that their capitalist system defeats its own purposes. The second contradiction arises from the unattractiveness of the new shops, maybe offices as well, even to large-scale retailers and commerce because of the fantastic rents demanded by the property investment owners on account of the princely sums paid to the developers. Leading retail associations are raising objections, even asking for some control over these town centre schemes, and displaced smaller shopkeepers cannot afford their former locations, which in turn discourages consumers from visiting the new centres.

Thus, capitalist methods in combination with inevitable inflation in land prices will actually prevent the much needed redevelopments. Real town planning is quite impossible unless all land is taken into public ownership. The Labour Party's current plan is to have a Land Commission enabled to acquire all land on which building or rebuilding is to take place (and then grant leases), to pay only current use value, plus something extra to encourage sale. Sellers may well be discouraged from coming on the market, but certainly the property developers will be out of the market, because it is they who want the increment derived from redevelopments; and the Labour Party has no plan to replace the City financiers behind the developers, with a view to putting local authorities in charge.

Tory attempts to handle housing problems and town redevelopments in the interests solely of private enterprise and profits belong to the dead past: their aims, both any genuine ones and the unavowed ones, will get only negative results. Though such truths are well known to Marxists—after all it is 90 years since Frederick Engels explained them—this does not mean there should be no struggle for reforms and partial gains. The people did win a Rent Act and they did compel an expansion, though an insufficient one, in the provision of reasonably rented and decent houses and in the clearance of some of the slums. The immediate purpose is not to let the people be foxed by Sir Keith Joseph.

CAMPAIGN FOR EDUCATION

Mrs. A. McMillan*

1 963 is Education Year! This, the slogan of the Campaign for Education, has been taken up with energy and enthusiasm in many parts of the country. A great number of conferences and meetings have been held, much local and national publicity in the press and on television has been obtained, and preparations for Education Week in November are being actively made in many localities, the climax to be a National Rally at the Albert Hall.

Yes, the schools are in the news. As never before, teachers and parents are on the move. The reasons are not far to seek, and are devastatingly exposed in the National Union of Teachers' survey of schools entitled 'The State of Our Schools' (1962). A growing and apparently chronic shortage of teachers, oversized classes in overcrowded schools, failure to remedy poor amenities such as outdoor sanitation (which alone led to the temporary closure of hundreds of schools during last winter's cold spell), the utter failure of our educational system to keep pace with the schools of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., and many other countries, the threat to the nation's future arising from our educational backwardness—all these factors are now bringing to a head the crisis in our school system. And the fact that this failure to implement the 1944 Education Act is the direct result of the repeated savage cuts by successive Tory Governments, in school building and other education estimates submitted by Local Education Authorities, means that education will be one of the foremost national issues in the forthcoming General Election.

The initiative in launching the Campaign for Education was taken by the majority association of teachers, the National Union of Teachers, which, in July, 1962, called an exploratory meeting of some fifty organisations which agreed 'on the desirability of a campaign for educational advance to be launched as soon as possible'. This meeting, attended by representatives of all the teachers' associations as well as many other bodies, decided to widen the basis of the campaign by appealing for the support of trade unions and all other interested organisations. Over one hundred organisations, all giving financial support, are now affiliated, a similar number of local Campaign Committees are now functioning, and many trade unions have joined the campaign. Since the campaign

*Mrs. McMillan is the President of the London Teachers' Association and L.T.A. representative on the Education Year Campaign Council. She writes here in her personal capacity.

was to be 'non-party political', the political parties as such were not invited to affiliate, but the affiliations of Conservative, Labour and Liberal teachers' associations were invited. Later, the application for affiliation of the National Education Advisory Committee of the Communist Party, representing Communist teachers, was rejected (by a majority of one vote, at a very badly attended meeting of the Campaign Council), and the Council also decided to refuse to give reasons for their rejection! This action has aroused widespread criticism in teachers' circles, where it has become known. Thus the July meeting of the General Committee of the London Teachers' Association (N.U.T.) by a very large majority recorded 'its disquiet at the discrimination exercised recently by the 1963 Education Campaign Committee—a body which should be non-party political—in refusing the application made by the Education Advisory Committee of the Communist Party'.

This political discrimination is significant of the disturbing trend of the campaign leadership, their abandonment of the 'non-party political' basis of the movement and their failure to develop the campaign as proclaimed in its inaugural manifesto, which called upon the Government 'to commit itself in 1963 to a progressive plan for advance in education, the basis of which must be the implementation of the 1944 Act, and a massive expansion of higher education'. At the preparatory meeting in July, 1962, it was made clear that attention must be drawn to present inadequacies, and that education should become 'number one social priority' at the forthcoming General Election. The Campaign Council has since agreed that the campaign should be continued into the period of the General Election, so that parliamentary candidates can be confronted with its aims and their reactions registered.

The first publication of the Campaign Committee, which outlines the objects of the campaign, stated in over-moderate language, what clearly emerges from this Government's own estimate of the situation, that it will be necessary to double the present programme of expansion of our teachers' Training Colleges to avert a breakdown in teacher supply in the next ten years. And even that ultra-cautious official body, the University Grants Commission, had declared that by 1966 there must be an expansion of University places to 200,000 if the academically qualified students seeking to obtain entrance to universities are to be accommodated.

Yes, the crisis is there! The campaign, launched to overcome the crisis, has influential patronage at the top and growing mass

support at the bottom. Yet, after a splendid start, it is flagging, and the initial enthusiasm is waning. For the main activity of the campaign has become the organisation of entirely uncritical education 'exhibitions', and 'educational weeks' in many towns, aimed at showing to the public the best features of our schools and of our educational activities, avoiding any exposure or censure of the manifest failings so frequently attacked by the campaign in its earlier pronouncements. Criticism of the present Government's policy is deliberately separated, as a matter of tactics, from the mass campaign, and is confined to committee level, and to letters addressed to the Minister of Education, Sir Edward Boyle, politely protesting at his defence of the Government's policy of cuts in the Local Education Authorities' school-building estimates. No wonder that the teachers of Tunbridge Wells, in Kent, refused to take part in the preparations for such an 'education week' in their district, as a protest against bad school conditions. Indeed, one can sympathise with the view of the harassed and underpaid teacher that if an 'education week' is to be a 'shop-window' for the schools, then models of the out-door lavatory and black-listed school must be exhibited as well as models of the newest Comprehensive School.

The campaign leadership also actively sponsors the open forum type of meeting. Thus a series of three meetings were recently held in London addressed by Mr. Grimond for the Liberals, Mr. Wilson for Labour, and the Prime Minister for the Conservatives. All speakers, in dealing with the educational policies of their parties, gave full verbal support to the aims of the campaign. Indeed, Mr. Macmillan described it as 'the biggest combined effort to secure educational advance in this country in all our history'. Fine words indeed, and clearly indicating that a general election is approaching in which education will become a vital matter of votes. Since then, Sir Edward Boyle has gone even further than the Prime Minister. He sees nothing wrong with (indeed he almost gives support to) the abolition of the 'eleven plus'—provided selection for Grammar School places is maintained and Eton and Harrow live for ever!

The time has come to speak plainly to the leadership of the Campaign for Education. They must learn the lesson of the predecessor of the 1963 Campaign, namely, the 1943 Campaign for Educational Advance, sponsored by the triple alliance of the National Union of Teachers, the Workers' Educational Association, and the Trades Union Congress, which played so great a part in achieving the 1944 Education Act, as a result of the active co-

operation in that campaign of the mass working-class movement. The 1963 Campaign (some of whose earlier pronouncements bear the slogan 'For an Advance in Education' later significantly abandoned) must return to the policy so clearly stated in its own Manifesto. They must realise that this Government, the first to impose its own salary award on teachers by special Act of Parliament, will not be won over by polite exchanges of opinion.

The leadership, also, must abandon their unprincipled exclusion of the Left, so that all organisations and individuals supporting the campaign's aims can help to develop it locally and nationally. The local Campaign Committees, increasing too slowly in number, must be given a clear and active lead, stressing above all the lamentable record of successive Governments and their responsibility for the present education crisis.

The new schools, built and to be built, are welcome indeed, but the fact that they do not even keep pace with the needs of the rising school population must be made clear to the public. Educational advance, like peace, is advocated by all, particularly at election times. But the lip-service support given by many parliamentary candidates to the campaign's aims must be exposed. In the education campaign which, in every constituency, must become a vital part of all election activities, hundreds of teachers and trade-unionists, co-operators and parents, could be so organised to secure the defeat of any candidate who has failed to support the aims and objects of the Campaign for Education.

Many more local Committees must urgently be formed to develop this campaign. Local press publicity, mass meetings and demonstrations, debates, education weeks giving a true picture of the local schools, and the publication of local propaganda material, could be undertaken by an active local Committee.

Local Associations of the National Union of Teachers, the initiator of the campaign and the most powerful element in its leadership, should call on their Executive to pay more serious and detailed attention to the Campaign for Education and to demand that the campaign actively implements the policy of its inaugural Manifesto. Teachers, parents, trade-unionists, co-operators, all who passionately demand a happy future for their children and for the security of their country, must realise that a new education system is just part of that brave new world for which they have been fighting so long, and that only by an undeviating and relentless struggle against the social forces which stand in the way, will success be achieved.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Railwaymen

Dr. Philip S. Bagwell

Allen & Unwin. 726 pp. 70s.

WHEN THE National Union of Railwaymen asked Dr. Philip Bagwell to write the history of the union, they made a wise choice. 'The Railwaymen' is no dry-as-dust record of events; it is a lucid story of working-class struggle, achievement and failure over the last fifty years.

The fact that the N.U.R. is today one of the most powerful industrial trade unions in the country is itself a tribute to the courage of men who fought against and overcame tremendous odds. Before they formed trade unions they were treated as serfs. 'Not an instance of intoxication, singing, whistling or levity while on duty will be overlooked and, besides being dismissed, the offender will be liable for punishment' (Taff Vale Rly. rules). Heaven only knows what these poor devils had to sing about! The directors encouraged men to report anyone bold enough to whisper about trade unionism. No man could trust his brother. In the House of Commons a noble Lord was dismayed that 'a servant dismissed by one railroad could get employment on another'. He demanded a black-list. Pay and working conditions were scandalous; men could be booked on duty twenty hours a day.

Despite formidable and unscrupulous opposition, the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants (forerunner of the N.U.R.) was founded in 1871. The tough struggles, achievements and failures since those early days make a fascinating story. Two events of outstanding significance were the national railway

strikes of 1911 and 1919. The first was for recognition—the right to negotiate. Four unions, the A.S.R.S., the General Railway Workers' Union, the United Pointsmen's and Signalmen's Society and A.S.L.E.F. acted in complete unity. All Executive Committee decisions regarding the strike were unanimous. Strike telegrams were signed by the four General Secretaries. The response was 'staggering'.

To break the strike, the Government authorised the use of troops. The bosses resorted to bribery: free beer, food and lodgings for black-legs. But within forty-eight hours, both Government and Companies climbed down. Why? Because 'all four unions concerned with the movement of traffic acted as one'. It was this dramatic demonstration of the power of unity which led to the formation of the National Union of Railwaymen in 1913 by the fusion of the victorious unions, with the regrettable exception of the A.S.L.E.F.

The 1919 national rail strike (over pay and conditions) lasted nine days. In an attempt to split railwaymen, the locomen had been given a relatively good settlement of their claims. But when the N.U.R. gave strike notice, the A.S.L.E.F. General Secretary wired to branches 'Executive decided to support N.U.R. Our members must strike at midnight'. Again the response to a united call was 'beyond all expectations'. Lloyd George labelled the strike an 'anarchist conspiracy'. Lords and Ladies, Dukes and Earls were conspicuous if ineffective strike-breakers. Troops were ordered out 'to protect railway property' but they played over one hundred football matches with the strikers for the benefit of railwaymen's funds! Fearful that the strike

would spread to other industries, the Government climbed down. Once again unity paid off.

But if this book records so graphically the victories won by railwaymen, it also tells of their failure to apply the lesson of their history. Relations between the unions became strained and, indeed, sometimes bitter. The Beeching menace has, however, brought their common interests to the forefront and relations are greatly improved. Yet real unity has not been achieved. One union has just announced a wage claim; another has declared the time inopportune; another will decide later. Is this state of affairs worthy of those grand pioneers? Does it serve the best interest of *any* group of railwaymen?

Many attempts have been made to achieve unity in one form or another—generally initiated by the rank and file. None of the rail unions is free from blame for the failure. The rank and file should not allow past failures to deter them from new efforts towards unity. They must keep on pressing, through their branches and annual conferences, for action to break through the artificial divisions which serve only the employer.

C. R. SWEETINGHAM

Karl Marx
Arnold Kettle

Weidenfeld & Nicolson. 120 pp.
10s. 6d.

A RECENT SURVEY of working class life, habits and cultural horizons, carried out at three large factories, included a test of their knowledge of great men. In one section, dealing with scientists and men of learning, the workers were asked to identify

Einstein, Darwin, Freud and Marx. At each factory, Marx headed the list. It was a worthy tribute.

Millions of workers, of course, know of Marx and think of him as a protagonist of their cause, despite the decades of jaundiced calumny which have tried to make it otherwise. Books dealing with his work have been many and have varied greatly in worth; but with the publication of Arnold Kettle's book we are at last in possession of a modern appreciation of Marx which brings us face to face with the giant stature of the man.

The great service Arnold Kettle renders is that he brings Marx to life as the many-sided, yet complete and rounded, and above all human, worker, thinker and fighter. Here are the four strings—the economist, historian, philosopher and revolutionary. Taken together it is these four which are responsible for the tremendous impact which Marx has had on the twentieth century.

This is not a book which sets out to tell the reader how to read Marx. Rather it brings him, in a straightforward and uncomplicated way, to life; it indicates what an enormous range of human understanding can be gained from applying the ideological weapons which Marx handed down to the working people who were to follow him.

The book appears in the publishers' 'Pathfinder Biography' series, and a happier choice of title would be difficult to find. The reason why the final chapter (Do Marx's Ideas Matter Today?) can be so powerfully written is that so many people throughout the world have found the path Marx indicated, and are following it.

ALAN BROWN

❧ ‘RELATIVELY IMMORTAL’ ❧

*The past is dead, it lives only for us to learn from.
The present, the present only, is ours to work in;
and the future is ours to create.*

THIS wise saying has much to teach, not least in the stress it lays on the continuity of past, present and future struggle. For us in countries which have not yet broken the power of their corrupt ruling class and so started clearing the ground of the hideous débris of class society, we need often to guard against a false sense of isolation, which can lead to lack of confidence. It can lead to stubbornly stodging on with eyes on the ground, instead of being alert to see first signs of change; to looking for solutions solely in help ‘from outside’; to clinging to methods suited to another phase; to overthrowing basic principles in favour of organisational ‘gimmicks’; to substituting wild adventures for patient organisation in hope of breaking what is felt to be a deadlock. Even in the smallest units of the labour movement we are familiar with such phases, whilst great controversies on theory over the past 150 years have shown the same on an international scale. One safeguard is to develop this sense of continuity of our own struggle, in our own country: what we have gained from our forefathers and what legacy we shall leave to our successors by our action here, today. The history of the British working class movement is rich indeed, and it is ours to create.

Essential weapons are the movement’s writings. As William Morris said about winning 1,000 new readers for *Commonweal* in 1887: ‘There have been so many advanced papers which have been born to die that it would be a most serious advantage if we could make one Socialist paper relatively immortal’. In it he aimed at a first class journal to campaign for socialism, with an intimate relation with readers, each being a seller and financial supporter. That was, and remains, the traditional British way, as *L.M.* readers have proved over 42 years. There are no easy short cuts. In contrast consider the fate of the *Daily Herald* today, when even the ghost of the honest old independent printers’ strike bulletin is vanishing. The beginning of the end was when Ernest Bevin ‘re-organised’ it, bringing it under the joint control of the right wing of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress and a commercial undertaking, free gifts and all, and told the 1930 T.U.C. it had ‘played Beaverbrook at his own game’. What dreams were

lost with the old *Daily Herald*! A reader writes from an East Midlands mining village of *L.M.*'s 'continuity of enlightenment and education on things that matter most. I have genuine proletarian pride to be able to read and pass on to others the refreshing message. Nearly 50 years ago I dreamed, along with a small village group of revolutionaries, that some day that message could be better spread by print than untutored tongues'. He described their struggles to raise a press fund by meetings and selling pamphlets 'in all weathers to people in the market places and farming villages'. How the money was often lost, once by 'a horsey comrade fondly hoping to help the fund', having he thought found the way to beat the bookie by doubling up on the favourite! He ends: 'Here's my donation and long life to the reliable *L.M.*' A young student on holiday work in the North pushes *L.M.* sales, and sends proceeds of 'two days hay-making': yet another expression of the continuity in time of the struggle, at one end of the age scale. Below we print a letter from a reader at the other end, both playing their part in seeking to make 'one Socialist paper relatively immortal'.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

Lancashire.

I have been a reader since first the magazine was published. Now, as an old age pensioner of 83, I still class it as making life worth living.

HARRY BROWNJOHN.

£110 19s. 3d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: 'Daisy Bell', £10; 'Windfall', £10; H.H., £10; G.F. £10; B. W. Mackay, 4s; D. Sandwell 5s; 'S. Mill', £1; J. A. Smith, 6s; B. Ainley, 10s; 'Backslider', 12s 6d; L. Bates, 5s; H. Brindle, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 2s; Oldham Branch, 1s; E. Strachan Rogers, £3 3s; D. H. Strathern and friends, £1; R.F.B., £3; S. Turner (for Daisy Mendez, Cuba), 5s; 'Pax', 2s 6d; 'In Memory of Joe Brien', 3s; 'L'Humanité', 5s; Humphreys family, 10s; R. Dodd, £1; 'Oliver Twist and Friends', 15s; S. Morrissy, 10s; N. Usher, 2s 6d; F.G.A., 10s; 'Highgate Reader', £3; M. Illing, £1; Marie Philibert, 10s; R. McLeod, 5s; Butcher family, 10s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; E.J.B., 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; 'Anon, Whitchurch', 1s; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 1s; L. Perkins 2s 6d.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: R. G. Fowler, 19s; G. and E. Bestford, 10s; H. Woodfield, 19s; D. Mukerji, £6 0s 6d; 'J', 4s 6d; M. Hurwitt, £2 19s; J. McLanachan, £1 1s; B. H. Steel, 19s; D. Smith, £1 5s; H. F. Westney, 19s; W. H. Laithwaite, £3 19s; M. Sternberg, 9s; 'Valentina', 17s 6d; W.H. (Australia), £5; J. R. Smith, 10s; J. Hall, 4s; K. Harling, 5s; M. Strickland, 5s; W.S. (Canada), 2s 9d; P. Wallis, 9s; A. Corbett, £1; Dorothy Brenner, 10s; D. R. Morgan, 9s; In Memory of Tom Peppercorn, 5s; Thomas Graham, 19s; H. Ludford, 10s 6d; R. Gibbs, 5s; S. Townsend, 12s 6d; A. E. Portbury, 9s; I. Innes, £2 2s; B. D. Youatt, 9s; A. S. Dopson, 9s; W. M. Cormack, 9s 6d; John Davis, 10s; C. M. Searle, 2s 6d; M. Perl, 9s; Mrs. R. Herring, 4s; L. Naftalin, £1 1s; H. Brownjohn (in memory of Pat Mooney), 4s; J. Manley, 5s; W. Davidson, 4s; G.H. (Canada), 15s; H.A. (U.S.A.), £7 8s; L. M. Congreve, 6s; E. P. Young, £1 1s.

Our thanks to you all.
Co-op. No. L.99482.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

SPECIAL CONCESSION.....

AND DELIVERED TO YOUR DOOR!

(All Post Free)

Second Class Mail (Unsealed Envelope)

Great BritainOne year 21s., six months 10s. 6d.

OverseasOne year 24s., six months 12s.

CanadaOne year \$3.50

U.S.A.One year \$3.50

First Class Mail (Sealed Envelope)

Great BritainOne year 23s., six months 11s. 6d.

Commonwealth CountriesOne year 27s. (Canada \$4.50)

Outside Commonwealth.....One year 35s. (U.S.A. \$5.50)

INSURANCE EXPERTS LTD

are independent Insurance Brokers dealing with all insurance companies and Lloyd's. Our full-time job is to keep abreast of all developments and to apply our knowledge in your interests. We represent YOU, and use our expertise to select for you the best policy to fit your individual needs. Our remuneration comes from the company which we select for you, so our advice to you is free. It costs no more for you to avail yourself of our knowledge, and often costs much less. Please give us the pleasure of quoting for all your insurance and mortgage needs.

1a Well Road, London, N.W.3.
HAM 5421, Evgs. HAM 6269.

Kindly mention *Labour Monthly* when enquiring.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d.
Cash with order to: 'Class Ads.',
Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane,
London, N.3.)

COMRADES! Sell your BOOKS to a modern realistic firm paying modern realistic prices. Marxism, Labour & T.U. Movements, Soc./Econ., Hist., Russia, Lit. Crit., etc. Stanley Noble, 24, Gladwell Rd., London, N.8. MOU 2831. We call.

WE BUY BOOKS, pamphlets, Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: RIV 6807. The Hammer-smith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6.

URGENTLY REQUIRED—All back numbers of *Labour Monthly* from 1921-1930 inclusive and 1939.

Labour Monthly

Bound Volume, 1962

It's a history of the year and
■ permanent record

ORDER NOW

We have a few **BOUND
VOLUMES** of earlier years
available.

Apply to:

**THE MANAGER,
134, Ballards Lane,
LONDON, N.3**

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating
by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

For all interested in the fight for Peace and
Progress in the Countryside and the problems
of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.

Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or

Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

27, Bedford St. Strand, London, W.C.2.

LABOUR RESEARCH

'N.I.C. and Profits'

'Incompetent Managers'

'Building Profits'

Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

To All Trade Unionists

Each month we have something of interest to trade unionists generally, in our series "Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties." Full commentary, too, on current peace problems, international affairs, the socialist world and former colonies.

HELP US TO GET THIS SERIES WIDELY KNOWN

1. Show this copy to your mates and fellow trade unionists.
2. Get your branch or shop stewards' committee to order copies.

Reduced rates for trade unions and shop stewards' committees during this series: 2s. each, 10s. 6d. for 6. Back numbers available.

I encloses.d. for copies.

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor : R. Palme Dutt

LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE SPECIAL

TED HILL

Trade Unions and a Labour Government

★

WHAT KIND OF LABOUR GOVERNMENT?

The Editor

★

J. E. MORTIMER

Case for Public Ownership

JOMO KENYATTA

African Unity

OCTOBER 1963

Two Shillings

CONTENTS

<p>Notes of the Month: What Kind of Labour Government? <i>First Catch Your Hare—Electoral Gamble—Policy the Key—Property or the People?—Trade Unions and Labour—Unity or Separation?—Americanising the Labour Movement—For Labour Unity—Unity and Policy—Wilson and the Atlantic Alliance—Towards Relaxation?—Wilson and Wage Policy.....</i>R.P.D.</p>	433
<p>The Trade Unions and the Labour Government. The Boiler-makers' General Secretary comments on wage restraint and socialist economic planning.....E. J. Hill</p>	449
<p>The Case for Public Ownership. Leading trade unionist shows the need for extension of nationalisation to key sections of industry.....J. E. Mortimer</p>	451
<p>Last Message of Dr. Du Bois to the World. A Tribute.</p>	455
<p>African Unity. Prime Minister of Kenya writes on the significance of the unity of the African States established at Addis Ababa Jomo Kenyatta</p>	458
<p>Britain's Guilt for Apartheid. An exposure of Britain's support for South Africa's police state.....A. Lerumo</p>	461
<p>Action Against Closures. An Executive member of the N.U.R. describes the mounting protests against closures.....Willie Wood</p>	467
<p>Kirkcaldy's Fight. Trades Council secretary shows the effects of pit and factory closures in Fife.....J. Mathieson</p>	469
<p>Memo. for Scarborough. Collapse of grand Nato 'Red Hordes' scare.....Andrew Rothstein</p>	470
<p>Charter for Youth. A teacher calls for proper training and jobs for youth.....Olwyn White</p>	472
<p>Illustrations. Chinese Contemporary Folk Art.</p>	456-7
<p>Book Reviews. 'The British Political Elite', W. L. Guttsmann: <i>James Harvey</i>; 'Economic Planning in France', J. and A. M. Hackett: <i>John Eaton</i>; 'Challenge of Marxism', Ed. Brian Simon: <i>D. N. Pritt</i>; 'A Philosophy of Man', Adam Schaff: <i>John Lewis</i>; 'Frederick Engels—Paul and Laura Lafargue Correspondence, Vol. III', translated by Yvonne Kapp: <i>R. Page Arnot</i>.</p>	474
<p>Not Wanted.....Angela Tuckett</p>	479

Notes of the Month

WHAT KIND OF LABOUR GOVERNMENT ?

The City of London has become convinced that a Labour Government is a strong probability. Yet share prices have risen.

(Sunday Citizen, former Reynolds News, July 28, 1963.)

Labour wants capitalism to work smoothly.

(‘Labour, Confidence and the City’, Financial Times, June 28, 1963.)

September 10, 1963.

WHEN the Labour Party Conference meets at Scarborough the thoughts of all will be turned to the prospect of a Labour Government. This prospect also in practice dominated the Trades Union Congress at Brighton. Even the victorious resolution of explicit and unqualified opposition to wage restraint was qualified in the minds of many of the delegations voting for it with a supposed implicit reservation (not set out in the resolution actually carried, though hinted at in an ambiguously worded and varyingly interpreted passage in the mover’s speech) that in the event of a Labour Government undertaking serious economic planning the trade unions would pledge co-operation which could include a different attitude to wage policy. Thus on the central fighting front of the class struggle at home today, wage policy, the battle is joined. The class confrontation facing a future Labour Government, as it faced the preceding three Labour Governments, has been already foreshadowed in the proceedings at Brighton, and will no doubt be in the minds of delegates at Scarborough.

Trade Unions and a Labour Government

Wage restraint, which is the heart and soul and real purpose of Neddy behind all its flummery of spurious ‘planning’, as shown in our last month’s issue, under a Conservative Government has been rejected without qualification by the Trades Union Congress. The same Congress has sanctioned continued participation in Neddy, but with the deletion of a paragraph which declared that wages must rise less rapidly than in the past, and its replacement by a paragraph declaring that on the basis of a policy of growth wages will need to rise more rapidly than in the past. The action of the unions in the

event of the return of a Labour Government has been left undefined, but with the implication of readiness to co-operate with such a Government in a policy of planning, and for such a purpose to reconsider wage policy. How much such a qualification will mean in practice is disputed and will obviously depend on the further development of the situation and the struggle. Ferocious right wing critics, who were defeated in their attempt to secure rejection of the resolution condemning wage restraint, claimed that this qualification meant very little. In support of this claim they pointed to the ultimately victorious fight of the trade unions against the disastrous wage freeze policy of Sir Stafford Cripps and the third Labour Government. But this is to assume that the policy of a fourth Labour Government will inevitably repeat the fatal path of the third. The conclusion should rather be that the fight to replace the Tory Government by a Labour Government needs to be accompanied by the fight for a new type of policy for such a Labour Government. In this context readers will give careful attention to the contribution on a later page in this month's issue from the mover of the victorious resolution at the Trades Union Congress against wage restraint, the General Secretary of the Boilermakers, Ted Hill, on the crucial question of the role of the unions in relation to a prospective Labour Government.

First Catch Your Hare

We have not yet got a Labour Government. Toryism is still in the saddle. The fight to defeat it has still to be fought and won. The complacent attitude of waiting for the penny to drop into the hat is dangerous for two reasons. It is dangerous because Toryism can still do a great deal of damage at home and abroad before it goes, and all the more if it becomes convinced that its reign is anyway drawing to a close. But above all it is dangerous because the failure to fight now, to bring down the Tory Government as an urgent immediate objective, may defeat also the further objective, and, by failing to mobilise the support of the labour movement and the people, give Toryism a new lease of life. Controversies on the future policy of a Labour Government, or on the attitude of the trade unions to a future Labour Government, are important at the present moment, not as an alternative to the fight for a Labour Government, or a retreat into speculation, but because the present fight on these questions is decisive for the success of the fight for a Labour Government and for an alternative policy corresponding to the demands of the labour movement.

Discredit of the Tory Government

It is true that the prospect of a Labour Government by 1964 is now almost universally assumed. For many months all the opinion polls, whatever their variations among themselves or successive lesser ups and downs, have consistently shown a considerable Labour lead over Toryism. The latest Gallup poll at the time of writing (*Daily Telegraph*, September 6) showed 50·5 per cent of those expressing a choice for Labour against only 33·5 per cent for the Conservatives or a Labour lead of 17 per cent. For purposes of comparison it is worth noting that the 1945 general election overwhelming Labour anti-Tory landslide showed 47·8 per cent for Labour against 39·8 per cent for the Conservatives or a Labour lead of 8 per cent. Thus the current Labour lead is double that of 1945. There is indeed no parallel to the present swing of opinion and extreme discredit of the Tory Government. All events at the moment are increasing that discredit. Never were the opportunities so favourable for an advance of the whole labour movement on a scale far exceeding that of 1945.

Electoral Gamble

Nevertheless, a note of caution is necessary. Public opinion polls have often proved a misleading guide. Elections in Britain are often a gamble, with a strong swindling element. The moment of the election is not fixed by the constitution, or chosen by parliament or by any democratic procedure, but by the Government to suit its own calculations. The political climate may change with new events, since the election—unless previously forced by the pressure of the mass movement—does not have to take place until the autumn of next year. The notoriously undemocratic character of the electoral mechanism, geared to maintain the monopoly of the two-party system and prevent representation of political convictions, delivers the decisive casting vote in a keenly contested election to the most undecided element—the small minority of so-called ‘floating voters’ who are most affected by the temporary event or emotion of the moment.

Tory Calculations

The Conservatives, while recognising their present unpopularity, hope that changes in the situation at home or abroad may yet come to their rescue. Some hope that perhaps a temporary economic upswing, with an election budget of concessions in the spring, may turn the scales. Already the usual chorus of buoyant predictions of

a boom in front, rising stock market prices and the like, has begun to be proclaimed. This chorus ignores the obvious negative signs of the deepening balance of payments battle between the major industrial powers, with the especially serious signal of the United States raising of interest rates and emergency measures of economic war. Others place their hopes in an improvement in the international situation, following the partial test ban treaty, and the possibility of a relaxation in the cold war; any such improvement they are already seeking to claim with their customary gay effrontery as a special triumph of Harold Macmillan. On this basis they may well attempt to exploit for electoral purposes, in the same way as they did in the general elections of 1951, 1955 and 1959, with their calls during those elections for a Summit Conference, the profession to stand for a relaxation of cold war tension, as a supposed contrast to the rigid cold war policy of official Labour.

No Complacency

Against such manoeuvres it is necessary to be on guard. Nothing could be more unwise than complacency or lack of vigilance or self-criticism ('don't raise questions of policy now'; 'it's in the bag'; 'don't rock the boat') in Labour's ranks at the present critical moment. Tory manoeuvres—and they will be multiplied a hundredfold as the election draws nearer—cannot be defeated merely by general denunciations of Tory hypocrisy or even of the disastrous Tory record or by general calls to replace a Tory Government by a Labour Government. Many of the younger generation, disillusioned by the frustrating experience of nearly two decades since the war and the spectacle of bipartisanship, are no longer convinced that this means any real change or a solution of Britain's problems. More and more of them are feeling (and not least the tens of thousands of school leavers and young workers, ready and eager to play their part in society, and denied the elementary right to work) that gigantic problems of Britain's future, of the whole economic and social future, as also of war and peace, are arising and clamouring for solution. Many of them feel that the pre-election literature already stacking the shelves of the rival ruling parties or the new-style hocus-pocus advertisements ('Modernise with the Conservatives!' 'Forward with Labour!') offer but a dusty answer to these questions; full of empty high-sounding generalities and ambiguities and evasions; delicately sidestepping all the nettles and monsters in the path. Of what use the joint Tory-Labour incan-

tations to the New Holy Mumbo-Jumbo of 'Planning' in the abstract, if in the real world the great private multi-million monopolies and landed interests are left in possession? The Trades Union Congress at any rate, while tolerating continued participation in Neddy, at the same time unanimously demanded nationalisation of a number of key industries. This demand of the organised working class was immediately repudiated by the official leadership of the Labour Party. Thus the battle is on. The question of the ownership of Britain's wealth cannot be so easily by-passed.

Policy the Key

The truth is that the fight to replace the Tory Government by a Labour Government would be meaningless unless it is linked with the fight for an effective alternative policy to Toryism. Toryism needs to be defeated, not by abstract slogans, denunciations and generalities, but by concrete proposals for a policy which can at any rate take the first steps to meeting the urgent needs of the people. The wide body of electors today, especially the younger electors untied by traditional loyalties, are far more sceptical and critical, distrustful of politicians' promises, conscious of past deceptions, even though they still have for mental nourishment only the mass of conventional lies and false information poured out to them by the official channels, or, in place of discussion, tedious exchanges of weary platitudes by orthodox bores, and are denied access (by legal coercion, in respect of the main means of public communication, broadcasting and television, and by the power of finance-capital in respect of the press) to the elementary facts of the world today or real living discussion. The parable of the *Daily Herald's* fate has thrown a floodlight on this situation. The fight for an effective alternative policy to meet the needs of the people—which is what the mass of the people, desperate over housing or jobs or anxious over the bomb, are hungering and thirsting for, although knowledge of the possibility of an alternative path is artificially denied to ninety nine per cent of them—cannot under these conditions be won in a single battle. The coming election is only one front of this wider battle. But such a policy is the indispensable basis for the real defeat of Toryism, including of Tory policy in the labour movement—whose domination, in the event of the formation of a Labour Government, could lead to an even more dangerous disillusionment than followed 1945-51 and characterised the sick decade of the nineteen-fifties.

First Things First

Nor is there much question among active trade unionists and socialists on the essentials of such a policy. Such a policy would need to put forward its concrete proposals for steps towards peace, for an initiative to end the cold war and the arms race, and to repudiate nuclear strategy or its basing in Britain. It would need to end the waste of Britain's resources on bankrupt imperialist policies (Wilson is reported to have defined Labour's arms policy in a recent interview in Hamburg as 'being strong East of Suez'), and go forward hand in hand with the advancing new nations and the national liberation struggle. In place of incantations to the now fashionable panacea of 'planning' the millionaires' property for them (Toryism also nowadays repeats the same incantations, so that there is not even any electoral advantage to be won by playing this game of make-believe), a serious policy would need to grasp the nettle and tackle the problem of taking over the biggest monopolies and commanding centres of the economy, including the land monopoly, as the only way to beginning to attempt to plan the resources and productive power of the country for the needs of the people.

Not to Be Afraid of the Big Bad Wolf

Certainly such proposals will arouse shrieks of scare propaganda from the Tories. A sample has been offered already after the unanimous nationalisation demands of the Trades Union Congress. But all the scare propaganda of Toryism in 1945 ('Gestapo', 'Dictator Laski', 'Savings in Danger', etc.) failed. It can fail still more today, with the mass anger against the Tory record, not only among the workers, but among wide sections of their former most staunch middle class supporters. It is probable that in no major country in the world, not even in the United States, is the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few so great as in Britain (in India the concentration may be in even fewer hands, but the scale is lower). The longer the tackling of the stranglehold of the big monopolies is delayed, the more they will suffocate the life of Britain, and Britain will continue to sink in the world scale.

Who Comes First—Property or the People?

Only on the basis of such a programme of decisive economic measures, alongside a policy of peace, will it be possible in practice to provide for the building of the houses needed, the lower rents, the requirements for health and education to bring Britain up from the

bottom of the league, or to end the scandal of existing pension and social benefit rates, with the resulting record two million total of what was once called 'pauperism' (now euphemistically termed 'national assistance') exceeding any parallel in the whole experience of capitalism in Britain. Labour's all too inadequate proposals in these fields are counterbalanced at every turn by proposals for increased charges on the workers to pay for them—and even to provide a 'National Investment Fund' from the contributions of the workers, because the monopolies are left untouched. Their proposals are limited in this way precisely because the private monopolies are left in possession and all the parasites' demands and crippling imperialist costs are regarded as sacred.

Trade Unions and the Cold War

The Trades Union Congress did at any rate adopt some positive proposals along these lines in the home field. It is true that the international field of foreign policy and the cold war and nuclear strategy, which could in fact settle the fate of Britain, was unwisely ruled out and fenced off from discussion as apparently ground sacred to the Labour Party. If the Trades Union Congress had accepted such an outlook in the past, there would never have been a Labour Party today. Even the very moderate Liberal-Labour mid-nineteenth century trade union leaders had no hesitation a century ago in signing their names to the famous Inaugural Address of the First International, penned by Marx, when it declared:

If the emancipation of the working class requires their fraternal concurrence, how are they to fulfil that great mission with a foreign policy in pursuit of criminal designs, playing upon national prejudices, and squandering in piratical wars the people's blood and treasure?

The experience of the counter-revolutionary role, they proclaimed, of 'the ruling classes' of the 'West of Europe' on the side of the slaveowners in the United States or against the Polish revolution

have taught the working classes the duty to master themselves the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective Governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power . . . The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes.

Such were the sentiments of the General Council of that day, the General Council of the First International, of which the most distinguished leaders of English trade unionism were proud to be members. If that was true a century ago, how much more true is it today in the need to fight against the infamous counter-revolutionary

cold war of 'the ruling classes' of the 'West of Europe' now openly allied with the descendants of the slaveowners of the United States, grown to monstrous wealth and military expansion all over the world?

A Home Programme

But at any rate in the home field the Trades Union Congress did pass positive resolutions, for the nationalisation of a series of specifically named basic industries; for the 'popular control of key enterprises as a means for creating a more democratic society'; for the democratisation of nationalised industries; for a national transport system; for the development of employment and youth industrial training; as well as important proposals in the sphere of health and education, for the increase (figures unfortunately eliminated in the compositing) of pensions and social service benefits, and for the legal enforcement of equal pay, in ratification of the already agreed International Labour Organisation Convention, to apply not only to public employment, where it is already established in many spheres, but also in private employment. The latter alone, if enforced, would already begin a revolution to change Britain's general social backwardness. All this provides materials towards a home programme of the labour movement.

Trade Unions and Labour—Unity or Separation?

How far, however, will these proposals be taken up in Labour's electoral programme or in the legislative programme of a Labour Government? Here we come to the peculiar and increasingly dangerous new feature of the present situation of the labour movement. Once upon a time it was taken for granted that the Labour Party was the political wing of the organised working class movement, whose industrial expression was the trade unions. Every spokesman of the old capitalist order denounced such unity as an outrage and affront to the sacred classless principles of the British Constitution. Today the modern generation of Labour politicians, all duly inoculated from childhood with orthodox capitalist doctrines (for the matter of that, the new run of trade union manipulators of the Woodcock brand are also nowadays academically inoculated with capitalist theories, so that the voice of a Ted Hill sounds among them like the Promethean voice of a surviving free man among indoctrinated pigmies), hold up their hands in horror at the thought that their programme should be 'dictated' to them by the trade

unions. Anxiously they proclaim to quizzing pressmen their 'independence' of the unions. The first reaction of Labour headquarters to the demands of the Trades Union Congress for a wide extension of nationalisation was to declare that this of course would make no difference to Labour's programme.

Hushing up the Family Background

Indeed, the most modern Labour parliamentarians tend to regard the trade unions shamefacedly as the skeleton in their cupboard—or the unfashionable relative, whom they would prefer to keep out of sight now that they have entered into the higher reaches of fashionable society. Once upon a time the trade unions were regarded by the right-wing political leaders as their bulwark and sheet-anchor to guarantee stability and the defeat of any revolt from the left. But now that the slow, uneven, yet in the larger perspective continuously developing radicalisation of the working class in the conditions of the deepening decline of British capitalism has revealed its effects also in the not easily changing structure and traditions of the trade unions, wherever democratic procedures permit its expression, the relationship has changed. The trade unions are seen by these Labour politicians, not only as an awkward electoral liability, but also as a potential source of dangerous thoughts. It was the T.U.C. unilateral resolution which preceded Scarborough in 1960; and it was the trade union vote which determined that famous swing to the left in the Labour Party Conference. No wonder some of the new-thinking Labour politicians dream of an ideal Labour Party without the unions—were it not that they need the union finances. Sordid material reality breaks in on the idealist dream of pure classless politics. They take the cash; but they will not let themselves be bought. The democracy of representation of the unions in the Trades Union Congress is not allowed in the Labour Party Conference. The unions are accepted as a necessary evil; worthy fellows at heart, but sometimes troublesome; the unrepresentable relative who unfortunately has the cash, and must therefore be cajoled and humoured, but as far as possible disowned in public. Servants should keep to their place in the kitchen, and submit their humble suggestions only on appropriate subjects, but not meddle in high politics, which they do not understand.

Americanising the Labour Movement?

These trends to promote a rift between the trade unions and the Labour Party should receive alert attention and be met with precau-

tionary counter measures equally on the part of socialists in the Labour Party and of militant trade unionists. The consequences otherwise could prove dangerous. For there are not lacking those also in the higher leadership of trade unionism who look askance at the irksome ties of the Labour Party alliance and dream of an above-party 'independence' in which they could negotiate on equal terms either with a Tory or with a Labour Government. Indeed, Bevin more than once used to throw out hints about the danger of putting all their eggs in one political basket. Toryism of course is delighted to encourage any such trend. All this would correspond to the increasingly visible blueprint for Americanising the British labour movement, so as to produce American-style 'non-political' unions in the old Gompers tradition bargaining with the two ruling political parties to sell their vote to the highest bidder. The correct and important aim of drawing in the professional unions into the T.U.C. is often used as an argument for encouraging this dangerous trend.

For Labour Unity

Against this menace the strongest stand will need to be made, in order to strengthen, not weaken, the links between the industrial and political labour movement. The fulfilment of this aim will require above all the restoration of democratic rights of representation of the unions in the Labour Party Conference in the same way as in the Trades Union Congress, thereby ensuring the fullest effective participation and role of the fighting party of socialism, today the Communist Party, in the common struggle for socialist aims—the role which the pioneers and founders of the Labour Party recognised from the outset as indispensable for the success of the alliance to ensure real independence from capitalist politics.

Unity and Policy

There are those who say that the fight on policy should be relegated to the background or placed in cold storage until after the election, because the paramount need is unity to defeat Toryism and return a Labour Government. This argument is in danger of repeating the ancient fallacy exposed of old by Lucretius: 'for the sake of life to lose the reasons for living'. Two different issues are in fact here confused. It is perfectly true that in the existing political confrontation of forces, in the existing choice presented by the electoral system between a Tory Government or a Labour Government, the most active campaign and mobilisation should be con-

ducted for the defeat of Toryism and the return of a Labour Government, whatever its limitations, and irrespective of opinions of existing official Labour policy. But this does not mean that the question of the policy of a future Labour Government should be regarded with indifference. Such a course would not only weaken the present election fight but would mean to ask for future trouble. On the contrary, the fight for an effective alternative policy to Toryism corresponding to the demands and needs of the people, requires to be conducted simultaneously with the fight for the defeat of Toryism, through all the forms that are possible. Thus in the limited number of constituencies where Communist candidates are standing, the direct fight for such an alternative policy can be conducted; and the disadvantage of the incidental contradiction arising from the electoral system and the present Labour refusal of electoral agreement is outweighed by the advantage of such a direct voicing of the fight for the whole campaign. In many constituencies the choice of militant fighters as prospective Labour candidates can be vigorously pursued by local organisations, or replacement of notorious reactionaries. Through all the organisations of the labour movement the fight for an effective alternative policy to Toryism needs to be intensified.

No Illusions

In some quarters, even on the left, the argument is put forward that no further fight on policy is necessary, and that everything is all right now, since Gaitskell was succeeded by Wilson as Leader. 'Trust Harold.' Irrespective of any judgment of the personal qualities of the very able Harold Wilson, this subjective approach will not do. It is true that in the Parliamentary Labour Party election of the new Leader to succeed Gaitskell in February of this year, the defeat of George Brown, who was the most vocal spokesman of right wing views and initially the favoured candidate of the Conservative press, by Harold Wilson, who had resigned with Bevan in 1951, been for a short time associated with the Bevan group, opposed German rearmament in 1954 and contested the Leadership against Gaitskell in 1960, represented a very significant political phenomenon. But to regard this as equivalent to the victory of the Left in the Labour Party would be to ignore the whole mechanism of leadership and policy in the Labour Party. The Right Wing (former Gaitskellites) is in fact firmly entrenched in all the governing organs of the Labour Party, not only in the Executive

and administrative machine of Transport House, but also and most overwhelmingly in the Parliamentary Labour Party and its Executive. When Wilson stood against Gaitskell in 1960 he received 81 votes against 166 for Gaitskell. If now Wilson received 144 against 104 for Brown, this did not mean that the Left had suddenly become the majority in the Parliamentary Labour Party. Their subsequent election of an overwhelmingly right-wing Executive, with exclusion of every left-wing candidate, proved this. The choice of Wilson revealed the prudent realisation of the main body, including some on the right (the 104 for Brown represented the hard core of die-hard right-wingers), that the new rising trends of militancy in the working class and among young people could make it dangerous to select the crude, arrogant and clumsy extreme right-winger Brown, and wiser to give to Wilson, with his reputation for some left tendencies, the task of holding the party together.

Who Dominates Whom?

The success of this calculation was shown in the resulting situation. The leading representatives of the Labour Left both inside and outside parliament acclaimed the election of Wilson as a victory, and called for an ending of all internal disputes and unity behind Wilson. 'Victory for Socialism', the very weak organisation of a handful of left M.P.s and supporters in the Labour Party, announced a decision to suspend activities and concentrate on unity for the general election. On this basis the right-wing policy has in practice swept forward, and its champions count on a relatively easy passage at Scarborough. Harold Wilson himself, even if he had any subjective inclinations a few degrees towards the left (always within the limited framework of left reformism, and in his case with the dominant outlook of a trained academic economist in capitalist economic theory* and statistician and 'practical' administrative bureaucrat), understood very well from the outset that he is dependent for his position on the support of the right wing dominating all the governing bodies of the Labour Party. Brown became

*In an interview of Kenneth Harris with Harold Wilson the *Observer* of June 9, 1963, reported:

Harris: How much has Marx influenced you?

Wilson: Not at all. I have studied the subject ■ history; you can't begin to understand the Russians without it. But quite honestly, I've never read *Das Kapital*. I got only ■ far as page two—that's where the footnote is nearly a page long. I felt that two sentences of main text and ■ page of footnote ■■ too much.

On page 2 of the English edition of Marx's *Kapital* the text occupies 25 lines of four inches. The five footnotes occupy two inches, or one-third of the space of the page, and contain fourteen sentences, not two. (The proportions on page 2 of the German text, if this text had been the object of Mr. Wilson's studies, are roughly the same.) In the same interview Harris referred to Wilson's 'photographic memory'. Wilson replied: 'I have got this peculiar memory—just a matter of facts sticking in my mind, for dates and figures'. Not always.

Deputy Leader and was soon engaged in independent forays in the field of policy, as in his visit to General Lemnitzer and Nato headquarters immediately after his election as Deputy Leader, and his public declarations there about what he would do 'as Prime Minister or as Defence Minister'. His ceaseless gaffes, however, have subsequently lowered his stock as potential candidate of the right. More important, the elected Parliamentary Executive, constituting the main field from whom Wilson had to appoint his Shadow Cabinet, was completely right-wing, unless exception is made of the centrist Crossman.

Shadow Cabinet

Recognition of this situation was shown in the first act of Wilson to declare that he would pursue the policy of Gaitskell, and his first declaration of policy in the House of Commons to affirm his loyalty to Nato and the cold war. In the appointment of his Shadow Cabinet he succeeded in depriving Brown of Foreign Affairs or Defence (which Brown had desired) by giving him overall charge of home affairs. But the key position of Foreign Affairs went to the extreme right-wing Gordon Walker; Defence to the envenomed anti-Soviet Healey; while Finance remained in the hands of Gaitskell's choice, Callaghan. The only nominee not associated with the extreme right wing, Crossman, was given the harmless minor position of Science, much in the same way as Macmillan had sought to relegate Hailsham to the same post. The composition of this 'Shadow Cabinet', foreshadowing a future Labour Government, is already a programme. A realist examination of all the concrete declarations of policy on major issues since the death of Gaitskell would confirm this general picture. While this analysis could be usefully extended to every sphere, for reasons of space it can be confined for the moment to two decisive issues. First, the Cold War. Second, Wages.

Wilson and the Atlantic Alliance

The first parliamentary declaration of policy of Wilson after the death of Gaitskell was in the debate on January 24 on the situation after the fiasco of the Government's approach to enter the Common Market. This occasion provided a unique opportunity for the Labour Party, not only to expose the utter fiasco of the Government's policy, but to present a positive alternative through the ending of East-West trade bans and actively utilising the possibilities

of trade with the expanding economies of the socialist and newly developing countries. Wilson showed his flag by conspicuously avoiding the obvious alternative which was even being discussed by conservative commentators, and concentrating on Western cold war unity:

The time is now urgent for the Government to start working on proposals for an Atlantic partnership, both economic and political, embracing the United States, the Six, Efta and the Commonwealth countries.

The exclusion of the socialist third of the world in this formulation was conspicuous. In the rest of his speech he made one additional reference, and that was to propose that the possibilities should be explored of developing further trade with Yugoslavia. In his subsequent visit to the United States in April his continued emphasis on the 'Atlantic partnership' and identity with the aims of United States policy delighted the State Department, and won warm expressions of approval from the American official press, while Wilson in turn declared his admiration for the U.S. Government as the finest Government in the world:

For sheer quality the U.S. Government, from President Kennedy downwards, are without equal in any Administration in any country.

(Harold Wilson, 'My U.S. Trip', *Daily Herald*, April 8, 1963.)

'The White House long ago made it known that a Labour Government in Britain would not be unwelcome' (Washington correspondent, *The Times*, March 28, 1963). But this is not perhaps the best recommendation to the British electorate, who are not entirely convinced that 'What is good for General Motors is good for Britain'.

Towards Relaxation?

Wilson's later visit to the Soviet Union in June, after which he was at pains to emphasise publicly that his views were 'quite different' from Soviet views on such vexed questions as Berlin, did not change this general picture. Certainly the present trend of British foreign policy under the existing Macmillan Tory Government, which in the face of the menace of the Franco-German Axis with its exclusion of Britain, and the increasingly relentless economic, strategic and 'anti-colonialist' pressure of the United States, is seeking some measure of negotiating accommodations with the Soviet Union and with China, may be continued also by a Labour Government in accordance with the normal practice of bipartisan foreign policy. The Labour Party has made useful proposals towards the aim of a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe and elsewhere, and has declared

opposition to the nuclear rearmament of Germany, including the plan for a West German finger on the nuclear trigger through a so-called multilateral nuclear force. But doubt has been cast on this opposition by subsequent statements of Gordon Walker, as Labour foreign affairs spokesman, in July when he 'indicated a willingness to reconsider the Nato multilateral nuclear force project' (*The Times*, July 23, 1963). More recently Wilson's speech on September 9 at the International Social Democratic Congress at Amsterdam has suggested some attempt to explore the possibilities of 'fruitful negotiations' with the Soviet Union on controlled disarmament and similar measures; and it is to be hoped that this theme will be further developed, with fewer inhibiting negative qualifications alongside. But up to the present Labour's policy still remains tied to the disastrous Nato cold war nuclear strategy, dominated by the United States, and involving, not only grave dangers for the future of Britain, but also very heavy present burdens crippling any plans for social or economic advance in Britain.

Wilson and Wage Policy

In his fraternal address to the biennial conference of the Transport and General Workers' Union on July 8 Wilson proclaimed Neddy 'a blueprint for socialism':

We believe in Neddy. A Neddy made into a reality with socialist policies which alone can turn an academic exercise into a national plan. Neddy, if it is going to be a reality, is a blueprint for socialism.

(Report in *Daily Herald*, July 9, 1963.)

On wage policy he said in the same address:

We shall have to ask for restraint in the matter of incomes, but when we say incomes, we mean all incomes. That means not only wages and salaries, but profits, especially monopoly profits, distributed dividends, yes, and rents as well. We have said again and again that neither wages nor any other incomes can for long outrun the year-to-year rise in our national productivity.

Here the bitter pill of wage restraint is coated with the usual conventional sugar of a promise also to limit profits. This promise is a familiar device, and was also made by the previous Labour Government, but never worked in practice. Callaghan in the parliamentary debate on February 12 talked roundly of a 'tax on wealth', but no subsequent enquiry made clear precisely what was meant, whether the tax on capital gains already initiated by the Tory Government, or a capital levy or increase of the corporate profits tax. It is probable that fiscal measures along these lines may be devised; but

no such measures within the framework of capitalist planning have ever in practice been able to limit profits, since the monopolies can get round them with a hundred devices.

The Fight Before Us

So far the City does not appear to have been seriously alarmed by these threats to profits, although the demand for acceptance of wage restraint will undoubtedly be taken up seriously by the Labour Party with the trade unions. The *Economist* on July 13 was quick to note the 'crafty' 'vagueness' of Wilson's reference to profits restraint:

This doctrine was craftily rather than demagogically worded. It is, like all Mr. Wilson's utterances, cagily difficult to interpret. But it is becoming increasingly possible to hope that Labour's anti-capitalist *quid pro quo* to the unions might take the form merely of a desirable strengthening of anti-monopoly legislation; of ordinary (and indeed, rather Conservative-like) appeals for dividend restraint, perhaps with threatened changes in profits tax (including distributed profits tax) held at the ready, and forms of 'rent restraint' that might be relatively mild. Mr. Wilson's skilful double nuances and deliberate vagueness are at least keeping the door open.

Whatever noises may be made during the election campaign, it is evident that the monopoly capitalists do not at present view with alarm the prospect of a Labour Government. This does not mean that the fight to defeat the Tory Government and return a Labour Government as the immediate next political stage needs to be any less intensively fought. But it does mean that the parallel fight needs to be intensified for an effective alternative policy to Toryism, both in the present period preceding the election, in the campaigning of the election, and after the election to press on the new Government. The Brighton Trades Union Congress has contributed something toward this aim. It is for the delegates to Scarborough to carry this fight further.

R.P.D.

Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties

THE TRADE UNIONS AND THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT

E. J. Hill

*General Secretary of the United Society of Boilermakers,
Blacksmiths, Shipbuilders and Structural Workers.*

WHAT should be the relations between the trade unions and the next Labour Government? Plenty of commentators on the sidelines at the Trades Union Congress last month were ready enough to say that the decisions at Brighton would embarrass Harold Wilson as Premier of the next Labour Government. They said it of all of us who were not willing to give unqualified support to the General Council's endorsement of the Neddy view of planning, but were completely opposed to any form of wage restraint. What poppycock!

To listen to some of these Dismal Jimmies you would have thought a Labour Government was already in power, bargaining successfully with benevolent employers to restrain their profits in order to give a fair launching to a Socialist economy at last. Yet here come the boilermakers throwing a spanner into the works by refusing to give up half a loaf of wages today in return for the whole loaf tomorrow. But that is as far from being the true picture as Trafalgar Square is from the committee rooms of the Treasury. Today there is no Labour Government in power pledged to planning a socialist economy. We do not even yet know if and when there will be a General Election. If last month we had gone on record in the trade union movement and given the green light to unconditional wage restraint, in whatever form, and had committed ourselves to shoving it down the throats of our members, there might not be another Labour Government. For why should workers vote for a Government of any colour which offers in practice nothing to meet the workers' real problems?

Make no mistake about it; the real problem is the dismantling of the key industries—shipbuilding, mines and railways; the decline in purchasing power of those who should be working in them. It is the old problem of cuts in social services: above all, in the education and training of the young people who are Britain's future wealth, and the callous disregard of the plight of the old folk who have

built Britain's past wealth. It is the problem of the shameful and dangerous waste of wealth and talent by a useless arms programme running at close on £1,800 million. These are the real problems of British economy. The tragedy is that we have put up with such a system so long; and the planning we should concentrate upon today is how to chuck them out.

My members have had experience of 130 years of the employers of Britain in the system of society which favours their insatiable greed for profits. We need no lesson on bargaining. We have known a long history of slumps and crises, during which they depressed our conditions and slaughtered us whenever we were not strong enough to prevent them. We know well enough what kind of expert planners they are. They can plan restraint of everything but profits. They can plan to close down shipyards. But they can never plan in the interests of the people. Why should they plan themselves out of existence? That is for us to do, before they complete the ruin of Britain's economy.

When two years ago the then Tory Chancellor of the Exchequer set up his National Economic Development Council and the General Council of the Trades Union Congress decided to go in and give it a trial, I gave this warning: 'Should he bring any pressure on wages, he will be rebuffed'.* Well, he has been rebuffed: and so will any of his successors in office who make the same attempt.

Today I must give another warning, not only to the employers and their Tory Government, but to anyone in our own great trade union and labour movement who may be deceived, about two dangerous tendencies. Stand firm against any attempt to play off the lower paid worker against other sections whose strength of organisation has enabled them to force on the employers relatively better bargains. When any section of workers successfully defend their wages and conditions, they strengthen the hands of all other sections. When they fail, it is a defeat for all. Is it the skilled toolmaker who exploits the scandalously low paid catering worker, bus conductor, and worker on ill-paid so-called women's work in engineering? Of course it is not. Again, watch out when anyone suggests that the interests of the unemployed would be assisted by restraining the wages of those still in work. It is a lie. It is as immoral to suggest this as those who, in 1948 and 1949 were ready to support wage restraint in principle, whilst they knew full well that they had wage demands claims for their own members in their pockets.

*'Wages and the Planning Council', E. J. Hill, *Labour Monthly*, March 1962.

When we have in power a Labour Government pledged to planning the economy of Britain in the interests of the people, and whose first loyalty is to the great working class movement which created the Labour Party, there will be no limit to the enthusiasm and loyalty they will receive. In my opinion there will have to be many changes: and I shall be very much surprised indeed if the movement is not capable of producing an efficient machinery for planning which will prove a far better horse to back than any Neddy. One of the first steps, in the transitional phase, that they will have to take when it comes to Socialist economic planning will be to impose physical controls. We shall soon see who is embarrassed then.

Nothing short of a progressive development at the earliest possible moment towards a socialist economy and peace in the world will satisfy the needs and wishes of the people of this country. Then indeed we shall be on the way to a modernised Britain. It is a change long overdue.

THE CASE FOR PUBLIC OWNERSHIP

J. E. Mortimer*

IN this article I do not propose to argue the case for the nationalisation of any one particular industry. Instead I shall try to show why the extension of public ownership to key sections of industry is essential for the solution of Britain's current economic problems.

Nowadays there is almost universal acceptance of the fact that the British economy has expanded nowhere near rapidly enough in recent years. Put in another way, this means that Britain has failed properly to utilise the productive resources which she has available. This failing of capitalism has become so obvious that even those who normally defend the system now acknowledge its truth. One of the results of this is that it has now become fashionable to support 'economic planning'. Hence, the setting up by the Government of the National Economic Development Council. This council was charged with the task of examining the economic performance of the nation and considering what are the obstacles to quicker growth. It was asked by the Government to seek agreement upon ways of

*Mr. Mortimer, Editor of *The Draughtsman*, writes in his personal capacity.

improving the nation's economic performance. All this, of course, is to be done without changing the existing basis of ownership and by measures which will carry the consent of the big employers.

The slow rate of growth, however, is not the only problem. The economy also lurches between periods of expansion and periods of stagnation. Even the growth which is achieved is not smooth and continuous. The burden of this instability is thrown on to the backs of the workers. It is they who suffer unemployment. At the beginning of this year unemployment was approaching the one million mark and even now, according to the latest official figures, it is above half a million.

A third serious and generally acknowledged problem is that the British economy is geographically distorted and this distortion is becoming worse. The traditional areas of heavy industry have suffered decline and the proportion of the workers in these areas who are unemployed is well above the national average. All the measures which have been taken over the last thirty years to reverse the trend—but without changing capitalism—have, despite some marginal improvements, failed to bring full employment to these areas.

All these economic deficiencies reflect, in one way or another, the failure to utilise the available productive resources to the best advantage. Why is this so? This is the basic question which needs to be answered. Under capitalism, in which industry is predominantly privately owned, the dominating motive of economic activity is the pursuit of profit. What matters is not whether social needs are being met, or whether resources are being fully utilised, but whether or not profit can be made for those who own the factories and other productive resources. If a profit cannot be made resources will lie idle no matter how socially necessary may be the products which they are capable of manufacturing.

This is why, fundamentally, the private ownership of the means of production and the profit motive run counter to the requirements of economic planning. Planning—if it means anything at all—demands that resources should be controlled and directed to meet socially determined priorities. It would be an unlikely coincidence under capitalism for a project which offers the highest profitability to private business also to satisfy the highest social need.

Those who claim that effective economic planning in the social interest can be carried out, in the main, with the consent of the big employers are, in fact, discounting the experience of British history.

So long as the major part of industry lies in private hands the suggestions and forecasts of the planners will, in the ultimate, be subordinate to the profit expectations of the employers. To expect the employers to do otherwise is unrealistic.

Those who suggest that effective economic planning is possible within capitalism base their contention on the belief that the co-operation of employers can be secured for the fulfilment of a social plan. Thus, the General Council of the T.U.C. in their report on economic development and planning, presented to the 1963 Congress, said:

The success of planning will depend on the extent to which groups of interests in our society are prepared to make their attitudes and actions conform to the needs of the community as a whole, as expressed in an agreed plan which would secure the optimum use of the nation's resources.

In another passage describing the planning process, the General Council commend a method under which an independent staff, such as the National Economic Development Council, draw up a plan in consultation with both sides of industry and Government departments and thereafter submit it to Parliament for approval. The advantage of this method, said the General Council, was 'that it recognised that planning, to be effective, must be largely based on consent'. Between this point of view and that of the socialist, who believes that effective planning will necessitate the social ownership of the vital sectors of the economy, there is, indeed, a very wide gulf.

One of the favoured arguments developed in recent years by those who sought to divert the labour movement from a policy of social ownership is that socialism is really concerned with the question of equality. This is to put the cart before the horse. The source of the gross inequalities in our society is the private ownership of land and industry. The really big differences in wealth and income in Britain are not due to differences in skill and training. They arise from the fact that the majority work for their living and the wealthy minority live on the work of others. It is not the highly skilled surgeon, architect or engineer who depends for his livelihood on his personal effort as an employed person, who accumulates a vast fortune. It is the industrialists, speculators and property developers who accumulate wealth by owning industry, land and property and by buying and selling it on the market.

Professor Titmuss, in his recent book *Income Distribution and Social Change* showed how inequalities in wealth in Britain have

probably become greater rather than smaller in recent years, and that, because of various forms of wealth concealment and tax avoidance which are now practised by the wealthy, the figures on wealth and income distribution published officially in Blue Books and White Papers are very unreliable. It is a good thing that everyone in the labour movement should be opposed to the gross inequalities which disfigure our society. It is quite wrong, however, to concentrate attention on inequality as a means of diverting the movement from the question of the ownership of industry. So long as capitalism exists, gross inequalities will persist.

In most of the debates about public ownership at Labour Party conferences and at the T.U.C., attention has been concentrated on particular industries. Understandably, the unions in such industries as engineering, building and transport are primarily concerned with the problems which immediately confront them. They speak with authority on the affairs of their own industry, and thus the debates sometimes tend to give the impression that what the labour movement is concerned with is a series of rescue operations for industries which are falling down on the job. Natural though this process of reasoning is—given the circumstances of the British economy and the make-up of the British trade union and labour movement—it is also important that all who are actively engaged in the discussion should not lose sight of the fundamental need for social ownership, even in those vital sectors of industry which appear for the moment to be prosperous and profitable.

The problems of the British economy cannot be tackled in a thorough-going manner without effective planning, and planning requires the control of resources. This is why the social ownership of the important industries of the nation is essential for Britain's future.

IN OUR SEPTEMBER ISSUE there was a full discussion of **NEDDY & NICKY**, by J. R. Campbell, and **PROBLEMS OF TRADE UNIONISM**, by R. Palme Dutt. There are still a few copies available if you write to **The Manager, 134, Ballards Lane, N.3.**

LAST MESSAGE OF DR. DU BOIS TO THE WORLD

[We pay honour to the memory of Dr. Du Bois, one of the greatest figures of this century, who led the way forward in every field in the fight for African freedom and the freedom of humanity. Following the interment of Dr. Du Bois, his 'Last Message to the World' was read to the thousands of assembled mourners. Dated June 26, 1957, it had been given to his wife, Shirley Graham Du Bois, for safe-keeping until the hour of his death. Below we print this Message which was published in The Spark of Ghana on Friday, August 30, 1963.]

IT is much more difficult in theory than actually to say the last goodbye to one's loved ones and friends and to all the familiar things of this life. I am going to take a long, deep and endless sleep. This is not a punishment but a privilege to which I have looked forward for years. I have loved my work, I have loved people and my play but always I have been uplifted by the thought that what I have done well will live long and justify my life: that what I have done ill or never finished can now be handed on to others for endless days to be finished, perhaps better than I could have done. And that peace will be my applause.

One thing alone I charge you as you live and believe in life. Always human beings will live and progress to greater, broader and fuller life. The only possible death is to lose belief in this truth simply because the great end comes slowly: because time is long. Goodbye.

(Signed) W. E. B. DU BOIS.

CHINESE
CONTEMPORARY
FOLK ART





AFRICAN UNITY

Jomo Kenyatta

Prime Minister of Kenya

(Jomo Kenyatta, now Prime Minister of Kenya, after a long imprisonment by the British Government, has been a friend of Labour Monthly since its earliest days and a contributor since 1933, when, as General Secretary of the Kikuyu Central Association, he wrote 'The Gold Rush in Kenya,' (Vol. 15. p. 691). We are pleased to publish the following article, written especially for Labour Monthly, in which he shows the developing role of the African States united in their efforts in international politics.)

IF one compares the resolutions passed at the first and the second Conference of Independent African States with the decisions taken at the third conference (of African and Malagasy States and Governments) held in Addis Ababa in May this year, one cannot escape the conclusion that the African giant is now fully awake and is taking strides.

It is a far cry from the days when we used to meet in one place or another in Europe and discuss Africa's tribulations and picture, in our exasperated minds, the sort of Africa we wanted to create. Pan-Africanism was the subject which occupied our minds then and which has occupied the minds of the leaders of public opinion throughout Africa since.

The first Conference of Independent African States at Accra in 1958 was largely occupied with discussions which centred round the principles of the Bandung Conference, the United Nations Charter, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Problems of Africa were discussed in the light of these principles. Racialism was condemned and its eradication recommended by 'vigorous measures' (resolution IV). Co-operation among the various countries of Africa was advocated in the matters of economic research (resolution VIII) and cultural relations (resolution IX). Informal permanent machinery for 'Consultation and Co-operation' was set up composed of the Permanent Representatives of the Participating Governments at the United Nations (resolution XIII). This was the beginning. Only eight independent states then existed and all attended.

Two years later came the second Conference and this was held in Addis Ababa. Thirteen governments participated and nationalist

leaders from eleven African countries attended as 'observers'. Kenya was represented by a team of ten observers headed by Mr. Mbiu Koinange (at present, Minister of State for Pan-African Affairs). It was decided to continue the 'Informal Permanent Machinery' for the time being. The 'eradication of Colonial rule from Africa' formed the subject matter of the eighth resolution which enjoined upon the Independent African States to 'continue to exert concerted action to achieve through all possible peaceful means' the complete liquidation of colonial rule. An 'Africa Freedom Fund' was agreed to be started and governments were asked to give 'assistance' and 'facilities' to 'genuine political refugees'. This resolution undoubtedly went one step further but the remaining resolutions followed more or less the 1958 line with the scope widened a little here and there.

It was left to the 1963 Conference to break new ground. The number of participating governments increased to thirty. This in itself was an indicator of the increased importance and authority of the Conference. Kenya was again represented by a team of observers under the leadership of Mr. A. Oginga Odinga, the Vice-President of the Kenya African National Union and, at present, Minister for Home Affairs. This Conference was not only called a landmark in African history—it was one. The greatest achievement of it was the establishment of a permanent organ of the Independent States of Africa in the form of the Organisation of African Unity and the adoption of a Charter to govern the functioning of it.

The Charter records in the preamble that the Heads of African and Malagasy States are 'convinced that it is the inalienable right of all people to control their own destiny', that they are 'conscious of the fact that freedom, equality, justice and dignity are essential objectives for the achievement of the legitimate aspirations of the African peoples', and that they are 'persuaded that the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights . . . provide a solid foundation for peaceful and positive co-operation among states'. The Independent African States will now have a central secretariat working to produce 'unity' in Africa on the basis of the principles laid down by U.N.O. and accepted by the entire world. The desire of the African peoples to create and maintain friendly and just relations among themselves and between them and the other peoples of the world has been given a permanent place in the Charter of the Organisation of African Unity.

The second achievement of the Conference is the positive decision on 'decolonisation'. This represents the next logical step, about which there has never been any doubt in the minds of African leaders. Appeals to reason having fallen on deaf ears and 'peaceful means' having failed, the need for some action is admitted on all hands. Nevertheless, the main resolution of the Conference still 'invites' the colonial powers to co-operate in achieving what is the insistent and rational demands of the peoples of Africa. The resolution calls upon the Independent States of Africa to give the nationalists fighting against the colonialist regimes 'moral and practical support' such as facilities for 'training in all sectors'. A 'co-ordinating committee' has been set up and 'a special fund' has been opened.

Thus, a sentence of death has been passed on colonialism and means for executing it have been devised. A greater part of Africa is already free: the Addis Ababa Conference has decreed that the whole of it shall be free.

ON THE 14th ANNIVERSARY OF THE VICTORY OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S REVOLUTION

Britain's Dreams of a Chinese Empire 100 Years Ago

'No mock modesty shall ever make us disguise our conviction that there are few Eastern races to whom British influence with all its drawbacks, and even British rule with all its blunders, are not, or might not be made, an almost incalculable gain. . . . Nothing will persuade us that to the semi-civilised races of the East in general (Japan we incline to consider an exception) the governing ability and the conscientious sense of duty which are characteristic of most Englishmen, as compared with the corresponding qualifications of their own chiefs, must not prove an incalculable blessing. . . . Nor can we picture to ourselves a grander or a nobler field for English energy and talent. To remodel, to purify, to develop, the resources of a magnificent Empire like that of China—imposing from its magnitude, but corrupt and rotten to the very core; to introduce honesty and purity and skill where now there is nothing but incapacity and speculation . . . these are surely tasks worthy of the ablest and most enterprising of our citizens.'

(*Economist*, June 20, 1863.)

BRITAIN'S GUILT FOR APARTHEID

A. Lerumo

ON August 7, 1963, the United Nations Security Council called upon all States to 'cease forthwith' the sale and shipment of arms, ammunition of all types and military vehicles to South Africa. Of the eleven members, nine voted in favour of the resolution and none against. Two, Britain and France, abstained. The resolution also deprecated South Africa's race policies and called for the release of all people imprisoned under them. The British representative, Sir Patrick Dean, made it clear that the United Kingdom had no intention of observing the resolution of the Security Council and would continue to supply arms to Verwoerd. The original draft of the resolution, submitted by the Afro-Asian States, called for a boycott of South African goods and a total embargo of the export of strategic materials to that country. It was watered down to its final form on the insistence of the United States, Britain and other imperialist or imperialist-inclined countries.

Even if it were honoured by Britain, France and other major arms-suppliers to Verwoerd's armed forces, the Security Council resolution is completely inadequate to meet the South African situation as it has developed now in 1963. Had such measures been adopted a decade ago, when the United Nations first began discussing the outrageous racial structure of our country, they might have been effective in preventing the vast military build-up which has resulted in the Republic of South Africa becoming what it is today—a Hitler-style police state, armed to the teeth, a vast prison camp for its people, an aggressive militarist dictatorship threatening the security of its neighbours and the peace of Africa and the world.

For there can be no doubt that—although every step along the Nazi road has been stubbornly and heroically resisted by the masses of South Africans, led by organisations such as the Communist Party and the African National Congress—civil rights and the rule of law have now been totally destroyed. In the streets and the factories the workers of our country year after year conducted a remarkable series of demonstrations and nation-wide general strikes. In the courts brilliant and courageous South African lawyers fought and won many a battle for civil rights, of which the marathon Treason Trial of 1956-61, ending in the acquittal of all the accused, was the

most famous example. When the fighting weekly, *The Guardian*, was banned in 1956, its editor Brian Bunting, aided by a team of remarkable journalists such as Ruth First, Govan Mbeki, Fred Carneson, M. P. Naicker, and the late Lionel Forman, succeeded in bringing out a 'new' paper with a new name the following week, and so on, with repeated bannings without missing a week until April 1963, when the last metamorphosis *The Spark* was compelled to cease—or rather, to suspend—publication.

But this year, the Nazi Minister of Justice Balthazar Vorster (he was interned during the war for directing sabotage aimed to help Hitler's cause) has thrown all pretences of democratic legal procedures to the winds. The struggle has entered a new, a grim and decisive phase. The Verwoerd-Vorster dictatorship has determined that nothing short of violent insurrection will shift them. With such crude instruments as the General Law Amendment Acts of 1962 and 1963, rushed through a panic-stricken white parliament with indecent haste, Vorster has abandoned even the pretence of a law-governed state and created a naked military dictatorship. The entire white population is being conditioned, armed and trained for civil war. The press has been thoroughly gagged and the bourgeois 'opposition' politicians and parties terrified into silence.

In terms of the 1962 General Law Amendment Act (the so-called 'Sabotage Act') an enormous number of political offences—ranging from strikes to painting slogans on walls—are defined as 'sabotage' and subjected to penalties from a *minimum* of five years' imprisonment, to death. The onus of proving his innocence is placed on the accused—and he has also to prove that he did *not* intend 'to further or encourage the achievement of any political aim'. In terms of the 1963 General Law Amendment Act, 'any commissioned officer may arrest or cause to be arrested any person whom he suspects of intending to commit any offence under the Suppression of Communism Act', or even to be 'in possession of any information' about such intended offence. Having been thus arrested the person can be held in solitary confinement for repeated periods of ninety days, 'no person shall have any access to him' (not even a legal adviser) and 'no Court shall have jurisdiction to order his release'.

The meaning of such laws is perfectly plain to the oppressed people of South Africa and their leaders. Either they must submit to the intolerable oppression, humiliation and exploitation of apartheid—or they must prepare to fight it out against the régime of white domination, with its formidable state machinery, army and

police force, massively armed and equipped by Britain and other Nato powers, and backed by Western and Japanese imperialist capital. The time for 'non-violent' struggles and legal victories is past: only one road to change has been left by the Nationalist government, that of mass insurrection. The Nationalist government must bear the full responsibility for the consequences.

Already the elements of civil war are fully present in the South African situation. Guerilla activities have flared up with increasing frequency in the Transkei and other rural areas. The 'Poqo' riots, which broke out in Paarl and other Cape areas at the end of last year, bore the character of desperate, unplanned and indiscriminate acts of revenge against the white population as such; though they also reflected the courage and determination of men provoked beyond endurance. Far more serious and dangerous to the apartheid régime are the activities of *Umkhonto we Sizwe* (Spear of the Nation), the military-type organisation which owes allegiance to the African National Congress. Beginning with planned and purposeful sabotage attacks against state installations, the *Umkhonto* is purposefully developing its plan of training and strategy for the South African revolution.

The position was lucidly analysed in the statement of the Central Committee of the underground South African Communist Party, 'The Revolutionary Way Out'.* In this statement, the Party unhesitatingly aligns itself with the policy of militant mass struggles against oppression, merging into a mighty stream of people's insurrection for the overthrow of white minority rule and the winning of a Free South Africa. Clearly, in taking the weighty decision to fight rather than submit, and to retaliate against state violence, the experienced and responsible leaders of the South African masses were keenly aware that it would call for heavy sacrifices both from the people and the leaders.

Faced with a serious challenge to their domination, their privileges and their profits, the fury of the ruling classes knows no bounds. Vorster, Verwoerd's strong-arm man, has gone berserk. More than five thousand political prisoners cram the jails, subjected to ill-treatment and torture. Following detailed reports from the Republic itself, the Pan-African Freedom Movement of East, Central and Southern Africa (PAFMECSA) charged that:

South Africa's Gestapo have committed and are daily committing acts of brutal torture against these detainees. The purpose is to force them to confess or turn informer . . . The methods used include electric shock

*See *The African Communist*, April-June 1963, Vol. II. No. 3.

treatment, wet bag treatment, solitary confinement, hosepipe beatings and other forms of assaults, inadequate medical treatment and lack of protection against cold.

Such brutal and lawless methods of rule are intended to quell the increasing rebelliousness of the population. But they are not succeeding in this object, and they cannot succeed, because the very measures taken by the Verwoerd-Vorster dictatorship can only add further to the anger, desperation and turbulence within the country.

The special branch of the South African police hope to strike terror and despair into the hearts of the forces fighting for freedom by the growing fascist 'efficiency' of their methods. Last year they captured the underground A.N.C. leader, Nelson Mandela, and on July 11, 1963, they brought off a further *coup* when Walter Sisulu, Govan Mbeki, Raymond Mhlaba, Rusty Bernstein, Kathy Kathrada and other well-known resistance leaders were arrested. Exulting at this 'success' Vorster and his police chiefs proudly announced that 'all internal subversion has now been smashed'. Within a few weeks they were given the lie by an illegal leaflet circulated throughout the country—'*The A.N.C. is Alive!*' '*Umkhonto we Sizwe Fights On!*' Within a few weeks these brave words were translated into action; a new wave of sabotage is sweeping the country, including such actions as the burning of the Alexandra pass office (Johannesburg) to the ground with all its records, and well-planned disruption of Cape Town's suburban railway system bringing the activities of South Africa's second-largest city to a halt for hours.

The A.N.C. leaflet concluded with the stirring Congress slogan *Amandla Ngawethu!* (The Power is Ours!) And indeed the power is the people's for the whole of current history shows that—like colonialism throughout the world—the special type of colonialism embodied in the structure of apartheid South Africa must soon go down to defeat at the hands of an oppressed people determined to win freedom and independence from white domination. The South African democratic revolution of national liberation has already begun—it will end in victory whatever the cost. The cost of that victory, however, in terms of human lives, sacrifice and suffering, would be far less, and the struggle itself greatly shortened, were it not for the powerful support which the Verwoerd régime still receives from its open and concealed backers in Britain, the United States and other imperialist countries.

The merits of apartheid are no longer a subject of debate at the United Nations and other international gatherings. Like 'sin' at

religious synods, everyone is against it—or says so. British and United States delegates virtuously denounce the wickedness of the Verwoerd régime, and then look for ingenious arguments to oppose. hamstring or emasculate every practical move to help the South Africans to emancipate themselves. The truth is that British, United States, Japanese and other imperialist interests are deeply involved in the maintenance of the apartheid régime, whose principal object is and always has been the production of superprofits from the exploitation of cheap African labour. The imperialists share handsomely in these profits; they curse Verwoerd in public, but they know and he knows that he is doing the dirty work on their behalf as well as the local white capitalist interests.

The point was well put by Mr. M. D. Banghart, Vice-President of the Newmont Mining Corporation, a United States concern with major interests in South and South-West Africa. Addressing the 1962 Annual Meeting of the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical and Petroleum Engineers, he said:

We know the people and the government (of South Africa) and we back our conviction with our reputation and our dollars.*

American firms doing business in South Africa, he pointed out, made an average profit of twenty-seven per cent on their investments. *This was the decisive factor.* Twenty-seven per cent: that is the fruit of apartheid. That is exactly what Sir Patrick Dean had in mind when he told the Security Council (August 7, 1963) that Britain would not support sanctions against South Africa because—together with other, far less convincing, reasons:

We have ■ considerable trade with and a considerable investment in South Africa.

The arguments of the British and other imperialists about their trade and investments in South Africa are no more convincing than those of the men who once opposed the abolition of slavery on the grounds that they had a profitable traffic and investment in slaves. Such arguments can only arouse passionate indignation among the whole of the people of Africa, impatient to see the slave South join the mainland of Free Africa, and among the millions of friends of South African freedom in every corner of the world.

Apartheid cannot survive without the support it receives from abroad. And the chief supplier of such support has always been and still remains the United Kingdom. With over £1,000 million investments, Britain remains the main investor in South Africa (although the United States is fast catching up). She is the main

*Quoted in *South-West Africa* by Ruth First.

supplier of arms, military aircraft and all kinds of other war material to Verwoerd, and is openly defying the Security Council resolution to stop arming the apartheid régime. In the neighbouring High Commission Territories of Basutoland, Swaziland and Bechuanaland, the British authorities are leaning over backwards to appease Verwoerd's republic. They deny independence and self-government to their people; they perpetuate the backwardness which makes the territories economically dependent on the Republic; they hound and persecute South African political refugees while giving Verwoerd's agents a free hand to come and go as they like, to kidnap people under British protection, and to commit acts of terror and sabotage. Britain is neither prepared nor able to protect the Basuto, Swazi and Bechuana people from Verwoerd's aggression, nor is she willing to grant them the freedom which they need to prepare themselves and make the necessary alliances for defence.

The oppressed people of South Africa are not asking for foreign intervention in their struggle against Verwoerd and his criminal accomplices. But we are appealing, and in particular to the British people and the British labour movement, who have shown so many signs of goodwill and understanding towards our cause, that Britain should stop intervening on the side of Verwoerd. Until that is done expressions of 'repugnance' towards apartheid must fall on increasingly bitter and cynical ears in our country and throughout Africa.

LABOUR MONTHLY

FORTY YEARS AGO

The real basis of the Empire is not the artificial cult of Empire Days, Kipling, the King-Emperor, etc., but a severely material basis woven into the lives of everyone and holding them by ties not always seen. . . . We need to change this by attacking the real material basis of the Empire, by laying bare its results in working-class division and corruption, racial separation, tyranny and militarism, and the destruction of working-class internationalism, by making clear the inevitable break-up and destruction of its material structure, by exposing the new plans of the Imperialists as an attempt to arrest this decay and cut off the British workers from the tide of the world-revolution in a prison house under conditions of artificial isolation bound to bring great suffering on the working class, and by showing the way to counter this effectively in attacking the system at its weakest spot, and changing from the position of a White Labour aristocracy having Utopian 'sympathies' with other sections to the leaders of a working-class revolt of all the exploited and subject forces against the real seat of power of British capitalism.

(From 'The British Empire' by R. Palme Dutt,
Labour Monthly, October 1923.)

ACTION AGAINST CLOSURES

Willie Wood*

THE volume of the national protest against railway closures continues to rise. Dr. Beeching and Lord Stoneham call each other dishonest and have a 'face to face' on the television. The Trades Union Congress calls unanimously for a halt to the closures. The railway trade unions continue their campaign, with the National Union of Railwaymen now topping a three million leaflet distribution.

As the lines scheduled in the Beeching Report are 'tabled' for closure, the mass national protest, the intense anti-Beeching feeling moves to the localities, where the people in the closure area begin to understand the full impact of what the Beeching Report really means. Such is the position in the North-East area where the intimation of the Crook-Bishop Auckland-Darlington-Durham lines closure caused consternation, resentment and then mass action to stop this folly.

The closure means the complete cessation of railway passenger services in an area populated by nearly 100,000 people and would mean places like Crook (population 12,100), Bishop Auckland (36,300), and Shildon (14,500) relying entirely on buses for public transport. It would mean the closing of 30 miles of class 'A' double railway track to passenger services and make approximately 100 railwaymen redundant. The closure was originally scheduled for September 7, but the enormous flood of protests to the Transport Users Consultative Committee resulted in the date being postponed. Protests include those from the Darlington Town Council and Trades Council, the Crook, Bishop Auckland and Shildon Urban District Councils and many other public and industrial bodies. The Crook British Legion not only placed an official protest with the T.U.C.C., but gathered over 1,000 individual signatures to support their protest.

A look at the services which are proposed to be discontinued and the frivolous manner in which adequate alternative services are dealt with will show why the anger of the people is rising. There are 45 trains per day between Crook and Darlington. All run by fast, comfortable, modern diesel multiple unit trains. At peak hours they are an absolute necessity for many people in the area. Figures of passengers, provided by the British Railways Board themselves, prove this.

The 6.25 a.m. Crook to Darlington train lifts 31 passengers at Crook, 55 at Etherley, 79 at Bishop Auckland, 12 at Beechburn, 51 at Shildon, 11 at Heighington, and 8 at New Road. Total 247. Running immediately behind this train is the 7.5 a.m. Etherley to Darlington which lifts a total of 187 passengers, and behind this runs the 7.10 a.m. Crook to Darlington train lifting a total of 241 passengers. In 35 minutes on this line, 675 passengers travel to work. All trains have standing room only, long before they reach the destination. The same is repeated in reverse in the evening.

Can buses provide an adequate alternative service, and at what fares? The United Automobile Services say in cavalier fashion 'No extra buses will be required'. No doubt this private enterprise will be looking for the pickings from the closure of this nationalised service. The bus time between Crook and Darlington is 1 hr. 25 mins., whilst the train takes 40 minutes. An extra 45 minutes is a long time when you are getting up in the morning to catch the 5.40 a.m. bus instead of the 6.25 a.m. train! Bus fares on this route are higher than the rail fares. So for the person who travels from Crook to Darlington, the closure would mean 7½ extra hours of travel each week in much less comfortable conditions and to add insult to injury, he or she will pay more for the service. It will be interesting to see if the Transport Users Consultative Committee when it meets at Darlington will consider this hardship.

The suggested closure is in the heart of the North-East development area. In fact the new town, Newton Aycliffe with a population of 20,000 and growing fast, is close to the railway line. Now Lord Hailsham is responsible to the Government for ensuring that new industrial development takes place in the area. One wonders if one Government department knows what the others are doing. While Hailsham babbles about development and a rosy future for the people, Marples closes down high grade railway lines and services and forces traffic on to second class, already congested, roads.

To those interested in world and British railway history, such a closure must bring a tear, for it was here in the year 1825 that Stephenson drove Locomotive No. 1, the first public railway in the world to be worked by a steam locomotive.

No wonder thousands of motor cars carry the slogan in the rear windows, 'Marples Must Go'. I would suggest all trains carry the slogan 'Beeching Must Go'. Certainly these two terrible transport twins are a menace to the British travelling public.

*Mr. Wood is the Executive Committee member of the N.U.R. for the North-East area.

KIRKCALDY'S FIGHT

John Mathieson

Secretary, Kirkcaldy and District Trades Council.

IN THE EARLY post-war years Fife was being described as the future workshop of Scotland. This country of great economic promise saw the sinking of a new colliery (Roths), that was described as Britain's greatest; the building of a new town (Glenroths) that was to house the miners and their families who came from other coalfield areas in Scotland; and the boom of trade in linoleum which served as the main basis of employment for Kirkcaldy's industrial workers.

The massive concrete towers and superstructure at Roths Colliery are now but landmarks to Tory folly and mismanagement. It is closed, and the promise of a lifetime's work has been rudely shattered, and a thousand workers have scattered themselves to the four corners of Britain in search of work. The new town has plodded along for more than fifteen years with only one or two small factories within its confines. Linoleum is no longer booming. Mergers have taken place, and in the process, Kirkcaldy, the pioneer of the world in linoleum is losing one of its main manufacturers. The factories are to be closed down and production to be accelerated at the plant in Staines.

The feeling of the Kirkcaldy trade union leadership is that this act is in direct contradiction to the government's own declared aims of passing legislation which would induce industrialists to come to places such as Fife, and I expressed, from the rostrum at the Scottish Trades Union

Congress, that if the government were sincere in their efforts to better Scotland's economic prospects then they had a duty to intervene in this transfer, and tell this company that the time was not yet ripe for such a transfer; that it would not take place until such times as suitable alternative employment would be found for those thrown out of work. We carried a coffin marked 'Barry's Linoleum' through the main streets of the town; there may be more yet, until we bury Toryism for ever.

The labour movement, on its own, and in conjunction with the local authorities, is fighting back. The County Council and the Town Councils are using all the ingenuity at their command to attract new industry, but as the County Convenor himself has said, it is like trying to fill a basin with water that has a hole in it. We have been vociferous in our demand for 'direction of industry' as the necessary cure. There are still many who think that the answer lies in salesmanship', that is selling the idea to prospective capitalists that your particular town or area is better than the next fellow's. I am not, personally, against 'salesmanship' but I can see the danger of a rat-race developing between the various towns, instead of a joining together of all affected parties demanding that the government face up to its responsibilities. For in the long run only government planning in the interests of the people will solve the problem, and Kirkcaldy and District labour movement fights on fully conscious of the tasks that lie ahead.

MEMO. FOR SCARBOROUGH

Andrew Rothstein

THE Defence Correspondent of *The Times* had the following to say on August 12:

The latest American appraisals of the Russian military threat to Europe suggest that previous intelligence assessments have consistently over-estimated the strength of the Soviet armed forces. Defence planners in Washington and a growing number of military observers in Europe now believe that the apparently large preponderance of Soviet conventional strength *upon which much of western policy and strategy has been based* (my italics) is as illusory as the notorious missile gap which bedevilled military strategy in 1960 and 1961. . . .

It has, for example, been usual in the past to put the strength of the Red Army at about 2,500,000, organised into 175 divisions. The British Institute of Strategic Studies . . . gave the figure for October last year as 160 active first-line divisions. Experts in the Pentagon now believe that there may be only 2,000,000 in the Soviet Army.

He did not indicate what were the 'intelligence assessments' for the rest of the armed forces—but we may assume that the *Statesman's Year Book*, which gives the figure he quotes for the Soviet Army, has its ear to the intelligence keyhole, and its estimates are 750,000 for the Soviet Navy and 350,000 for border and security troops. So we are back at 3,600,000—a total not far off the fancy figures which were all the rage 'in the past', *i.e.*, from about 1950 onwards.

True, this happens to be 50 per cent more than the figure Khrushchov gave as the total of Soviet armed forces in 1960—2,423,000. But what is 50 per cent, compared with what the Defence Correspondent calls 'the natural tendency of military intelligence organisations to exaggerate', *i.e.*, to tell lies about the Soviet Union in order to terrify the people?

Incidentally, he is not quite fair to the military. On February 17, 1951, an American spokesman did, in an incautious moment, admit that the total Soviet *armed forces* were at 'about the level of 1939'—and that this was 2,300,000.* But four weeks later John Strachey—then Secretary for War—gave the total as 175 divisions, 'about 4 million men', in the Soviet *Army*. The intelligence chaps had got the upper hand again. Similarly, on February 19, 1953, General

*The facts were that in March 1939 the figure given at the 18th Congress of the C.P.S.U. for the total Soviet armed forces was 1,900,000; that in the course of the year (of the total annual contingent of 800,000) the usual average, noted by the League of Nations *Armaments Yearbook* on the basis of the Soviet official statistics, of 460,000, had been called up before the beginning of the second world war; and that ~~more~~ 10,000 casualties in the fighting with the Japanese, with normal wastage through sickness and other causes, could be allowed. This brought a total strength of 2,300,000 or thereabouts.

Bradley, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, told the Congressional leaders of both parties that the Soviet Union had 'about 2,500,000 men under arms' (*i.e.*, in all its armed forces)—and what angry protests there were from the anti-Sovieteers here and over there, how quickly the offending figures were forgotten, how soon the fantastic figures of 4 million men or more were circulating again!

Readers of *Labour Monthly* as far back as September 1951 will recall that the exaggerated figures for the Soviet armed forces, put about then by British Ministers as well as Americans, were exposed by the present writer, and were also dealt with later in his Penguin Special, *Peaceful Coexistence* (1955). His assessments were based on published Soviet figures, not on anonymous 'intelligence assessments'. A year ago, in *Peace News*, an anti-Soviet writer took him to task for this, asserting among other things, that Western intelligence estimates 'have on the whole tended to underestimate, rather than overestimate, Soviet military resources'—the very opposite of the truth, as anyone not blinded by anti-Communism could see, and as we now hear from the (probably better qualified) *Times* writer.

The truth is that the British people have been hoaxed for over fifteen years about the Soviet 'threat' (*The Times* man sarcastically calls it 'the image of the Red hordes') in order to stampede them into approving of Nato and all its consequences (including German rearmament, Polaris bases, etc.). It would be well if these facts were remembered at Scarborough.

WASHINGTON—CAPITAL OF 'FREE WORLD'

West of Rock Creek Park lie the cantonments, row upon row of neat houses in pleasant gardens where Government officials, generally from distant states, live the well-ordered life of expatriate officials everywhere. Downtown and across the District line in Virginia and Maryland are the exclusive clubs. Not only do most of them black-ball Negro and Jewish candidate members, but they lack the democratic camaraderie of the colonial club. . . Birth, money, and position are required as well as a white face and an Anglo-Saxon Protestant background.

East of the park is the Native City, where the Negroes and the poor whites live in sullen enmity. It is not so well policed as the old colonial towns. Washington has one of the worst crime records in the country. . . Vandalism abounds and the police demand extraordinary and probably unconstitutional powers. There is an indifference to slums, poverty, and hardship that surprises the foreigner appreciative of American generosity abroad.

(Washington Correspondent, *The Times*, August 27, 1963.)

CHARTER FOR YOUTH

Olwyn White

I WANTED to leave school, but now I wish I was back. We were considered here: nobody considers us now'. This was a remark from a girl who had left school six months before. It was made to me at a Dagenham school during a period of full employment, when young people leaving school had no difficulty in getting jobs; but a job with training, a job with a future? That was a different matter. Now, with unemployment a threat in most areas, matters are worse still.

The Government has produced the outline of a scheme for training young people in some industries, largely on a part-time basis and with money drawn from a levy on employers. Such schemes operate quite comprehensively in several capitalist countries, notably France; but unless the working-class organisations take part in drawing them up, and exercise a constant watch over their operation, the employers' influence tends to get them 'on the cheap' and without a really full-scale training in the trade or industry being secured for the young people.

Active trade unionists may be worried from time to time over the position of the young entrant into their field of work, but their day-to-day struggles bring them so many tasks and responsibilities that they may well feel this is a job they can leave to the Youth Employment Committee and others concerned. In some trades, even, with the threat or actuality of unemployment looming, there may be the age-old temptation to restrict entry. The whole question of apprenticeships is bedevilled with a mixture of valid and outworn craft and technical considerations and prejudices, which have long been a nightmare to those who genuinely seek to get a general inte-

grated scheme for the training of youth.

Yet where young people have been in struggle for better apprenticeship conditions—in the Glasgow and Manchester areas, notably—their spirit and militancy have not only achieved success at the time, but have thrown up leaders for the trade union and working-class movement. We have to recognise that, as was pointed out at the 28th National Congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain, 'the trade unions will win young workers into membership and support to the extent that they fight on their behalf. It has to be frankly admitted that so far the unions have not shouldered their responsibilities in this regard, and that this is the principal reason for the failure to bring these millions of young people into the unions.'

The existence of youth unemployment in almost all areas, and its prevalence in some, increases the need for the adult movement to insist on proper solutions to the problems of young people. Unless we demand special provision for them, school-leavers will be pushed back into already over-crowded secondary modern schools. The Government now admits that what it had insisted on calling the bulge in the birthrate,

is in fact an upward trend which may be expected to continue. We must prevent the Tories and employers from exploiting the young people themselves, and from using them to attack and worsen the conditions of trade unionists generally.

In many of our largest factories in Dagenham, the apprenticeship system does not operate or is confined to a small number of technical apprentices. Of our youngsters attending secondary schools, 85% leave at fifteen, and in many areas cannot be employed in local industry until they reach twenty-one, and can go on the assembly line. It was encouraging to note the demand at the T.U.C. for adequate industrial training and for speedy implementation by legislation, of proposals to set up a central authority to supervise and direct the work of training boards. Every factory and enterprise of any size should have arrangements for training agreed with and supervised by the trade unions in consultation with technical teachers, and the adult rate should be paid at eighteen. Smaller enterprises can join in overall integrated schemes similarly arranged and supervised. Besides this, we need a massive increase in full-time education at existing or newly-set-up technical

colleges for young people up to the age of eighteen, with full pay while they study. In areas where youth unemployment exists, full-time education with an adequate grant must be maintained until work is provided.

Trade union branches should be asked to act through their District and National Committees to secure a sound Youth Training Scheme. Some Trades Councils have already done good work in raising this problem, but these could be strengthened in their efforts, and others alerted to the need by resolutions from local trade union branches. Young people in trade unions have to fight to get representation on all committees, so that they may play their part in getting not only training facilities for youth, but also sports and cultural facilities, sadly lacking in most areas. Education in trade union and working-class history and activity should be given by each union to its younger members.

The Trades Council Federations of the North have given a lead on the question of youth unemployment with their call to lobby Parliament. Together, the older and experienced trade union fighter and the young, eager apprentice, can win the proper training and jobs to which they are entitled.

THE DAY IS COMING

Men in that time a-coming
shall work and have no fear
For tomorrow's lack of earning
and the hunger-wolf a-near.

I tell you this for a wonder,
that no man then shall be glad
Of his fellow's fall and mishap
to snatch at the work he had.

—William Morris.

BOOK REVIEWS

The British Political Elite

W. L. Guttsman

MacGibbon and Kee. 398 pp. 50s. MR. GUTTSMAN'S DEFINITION of the 'political elite' is a curious one. The term ought surely to include all those who wield political power—the senior officials in government departments, the service chiefs, the heads of the police and secret police, etc. But this book is almost entirely confined to a study of the Cabinet, House of Commons and House of Lords, even though most of the members of the Commons and Lords do not in fact wield nearly so much political power as those holding key positions at the top of the permanent apparatus of government.

The author has set out to analyse why some people reach the Houses of Commons and Lords and the Cabinet and why others do not. To this end he has compiled a great many tables classifying politicians according to occupation and education. His period is essentially 1868 to 1955. In between the tables he provides much comment on the circumstances which facilitate a successful political career. Thus a table on p. 126 shows the types of industry and commerce represented by newly created peers from 1901-57, and another on p. 238 gives the occupations followed by Labour M.P.s other than those sponsored by trade unions. Although this kind of analysis has often been done before it has not been done in such detail. The close links between Tory Cabinets and big business, and the role of the public schools in training Tory (and some Labour) Cabinet Ministers, are well brought out.

Mr. Guttsman also classifies his 'political elite' into aristocracy, middle class and working class, but

his definition of these terms (in a vital footnote on page 77) is unsatisfactory. By defining the aristocracy as all those who were descended from the holder of a hereditary title in the grandparent generation, he omits the crucial factor of land ownership, which determined the part played by the landed aristocracy in the last century. In describing all those between the aristocracy and the working class as the 'middle class', he mixes up capitalists with professional men, administrators and the like.

But this was likely to happen because the author sees society, not so much in terms of classes but as a mass of individuals, a few of whom succeed in rising to the top. Economic interests, the outlook of political leaders, and the issues they fight for are almost completely absent from Mr. Guttsman's world. This is the approach of the schools of sociology, which are currently so influential in our universities (he acknowledges the help he received from the sociological department of the London School of Economics). It tends to lead to an accumulation of facts which are arranged in such a way as to deprive history and politics of all meaning.

JAMES HARVEY

Economic Planning in France

John and Anne Marie Hackett

Allen and Unwin. 418 pp. 40s.

IN THE OPENING words of their Introduction the authors say: 'Economic planning has at last acquired an honourable status as a branch of theoretical and, even more, of applied economics' (p. 17). What they say is true enough, but perhaps the real point of their remark is that planning is now 'respectable'. What social-psychological circumstances make

this so? Planning has never lacked honour amongst socialists and socialism remains, in theory and in practice the vitalising spirit of planning which comfortable capitalist property will never think 'respectable'. Nonetheless capitalist concern about national planning has grown rapidly and extensively, particularly in Britain and Italy, but has probably gone farthest in France where there is a more or less general acceptance in capitalist circles that national planning is necessary.

The explanation for this lies not in the personality of Jean Monnet—though this is a factor—but rather in historical circumstances in France and in the world. We are living in the epoch of transition to socialism on a world scale, and as the socialist sector grows, the challenge of socialist planning changes things for every capitalist power too. Add to this the impact of the progressive forces in France at the end of World War II with the Resistance fighters at their head, together with the consequent nationalisations and the amelioration of social services undertaken by the progressive French Government in the early post-war period—and then it is not hard to see why French capitalism has been compelled to take a positive attitude towards national planning. It had to find a way of living with a large nationalised sector and also of injecting new energy into its own private undertakings. At the same time it was anxious to block further advances of the popular and progressive forces. Consequently it has evolved its own special type of planning, of which the present Commissaire Général du Plan, Pierre Massé (his predecessors were M. Jean Monnet, 1946-1950, later first President of the European Coal and Steel Community, and M. Hirsch, 1950-

1959, later President of Euratom), writes as follows: 'The foundation of the French Plan is a collective reflection on the future. It leads to conclusions which are concerted between the representatives of the various groups in society and correspond to a middle way between the traditional liberal market economy and the detailed, centralised and authoritarian type of planning which existed and still exists, in the Eastern European countries' (Foreword, p. 7). For Britain this French experience is of considerable importance for we shall be told—and are already being told—that French style planning is the alternative to socialism and the answer to those who demand more nationalisation. It is nothing of the sort: it is an insecure compromise arising out of a particular balance of social forces nationally and internationally. However, it is certainly an important feature of the contemporary historical landscape and as such deserves study. For those who wish to make such a study, this intelligently written and thorough book will be of great value. It shows how things work, dealing fully with the institutional framework, methods used in drafting the plan and the means of implementing it—so far as they exist which, outside the public sector, is not much! On the other hand, this book adds more to knowledge of the apparatus than it does to basic understanding of France's economic and social system. It would be wrong to say that it is 'uncritical' for on its own assumptions ('... No major changes in the existing structure of society and its institutions are envisaged.' p. 122), it faces facts; rather it is 'acceptive' and turns its eyes away from those major social defects which are the *raison d'être* of socialist planning.

JOHN EATON

The Challenge of Marxism

Edited by Brian Simon

Lawrence & Wishart Ltd. 206 pp.
21s.

THESE six essays, giving a general analysis of the present political and economic position of Britain; an exposition of the true meaning of democracy and the class struggle; a consideration of Marxist theory in its application today; and a study of the place of the arts, of science, and of the intellectual in Communism, are rich in lessons for Marxists, near-Marxists, and non-Marxist. There must be very few of us so well-informed that we cannot learn a great deal from them.

The six writers—Brian Simon, John Gollan, J. R. Campbell, A. L. Morton, E. Rowsell, and Arnold Kettle—tell us pretty simply what in essence Marxism and Marxist life are, and they answer the main criticisms of Marxism which most non-Marxists have been brought—or brought up—to entertain. In particular, they give a reasonable and convincing estimate of what life can and will be under scientific Socialism and they expose and explain frankly what has at times 'gone wrong' in some Socialist countries. They make clear the vital importance, in practice as well as in theory, of the class struggle, and analyse the real nature of democracy and of freedom, which are class issues. They examine life under Capitalism as it is in Britain today, including the growing futility and unreality of 'parliamentary democracy' and demonstrate that its disappearance is as inevitable as it is necessary, and that it must be replaced by scientific Socialism. They give a particularly illuminating examination of the phenomenon, now a century old, of the country being ruled by a narrow minority

ruling-class in face of the theoretically overwhelming power of the popular vote.

Turning to what has to be done to get rid of Capitalism, they prove the incapacity, indeed the unwillingness, of Right-wing Social Democracy to bring about the necessary change, and the consequent vital need of the leadership of the Communist party for its achievement. And, inevitably, they show the optimism of inevitable victory, the optimism of those who know clearly that if we do our political work correctly, the advance to the Marxist State cannot be halted even by the most cunning reactionaries—the worst that they can do is to cause delay and confusion here and there.

Everyone can, and must, go to this book to know what Marxism is, and why it and it alone can rebuild and guarantee our future. There may be no short way to learn what Marxism is, but this book goes near to providing one.

D. N. PRITT

A Philosophy of Man

Adam Schaff

Lawrence & Wishart. 140 pp. 15s.

ADAM SCHAFF, PROFESSOR of Philosophy in the University of Warsaw and a member of the Central Committee of the Polish People's Party, gives us in this book, his own Marxist contribution to the great debates which broke out in Poland after the events of 1956. It was a period of great intellectual unrest and confusion, rendered more difficult by the invasion, by many streams of thought, from the capitalist West, including the cult of Existentialism. This was not only a time of intellectual upheaval but of moral heart searching.

Schaff met the challenge with a series of articles, lectures and eventu-

ally a collection of the most important of these in book form. Here he deals with these issues critically, constructively and with a refreshing absence of conventional phraseology. This is a living and illuminating re-statement of Marxism as the answer to many of the most searching of these contemporary problems.

The main question is that of the fulfilment and achievement of happiness by individual men. Schaff makes it clear that man has no self to realise that is not a social self, finding its fulfilment in human fellowship and in the shouldering of human obligations, and that he has no freedom which is independent of the conditions which surround him and indeed make him what he is. The only effective freedom of choice is the rational decision as to what course of action is required by the concrete situation, not some abstract and unconditioned choice of an arbitrary nature. What nullifies the individual and denies his freedom is not the pressure of society and of conditions as such, but the frustrations of a class society. Here the freedom of one class is restricted by the freedom of another. Freedom for all is only to be achieved by the final overthrow of the freedom of the capitalist class to achieve its own aims at the expense of the rest of us. In other words, there is no real freedom apart from a radical change in property relations, since it is these that stand in the way of human happiness and deny fulness of life to the great majority.

To proclaim ideals, to preach utopianism, to proclaim the worth of freedom, all this is futile so long as we remain in the realm of abstractions and vague generalities, unless we face the actual conditions and decide how precisely the freedom of the great majority is to be obtained

Africa: the Way Ahead

Jack Woddis

A notable contribution on a subject of immense importance; a worthy successor to Jack Woddis' two previous books, *Africa: The Roots of Revolt* and *Africa: The Lion Awakes*, (both still available, at 21s. each).

21s

The Labour Government 1945-51

D. N. Pritt

"the lessons of 1945-51 must be learned and acted upon . . . Pritt's book is essential reading for everyone who takes these things seriously."

The Foundry Worker

37s 6d

Against Liquidationism

V. I. Lenin

Extracts from Lenin's works, on the importance of maintaining an organised Marxist Party.

5s

LAWRENCE & WISHART

—what are the indispensable conditions, what *must* be done? When we have discovered that, 'ideals do not by that stop being ideals, but they stop being utopias'.

It is a trenchant and searching book. This is not to say that there is not room for further argument on some of the issues raised, but it deserves the same welcome and careful reading here that it has received in Poland.

JOHN LEWIS

Frederick Engels—Paul and Laura Lafargue Correspondence Vol. III (1891-1895)

Translated by Yvonne Kapp

Lawrence & Wishart. 640 pp. 9s.

THESE famous letters, whose discovery and forthcoming publication by *Editions Sociales* of Paris was announced in the August 1955 issue of this magazine (in whose pages that year, by the kindness of Emile Bottigelli, a selection appeared for the first time in print), are now fully available in English. The Paris edition, partly in French, appeared between 1956 and 1959. The Moscow

edition, wholly in English, came out in 1959, 1960 and 1963 from the Foreign Languages Publishing House, and is now published in Great Britain. The third volume has no less than ninety pages of indexes (of books, journals and persons) and this English edition of it contains also, as an 'Afterword', a fifty-page translation of the French editor's introduction to the series. The text of this introduction, however, has been edited by Yvonne Kapp and by Andrew Rothstein, who has added a new section on the working class movement in Britain. This valuable matter, instead of being put at the beginning of Volume I, is oddly placed at p. 489 onwards of Volume III. This, however, is a very small blemish on a remarkably fine production of letters which throw so much light on working class history in the period they cover. The exceptionally low price of all these volumes, a guinea that comprises some fifteen hundred pages, should attract bargain-hunters as well as those who feel they must possess these letters.

R. PAGE ARNOT

Publications Received

BOOKS

- Founder of Modern Communism. Karl Marx. Arnold Kettle. Weidenfeld & Nicolson. 120 pp. 10s. 6d.
- Your Trip to the U.S.S.R. Priss. Kasatkin. Mazov. Central Books. 278 pp. 4s.
- Lectures on Marxist Philosophy. David Guest. Lawrence & Wishart. 90 pp. 7s. 6d.
- Revolution in World Politics. Morton A. Kaplan. John Wiley & Sons (N.Y.). 478 pp. 60s.
- Spartacus. F. A. Ridley. Frank Maitland (Kent). 90 pp. 7s. 6d.
- The Alderson Story. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. International Publishers (N.Y.). 224 pp. \$1.65.
- Collected Works. Vols. 12, 13 and 14. V. I. Lenin. Lawrence & Wishart. 7s. 6d. each.
- The Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Leonard Schapiro. Methuen & Co. 632 pp. 21s.
- Twentieth Century Capitalism. E. Varga. Lawrence & Wishart. 158 pp. 7s. 6d.
- Use and Abuse of Trade Unions. Arthur Bottomley. Allen & Unwin. 90 pp. 3s. 6d.
- Politics and Law in South Africa. Julius Lewin. Merlin Press. 116 pp. 16s.
- Militarism and Industry. Victor Perlo. Lawrence & Wishart. 208 pp. 30s.
- The Tory Years. Alan Brown. Lawrence & Wishart. 192 pp. 12s. 6d.
- American Labor Unions. Florence Paterson. Harper & Row. 272 pp. 30s.
- 700,000 Kilometres in Space. Herman Titov. Central Books. 134 pp. 4s. 6d.
- Reader in Marxist Philosophy. Edited by H. Selsam and H. Martel International Publishers. 384 pp. \$2.45.
- The Laws of Social Development. G. Glezerman. Central Books. 280 pp. 3s.
- Britain Divided. K. W. Watkins. Thomas Nelson & Sons. 270 pp. 30s.
- Power. Howard Fast. Methuen. 356 pp. 21s.
- Pethick Lawrence. Vera Brittain. Allen & Unwin. 232 pp. 25s.
- A History of Cuba. Philip S. Foner. International Publishers (N.Y.). 384 pp. \$5.
- Physics for Entertainment Bk. 2. Y. Perelman. Central Books. 258 pp. 7s. 6d.
- The Communist Foreign Trade System. F. L. Pryor. Allen & Unwin. 296 pp. 40s.
- Socialism in Britain. A. L. Morton. Lawrence & Wishart. 484 pp. 21s.
- The Furtive War. Wilfred J. Burchett. International Publishers. 224 pp. \$3.95.



NOT WANTED



OUTSIDE conference halls when organisations like the Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress meet, you will always see the lobbyists. Peace supporters with their banners; groups opposing *apartheid* or provocation in British Guiana; evicted tenants, victimised shop stewards—all jostling amongst press, film and TV cameramen. Most notable at last month's Brighton TUC were two groups: the old and the young. Two women with a lifetime of battle and experience were irresistible in their persuasiveness, as they looked each delegate squarely in the eye and said: 'You too must grow old!'—and got yet another signature demanding increased pensions. The second group were a dozen unemployed boys and girls from Scotland, the North-West and North-East. Two of the youngest, Eileen and Dennis, aged 16 and 17, came from the mining village of Horden in Co. Durham. An older lad borrowed a mini-bus. They came down to Brighton overnight and must return the same way, in time to sign on at the youth labour exchange. Home-made posters said: 'Not Wanted'; 'We Are Unemployed Youth from the North-East. There are 13,000 of Us'. Others referred to the 18,000 in the North-West, 2,944 from Liverpool; 10,853 from Scotland. They didn't know how you lobbied; they just did it. Bit by bit delegates took notice, collected for them, began to talk to them and learned some home truths about our society today. Not only lack of jobs. At 16 Eileen worked in a textile factory, where almost all were young girls on low pay and with no future. Unable to stand the shift work, she turned in the job—and so was without benefit. No other jobs.

She went far afield, after every advertisement, herself advertising for a job as a petrol pump attendant. No go. Then the school-leavers came on the market this summer. Dennis told me how of 50 lads who applied to work in the local pit, only five got a start. There is no other work. They heard that on the Newcastle dole queues they were forming youth unemployment committees. So they borrowed a room in the Miners' Welfare and held a meeting; elected delegates to find their way to Brighton. Here they were. 'I thought the delegates would just pass by and take no notice', said Eileen. Far from it. These young people made a deep impression; during the week they were mentioned in speech after speech. They stood for all the other young unemployed 'hands' not wanted in the industrial North. For those in the more fortunate

South, where, too, apprenticeships are drying up. For those sent back to school this autumn who have passed their exams and yet have no place in college or university. They live in a society which cannot treasure the young, but treats them all as strays and unwanted orphans; and can only offer them the prospect of recruitment in nuclear armed forces. A society that does not cherish those who have worked all their lives and regards them as nothing but a burden when they have 'outlived their usefulness'. That a socialist society is long overdue, with a world of difference in its values, and that this is intimately related to those 'unwanted youth' queues: this lesson needs to be driven home to all urgently, not only the youth. Any group or publication that 'casts light on the problems and possibilities of this difficult world', to quote a U.S. reader, deserves active support, beyond mere approval. But it needs thinking out, not to be taken for granted. We would ask each reader: Look at these articles and how to plan for *this* number to be put into new hands.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

FUND FIGURES

£57 5s. 11d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: 'Daisy Bell', £10; 'H.H.', £10; E. Strachan Rogers, £3 3s; 'Backslider', 12s 6d; J. Tarver, 5s; B. W. Mackay, 4s; B.J.M., 5s; R.F.B., £3; 'S. Mill', £1; D. Sandwell, 5s; 'Pax', 2s 6d; A. Corbett, £1; S. Turner (for Daisy Mendez, Cuba), 5s; 'In Memory of Joe Brien', 3s; L. Bates, 5s; H. Brindle, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 2s; Oldham Branch, 1s; J. Hill (per Prendergast), £1; 'L'Humanité', 5s; M. Illing, 10s; G.I., 2s; R. Dodd, £1; 'Oliver Twist and friends', 15s; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; H. Brownjohn (in memory of Willie Paul), 5s; 'Humphreys family', 5s; Nellie Usher, 2s 6d; F.G.A. (Canada), 10s; S. Morrissy, 10s; 'The Butcher family', 10s; E.J.B., 10s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: E. Trescaheric, 4s; D. Yoli, 4s 6d; A. Winsloe, 10s; R. Stubbs, 9s; K. E. Houghton, 4s; P. Leplar, £1; J. Murphy, £1 1s; C. M. Truscott, 9s 6d; R. N. Smith, 5s; A. Idle, 9s; K. A. Harling, 5s; 'An Indian Socialist', 6s; O. M. Ford, 9s; W. Harmer, 1s; L.G. (Canada), 8s; W. G. Leeds, 7s; A. A. Boyd, 5s; A. Hampton, 10s; W. Buchanan, 5s; W. Eckersley, £1 10s; S. Townsend, 12s 6d; J. Peterson, 19s; D. J. Perry, £1 1s; I. Montagu, £1 9s; W. Wales, 1s 6d; S. W. Ashton, £1; P.B. (Canada), 15s; B.H. (U.S.A.), £3 12s 5d.

Our thanks to you all.

Co-op. No. L.99482.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

FINchley 5135.

Africa Latin America Asia
REVOLUTION

*An illustrated monthly review for and about the Third World,
founded in Algeria after independence and now published in
Switzerland for a worldwide audience*

Featured in our October issue (160 pages):

- 'The Freedom Struggle in South Africa'
(24 pages of photos)
- 'State Capitalism in Egypt' by Hassan Riad
- 'The Agrarian Situation in India' by Dr. Sulekh C. Gupta

Our 240 page August-September double issue, featuring 25 pages of photos of the Afro-American struggle and 'The War of National Liberation of Iraki Kurdistan' by Ismet Cheriff Vanly, as well as all the documents of the Addis Ababa Conference, is still available.

Special introductory six-months subscription rates: 18s. or \$2.50
REVOLUTION, Metropole, 10-11, Lausanne, Switzerland

WHY NOT BY POST?

NAME

(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS

I enclose 21s. (Overseas, 24s.,
Canada and USA, \$3.50), for
year's subscription from the
.....issue.

(SIGNED)

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE,
LONDON, N.3.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

*(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d.
Cash with order to: 'Class Ads',
Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane,
London, N.3.)*

COMRADES! Sell your BOOKS to a
modern realistic firm paying modern
realistic prices. Marxism, Labour &
T.U. Movements, Soc./Econ., Hist.,
Russia, Lit. Crit., etc. Stanley Noble,
24, Gladwell Rd., London, N.8.
MOU 2831. We call.

WE BUY BOOKS, pamphlets, Socialism,
U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We
collect: RIV 6807. The Hammer-
smith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6.

DUPLICATING, verbatim shorthand,
professional typing (tape m/ss),
translating. Mabel Eyles, 10, Beacons-
field Rd., N.11. ENT 3324.

Labour Monthly

Bound Volume, 1962

It's a history of the year and
a permanent record

ORDER NOW

We have a few **BOUND
VOLUMES** of earlier years
available.

Apply to:

**THE MANAGER,
134, Ballards Lane,
LONDON, N.3**

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating
by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

For all interested in the fight for Peace and
Progress in the Countryside and the problems
of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.

Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or

Send 9d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

27, Bedford St. Strand, London, W.C.2.

LABOUR RESEARCH

'Money for Tory Propaganda'

'Pay at the Top'

'Three Weeks' Holiday'

Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

To All Trade Unionists

Each month we have something of interest to trade unionists generally, in our series "Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties." Full commentary, too, on current peace problems, international affairs, the socialist world and former colonies.

HELP US TO GET THIS SERIES WIDELY KNOWN

1. Show this copy to your mates and fellow trade unionists.
2. Get your branch or shop stewards' committee to order copies.

Reduced rates for trade unions and shop stewards' committees during this series: 2s. each, 10s. 6d. for 6. Back numbers available.

I encloses.d. for copies.

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor : R. Palme Dutt

Home : Scarborough : The Future
SCIENCE AND SOCIALISM

The Editor

★

CHARTER FOR WOMEN

John E. Newton

★

A NEW CLIMATE?

Ivor Montagu

★

Also: articles on Youth—Vietnam—Ireland

NOVEMBER 1963

Two Shillings

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL. XIV

No. 11

NOVEMBER . 1963

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Notes of the Month: Science and Socialism. <i>A Portent and a Warning—Tory Calculations—Preparedness, the Left and the Communist Party—Re-defining Socialism—From Utopia to Science—Forty-six Years of Proof—Science of Social Revolution—Spirit of 1945—Wages and Profits Confidence Trick—The New Asceticism—Labour Austerity, Tory Spending Spree—Practical Conclusions.....</i> R.P.D.	481
A Charter for Women. General Secretary of the Tailor and Garment Workers presses for equal pay for work of equal value John E. Newton	494
A New Climate? An evaluation of the Test Ban Treaty and its effects throughout the world..... Ivor Montagu	498
Youth's Campaign for Jobs. National Secretary of the Young Communists shows the fighting spirit of youth in their demand for training and jobs..... J. Reid	506
Accidents, or Crimes? An exposure of widespread breaches of the Factories Act and alarming accident rate..... O. H. Parsons	509
Why the Rochdale Plan? Chairman of the Royal Docks Liaison Committee calls for a 'New Dockers' Charter'..... J. Dash	512
Vietnam: U.S. Guilt and Dilemma. A call to end U.S. aggression in South Vietnam..... Hilda Vernon	515
A Programme for Ireland. The future of Ireland and the need for solidarity between the British and Irish labour movement C. Desmond Greaves	518
Illustrations. From the film 'The Russian Miracle'.	504-5
Book Reviews: 'Economic Competition between Capitalism and Socialism', J. Flek, L. Kruzik and B. Levcik: <i>Maurice Dobb</i> ; 'International Law and the Use of Force by States', Ian Brownlie: <i>D. N. Pritt</i> ; 'A History of British Trade Unionism', Henry Pelling: <i>Allen Hutt</i> .	523
'Undemocratic'? Angela Tuckett	527

Notes of the Month

SCIENCE AND SOCIALISM

The people saw on their hindquarters the old feudal coats of arms, and deserted with loud and irreverent laughter.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO.

October 21, 1963

The cards are on the table. After all the under-the-counter shuffling Earl Home has emerged as the Chosen Leader of Britain. Chosen by whom? By parliament? Parliament had no say in the choice until it was all finished. By the voice of the people? All the public opinion polls showed the opposite. By any vote of any conclave or committee or organ of his party? No. By what is euphemistically termed 'the customary processes'—that is, by the customary combination of hocus-pocus mumbo-jumbo and hard anti-democratic reality which is the essential tradition of the glorious unwritten British Constitution. But this appointment of Home, the physical embodiment of the Upper Hundred of the biggest land-owning aristocracy allied with the financial sharks, in open defiance of any popular feeling, without a pretence of any popular following or support, has brought into the open and revealed to all with conspicuous and pictorial vividness the reality of the developing class fight which can no longer be concealed by the mellifluous tones of a Butler or a Macmillan.

A Portent and A Warning

Britain's political situation is beginning to stir from the stifling climate of stabilised reaction of the past dozen years into an era of rising economic and political struggles. Neither the apparent tranquillity of Scarborough, with every crucial question of policy buried discreetly under the carpet in order to maintain the enthusiasm of unity for victory, nor the unedifying noisy spectacle of the self-absorbed scramble of the Tory top contenders for place and position in the succession to Macmillan, making a mockery of their Blackpool Conference, can conceal this real character of the era into which we are now entering. Following Profumo and Denning, the Conservative cabal's week of the long knives in their backstage grapple for the leadership of 'Cosa Nostra' has assuredly furnished the people with a further demonstration of the moral and political degeneracy and bankruptcy of the ruling financial oligarchy. But

the choice of Lord Home at this moment; the choice, at this moment of nadir of Tory electoral fortunes, not of some 'progressive' looking figurehead, but of the most notorious anti-popular old Etonian Munichite red-baiting fourteenth Earl, one of the very few genuine relics of the old feudal land-robbing aristocracy, to be the visible face and image and leader of British 'democracy' in the forty-seventh year of the victorious Russian socialist revolution—this is indeed a symptom and a portent not to be lightly laughed away, but to be considered seriously as a warning signpost of our times, of the British political regime under which we suffer, and of the most elementary tasks we have still to fulfil in the fight for democracy and for socialism.

'Dost Thou Remember Sicily?'

Disraeli used to describe the British ruling oligarchy as 'the Venetian oligarchy'. At the present moment it might be more appropriate to recall Sicily. A graphic picture of the Sicilian aristocracy was provided by Frederico De Roberto in his book, published in English last year, *The Viceroys*:

Once the power of our family came from kings. . . . Now it comes from the people. The difference is more in name than in fact. Of course it's not pleasant to depend on the mob, but . . . history is monotonous repetition; men have been, are and always will be the same. Certainly there seems an abyss between the Sicily of 1860, still more or less feudal, and this of today; but the difference is all on the surface. The first man to be elected by near-universal suffrage is not a member of the working class, or a bourgeois or a democrat; it is I, because I am called Prince of Francalanza. The prestige of nobility is not and cannot be extinguished.

Backward Sicily might seem a remote comparison for 'advanced' finance-capitalist Britain now all agog for 'modernisation' at the hands of both governmental parties. But the Valachi hearings in the United States have indicated that the tentacles of the Mafia are not so remote from the innermost workings of the foremost citadel of the Western political system. The origins of the Profumo family and their not inconsiderable fortunes stem from Italy. Perhaps at this moment it is not inappropriate that the most modern, most up-to-date British Toryism of the great imperialist monopoly interests of the City, which still bears on its coat of arms the dagger that perfidiously under the flag of peaceful negotiation stabbed Wat Tyler, should choose as its paladin and banner-bearer the scion of the feudal land-grabbing family whose 'detestable reputation for instability and treachery' was recorded by Tom Johnston in his 'Our

Noble Families'. At a moment when the fight for peaceful co-existence is reaching new heights and opening new horizons for humanity, and the signs of developing U.S.-Soviet negotiations are watched with no little anxiety in certain British quarters, the proclamation of a Munichite anti-Yalta Premier is itself a programme. No doubt in the view of these sections 'East-West? Home's Best'.

Tory Calculations

Even the fondest admirer of Lord Home would hardly claim that he is a likely election-winner. Why then choose him? Certainly it looks as if the Tory calculators may be already discounting the next election as lost (although of course the labour movement will be wise not to be lulled by any 'in the bag' sweet dreams, and should rather use the moment of opportunity to press the maximum offensive). In that case a removable caretaker might be regarded as a convenient scapegoat to leave a clear field for the next man when the decisive fight for the come-back is launched. Such an interpretation is open to anyone's speculation. But in practice the man in charge, once installed, is not always so easily removed. The example of Attlee in the case of the Labour Party has shown how the 'third man', supposed to represent the safe inoffensive minor personality replacing the clash of two major combatants, can become the permanent incumbent blocking everybody and fatally deflecting policy. But what is clear from the choice of Home as their Leader and temporary Prime Minister is that the Tories are not primarily calculating on the most favourable shop-window for the next election.

Battles of Today and Tomorrow

In other words, their present calculations are running, not merely to the next election, but to the election after that. They are calculating that the prospective Labour Government, since it has pledged itself not to attempt any drastic socialist changes or taking over of the big monopolies, and has further pledged itself to maintain the full cost and possible increased cost of the cold war arms programme, while at the same time it promises to embark on a vast and costly expansion and technical re-equipment programme within these shackling conditions, will in consequence be compelled to carry through such measures of wage restraint, denial of immediate social benefits, increased taxation and burdens on the workers and general

austerity, as will result in a wave of unpopularity to lift Toryism back to power in 1969 as in 1951. But the Tories are equally aware that such a situation could not reproduce all the conditions of 1951, especially with the accelerating rate of change in the modern world, and that in consequence of such an outcome vast new currents of revolt, far exceeding Bevanism, would be generated within the labour movement, and would find reflection in the advance of the Communist Party and of the left and of every form of militancy. Hence their choice of Home at this moment as their banner-bearer (with the equally ultra-reactionary and Tory-rabble-rouser, Hailsham, as the nearest rival contender) is already equivalent to raising their flag, not so much for winning the next election, as for the sharpening social and political battles of the coming era which they are foreseeing.

Verb. Sap. for Labour

In face of these manifest calculations of Toryism the trade union and labour movement will be well advised not to bask in roseate honeymoon pictures of the coming election victory (which in any case has still to be won), nor to chortle with delight at the electoral gift on a plate offered to them by the presentation of such a figure of aristocratic ineptitude and popular contempt as the voice and image of modern Toryism, but rather to recognise very seriously the nature of the challenge which is being presented, and to examine the real perspective of the next five years in Britain and the world a little more soberly than appears to have been done in the golden-hued, but very indistinctly drawn, visions of Scarborough. The appointment of Home as Premier of Britain in 1963 is not merely an insult to the British people. It is also a challenge, and a challenge which needs to be met. The prospect offered today by Toryism and the big monopolies for whom it speaks is no longer the velvet glove of a Butler, but a battlefield already foreshadowed in preliminary form over the crucial issue of wage-restraint, which was plainly rejected (in spite of the General Council's advocacy) at the Trades Union Congress, but evaded and sugared over at the Labour Party Conference.

Preparedness, the Left and the Communist Party

The trade union and labour movement will need the fullest preparedness to meet these battles in front, for which the shipbuilding employers' blunt initial refusal of any concession to their 200,000

workers has been a foretaste. Preparedness means not to let the guard be lowered in the name of electoral sweetness and light. All experience has shown, and the lesson of 1959 confirmed it again, that the lowering of militancy does not win elections, but loses them. Preparedness requires, not the abdication of the left, but the strengthening of the left in order to strengthen the whole movement for the fight. The strengthening of the left requires, as a cardinal element for the fulfilment of this aim, the strengthening of the indisputably principal fighting organisation and political expression of the left, the Communist Party, and the only daily newspaper of the working class, the indomitable *Daily Worker*, which alone maintains itself (like *Labour Monthly*) without any subsidies and solely by support of its readers. It requires the understanding of the role of the Communist Party among all sections of the left. It requires the strengthening of the co-operation of the Communist Party with all sections of the left and with all sections of the labour movement. Unity for the defeat of Toryism needs to be combined with such an advance of the fighting spirit and political consciousness of the whole labour movement. The fulfilment of these aims is vital, equally for victory in the coming election battle, and for victory in the further battles which will follow and reach new heights beyond the election. The experience of the Scarborough Labour Party Conference, where the eager anticipation of the electoral battle and unity of will for the defeat of Toryism was accompanied by a dangerous trend to political abdication in the name of electoral expediency, and evasion of the brutal and testing issues which will in fact have to be faced, has reinforced this warning.

Re-Defining Socialism

At Scarborough Harold Wilson re-defined Socialism. He said:

We are re-defining and re-stating our Socialism in terms of the scientific revolution.

Re-defining Socialism has always been a favourite occupation—one might almost say, an occupational disease—of Labour statesmen. Long ago the Webbs, in the days when they fought Marxism (before their final courageous recognition of their error in failing to recognise the correctness of the Marxist theory of capitalism) used to demand that Socialism should be re-stated in terms compatible with the Union Jack and the Ten Commandments. MacDonald used to demand 'Socialism pure and simple, Socialism undistracted by political tactics, Socialism with a vision fixed above the smoke of

daily strife'. Arthur Greenwood re-defined Socialism as 'a society where the community has responsibilities to the individual, and where the individual has responsibilities to his fellows'. Herbert Morrison re-defined Socialism as 'the assertion of social responsibility in matters which are properly of social concern'. And so on without end. In short, anything and everything except common ownership of the means of production. Thus Harold Wilson was re-treading well-trodden ground when he offered to 're-define' Socialism 'in terms of the scientific revolution'.

Credit Line to Unilever

All his expansion of his theme made clear that the vast scientific and technological revolution, whose benefits he was describing in such glowing terms, was envisaged by him as being accomplished within a framework of the continuance of the biggest monster monopoly combines, I.C.I., Unilevers, Royal Dutch-Shell and the rest, in possession. Indeed, unkind critics hinted that some of the most glowing passages and examples with whose brilliant *expertise* he dazzled the simple minds of his untutored audience had been lifted from the recently published Report on the forthcoming beneficent marvels of automation and technological development to be accomplished during the next twenty years under the benign guidance of the great monopolies—the Report brought out, appropriately enough, under the auspices of Unilevers, with the title *1984*, price fifteen shillings.

From Utopia to Science

One of the co-founders of modern Socialism, Engels, wrote a work (actually three chapters taken from a larger book) entitled *The Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science*, which has probably been translated into more languages, circulated in more countries, and taught more generations of socialists than any work since the *Communist Manifesto*. But when Engels spoke of developing Socialism to 'Science' he did not mean quite the same thing as Harold Wilson. Engels meant that all the utopian aspirations for a society of justice and equality and happiness brought within reach by the vast new scientific and technical developments of the industrial revolution, whose significance was perceived already by the brilliant and benevolent big manufacturer, Robert Owen, could only be fulfilled when the sentimental aspirations of early socialism could

be translated into a science of society, a scientific understanding of the laws of motion of class society and social development and the consequent mastery of the forms and methods of social transformation.

Forty-Six Years of Proof

The proof of this has been established, no longer only in a textbook of theory, but in the living practice of human history, over one-third of the world. Only where Communism leads the working class and the people has socialism been established. This month we celebrate the forty-sixth anniversary of the Russian socialist revolution. Forty-six years ago the Russian working class led the way and were the first to win power. This example inspired the Labour Party a year later to inscribe for the first time the aim of socialism on its programme. During these forty-six years there have been three Labour Governments. After them all, landlordism and monopoly remains in possession. Today Harold Wilson informs us that the 'democratic process' of half a century 'has ground to a halt with a fourteenth earl'. A contrast between two outcomes of these forty-six years.

Science of Social Revolution

During these forty-six years the Russian workers have successfully maintained their power against every assault and armed offensive of reaction throughout the world, including that protégé of Home, Hitler. They inherited the most derelict war-stricken ruin of backwardness, illiteracy and filth, such that H. G. Wells, when he visited them in the early years, could only describe the scene in his book *Russia in the Shadows* as a desolate foretaste of the end of civilisation. They have not only completed the building of the first socialist society in the world, and entered on the advance to communist society. They have not only led the way in ending unemployment and establishing the first system of universal social security and a universal health service without contributions. They have established such standards of scientific and technological development and education that Wilson at Scarborough can only refer to them as lofty targets, ten times the British level, to aspire to emulate. But Wilson did not mean by that to emulate their socialism or the abolition of capitalism and landlordism. For the programme of Wilson is to apply science to everything in Britain except to society. Wilson jibs at the application of science to the theory of society; he admits

that he could not get past Page 2 of *Capital*. Wilson renounces the science of society. For the science of society is Communism.

Spirit of 1945

Earl Attlee at Scarborough remarked that he found at the Conference 'the spirit of 1945'. He should know; for he did more than any man, in conjunction with Bevin, to murder that spirit and prepare the black fifties of Tory reaction. But there were some differences which he should recognise. First, in 1945 he never expected the Labour majority, which took him by surprise. At Scarborough the assumption of an approaching Labour majority was universal. Let us make sure there is no mistake this time. Second, the tide which swept Labour forward to victory in 1945 was the tide of popular enthusiasm for the united victory of the peoples over Nazism, and the hatred of Munichite Toryism which had rearmed Germany and brought on the second world war. Today Britain is the ally of a neo-Nazi Germany which has again been rearmed, in violation of the solemn pledges of 1945, by the bipartisan policy of Toryism and Labour. Third, in 1945 the tide of popular enthusiasm which swept Labour forward was the tide of enthusiasm for the Socialist Soviet Union and the Soviet armies which had smashed nine-tenths of the Nazi armies, and the belief that the British-Soviet Alliance was the guarantee to prevent the revival of German militarism and maintain peace in Europe. Today by that same bipartisan policy Britain is the ally of West German militarism in the cold war Nato military alliance against the socialist world; and the guest of honour at the Scarborough Rally was Brandt, the fiery apostle of the gospel of the recovery of the 'lost territories' of Germany, that is, of the expansion of Germany at the expense of neighbouring states. Fourth, in 1945 the electorate believed that Labour stood for socialism. At Scarborough even resolutions for extending nationalisation were ruled out. Thus there were some differences not without significance. A real recovery of the spirit of 1945 would require a corresponding policy.

Hamlet Without the Prince

The self-denying ordinance of the Conference to exclude questions of foreign policy, war and peace, armaments, nuclear weapons and

CORRECTION

On p. 444, footnote line 9, in the October issue, 'contain' should read 'the text contains'.

bases, and nationalisation, in the name of the necessity of maintaining electoral unity (an argument apparently accepted by the majority of those on the left, since the ruling was not challenged to the point of a division) stultified the role of the Conference as a policy-making body, and reduced it to the role of a pre-electoral demonstration. It is true that a vast volume of documents and programmes and speeches on a variety of home subjects, outlining large and undefined horizons for economic planning and expansion, a scientific revolution and improved social standards and benefits (no figures) and educational advance, were presented and adopted with enthusiasm. On some detail points there were even divisions brought to a vote, as in the vote against abolition of the public schools by 5 to 1, against abolition of pay beds by about the same, and against abolition of the 3-day waiting period for unemployment and sickness benefit. But in general it was obvious to all that in the modern world situation, the possibility of fulfilment of all the very loosely defined general aspirations on home policy, was basically governed by the decisive factors of international policy, foreign policy, the cold war, the obligations of Nato and the American alliance and the arms programme, and that the attempt to separate the two and exclude the major issues was a judgment of Solomon which could only result in killing both halves of the baby.

'Nothing New'

When Harry Crane on behalf of the Conference Arrangements Committee justified the exclusion of foreign policy from debate on the grounds that 'nothing new on the subject could be said at this stage', he achieved a historically memorable sally worthy to be recorded alongside the classic entry of Louis XIV in his diary on July 14, 1789: 'Nothing'. But in fact the opportunity of Scarborough was utilised by the leadership to make certain important pronouncements on foreign policy, only not inside the Conference where they could be discussed by the delegates. Thus at the Rally, Wilson, speaking alongside Brandt, replaced his previous warning against allowing any German finger, 'directly or indirectly, on the nuclear trigger', by a new definition declaring opposition to any 'independent nuclear power' for Germany, thereby implying the possibility of participation in Western nuclear power. Similarly Gordon Walker during the Conference took the opportunity to make a statement outside the Conference on October 1 to 'make it unequivocally plain that the Labour Party has been and is against the

recognition' of the German Democratic Republic, and that any Labour M.P.s visiting it and making friendly speeches did not represent the Labour viewpoint. No opportunity for the M.P.s thus criticised or for any delegate to take up the question in the Conference. Similarly on the eve of the Conference, when British troops were being massed and engaged in the 'Malaysia' region, Gordon Walker assured Lord Home on September 18 that 'the Labour Party would completely back the Government . . . in any demands that British property and British interests should be protected'. A major issue of potential armed conflict in this region, which even Mr. Crane might find 'new'. It is evident that the self-denying ordinance of the Conference against consideration of foreign policy or the overseas armed actions of British imperialism was intended to apply to the delegates rather than to the leadership.

Wage Restraint

Even in the sphere of home policy the exclusion of any consideration of proposals for a major extension of nationalisation to take over the big monopolies inevitably meant that, taken in conjunction with the maintenance of the crippling cold war armaments burden, the very generalised programmes for planning and expansion and improvement of social conditions were remarkably lacking in concrete figures and targets (unless the proclamation of the need for ten million new jobs by the 1970s should be regarded as equivalent to a programme for their provision). Even on the crying scandal of the old age pensioners no immediate demand for any definite figure was offered. Thus, when it came down to brass tacks, the most important hard concrete immediate demand in the home field became the demand for wage restraint. This became the central issue at the Labour Party Conference, as it had been at the Trades Union Congress. The defeat of the General Council at the T.U.C. on this issue, by the adoption of the resolution declaring 'complete opposition to any form of wage restraint' created a problem for the Labour Party leadership at Scarborough. The problem was in fact met, not by changing the real policy of wage restraint (that policy had already been explicitly described by Wilson in terms of 'restraint' of wages and incomes in his address to the Transport Workers' Conference in July), but by the time-honoured technique of trying to dress up the old policy under a new formula ('planned growth of wages') and thus avoid a head-on collision.

Wages and Profits Confidence Trick

The tactical method adopted at Scarborough was to present a resolution calling for 'an incomes policy to include salaries, wages, dividends and profits (including speculative profits) and social security benefits'. This, it was explained, did not mean wage restraint, but the 'planned growth of wages'. On the basis of this explanation the resolution was carried by 6,090,000 to 40,000. The hollowness of this resolution's pretence was exposed by the official statement of the Shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer, Callaghan, at the Conference when he said that with regard to the promise to limit profits and dividends he had no idea how to do it:

If I were asked to say what exactly we will have to do about profits and dividends I would be less than frank if I were not to acknowledge that there were many loopholes in what we tried to do between 1945 and 1950.

In place of any concrete proposition he promised that the Executive would 'consult with the Unions and Trades Union Congress about dividends, profits and taxation reform'. The real issue will not be so easily evaded.

The New Asceticism

Consciousness of this real perspective of disappointment of expectations of social benefits, and of necessary deprivation to meet the requirements for strengthening monopoly capitalism and re-armaments and cold war expenditure, was revealed in the repeated warnings of the Labour Party leadership at Scarborough against expecting any rapid social gains from the early years of a Labour Government. A new gospel of asceticism found favour in the name of fulfilling a 'high purpose' for Britain. Once again the authentic Crippsian note was struck to renounce materialism and embrace austerity for the sake of building up the competitive strength of capitalist Britain. Wilson, in his speech at Gloucester on September 14, denounced the 'materialist hedonism' preached by the Tories ('the Prime Minister had debauched Britain's public life by preaching a selfish materialist hedonism', *The Times* report, September 18, 1963). Brown at Scarborough warned against expecting too much 'material' benefits from the first years of a Labour Government:

We have to recognise and say that not all the demands that will be made on us for material progress can be met early on in the lifetime of the next Government. . . . We must be courageous and say to our people what is involved. . . . In spite of all the appearances of a materialist society, it still remains true that there is in our people a tremendous yearning for something very much deeper.

Sir Stafford, thou shouldst be living at this hour. Once again the spirit of sacrifice of the workers, which they would readily show for the building of socialism, is to be summoned for rebuilding and strengthening monopoly capitalism and maintaining the array of overseas bases and garrisons and £60,000,000 aircraft carriers to dominate the peoples of the Persian Gulf or South-East Asia (Labour's strategic policy, as Wilson explained at Hamburg in September, is for Britain to be 'strong East of Suez').

Labour Austerity—Tory Spending Spree

And where did the Crippsian austerity lead? To socialism? No. To the Tory comeback. All that the Labour Government of Attlee and Bevin and Cripps had stinted and saved to put British capitalism back on its feet after the shock of war, to construct the atom bomb, embark on the cold war and Nato, conduct colonial wars in Malaya or imprison Nkrumah, or undertake a fantastically impossible rearmament programme, provided the basis for Toryism to float back on a wave of mass disillusionment and enter on a glorious spending spree ('set the people free'). Now capitalism is sick again, and a Labour Government will have the task, according to the capitalist viewpoint, to call on the workers, more successfully than the Tories can, to make the necessary sacrifices, so that Toryism can return to power on the basis of the resultant disillusionment and have another bout. Some young writers, who never had any experience of the Labour Government of 1945-51, have written a book about it under the title *Age of Austerity*. The book has of course received infinite reviewing space in the press, in marked contrast to the very considerable degree of silence accorded to the informed and authoritative study by D. N. Pritt, *The Labour Government*. But the interesting point is the title of this other work which reveals the main impression left on these young people by their diligent newspaper researches about the Third Labour Government. Crossman, reviewing this book, writes:

Certainly Mr. Attlee can take most of the credit for making possible the economic recovery which was frittered away in the course of the Tory decade.

Do we really want to go through all this again?

Practical Conclusions

There are some practical conclusions to be drawn by all serious socialists and fighters in the labour movement. First, if we do not

want the Fourth Labour Government to repeat the unhappy experience of the Third, the time to see to that is now. Second the tactical conception of many on the left, as shown at Scarborough, to keep mum and raise no controversial issue of policy for fear of weakening electoral unity and the chance of electoral victory, is not only mistaken tactically (the right wing observe no truce, but merely takes advantage of the non-resistance of the left to put over their policy as a unanimous policy), but actually a menace to the future of the labour movement, to the effectiveness of a future Labour Government, and even to the immediate objective of Labour victory. Surrender of the fight for the most effective policy of a Labour Government such as could serve the interests of the working people, supposedly in the name of unity for electoral victory, could result also in losing the electoral victory. The two sides of the fight are inextricably united. Third, the battle of those on the left, including the Communist Party, who consider it necessary to combine the fight for the defeat of Toryism with the fight for a real change of policy from Toryism (voiced by the Communist candidates in the election, and of significance for the labour fight in all the constituencies), and for this purpose to strengthen the organisation of the left, represented by the Communist Party and the *Daily Worker*, corresponds to the true interests of the labour movement, and is of vital importance, not only for the character of a future Labour Government, but also for the aim of a mass electoral victory over Toryism. This is not a question of rocking the boat. It is a question of giving the boat more motive power and a sense of direction.

R.P.D.

A LETTER has come to the offices of *Labour Monthly*, smuggled out from the Aigina Prison in Greece. It reads:

For 19 years we have celebrated the occasion of the great Antifascist Victory with our hands chained. We are still in prison for our activities against the fascist invaders, for our participation in the National Resistance, for our ideas. . . In spite of the outcry from world public opinion and the continuous struggle of our people, the Government still refuses to end its policy of trying to exterminate us politically and physically, a policy which only recently resulted in the death of five of our comrades. . . We write to thank you for your warm solidarity and to wish you new successes in the struggle for democracy and peace.

Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties

A CHARTER FOR WOMEN

John E. Newton

Secretary, National Union of Tailors and Garment Workers

[Our Industrial Correspondent writes: Few people carry greater authority on the subject of the new Industrial Charter for Women than Mr. Newton. A member of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress, he has served on its National Women's Advisory Committee for ten years, his union having a higher percentage of women members than any other represented upon it. No less than 94,000, or over 81 per cent of his 115,100 members are women. 'Tailors & Garment' started the movement for the 'Women's Charter' when they put down a successful motion at the T.U.C.'s Conference of Unions catering for women workers in April 1962, demanding an industrial charter for women workers. The T.U.C. therefore prepared a Charter of Six Points:

- 1. Equal pay based on the value of the job, not the sex of the worker;*
- 2. Opportunities for promotion;*
- 3. More apprenticeships for girls;*
- 4. Improved opportunities for training;*
- 5. Re-training for older women returning to industry;*
- 6. Special provisions for health and welfare.*

Unanimously accepted at the 'Women's Conference' in April this year, it was endorsed five months later at the Brighton Trades Union Congress in September.]

ALTHOUGH 43 countries have already ratified Convention 100 of the International Labour Office on equal pay, every Tory Government since 1951 has refused to do so; their excuse last year being that they had to wait to know what the obligations would be if Britain entered the Common Market. On this and on other I.L.O. issues their defence has usually taken the form of special pleading. Time and again the Trades Union Congress have therefore pressed the Government to give a lead by applying equal pay in their own industrial establishments; to no avail.

The speaker for the National Executive Committee at the Labour Party Conference last month, replying to the discussion on the resolution on equal pay, appeared to have this in mind when he said that to call upon a future Labour Government to introduce legislation within a specified time would take them further than

ever before. The N.E.C., however, accepted the motion, and if returned to power, a Labour Government would seek at an appropriate stage in their first term of office to consider ways and means of implementing it. Whilst the meaning of this statement is not clear, the resolution* which was carried unanimously was quite specific in that it called upon the next Labour Government to ratify Convention 100 of the I.L.O. on equal pay for work of equal value, and by legislative initiative to facilitate the achievement of this objective throughout industry and commerce within a specified period. The policy on equal pay, a principal objective of the trade union movement, by constant repetition over the years was in danger of becoming a slogan rather than a maxim. I do not think it is too much to claim that the establishment of the Industrial Charter for Women has been the means of lifting it from this dangerous position.

Undoubtedly when the Charter was promulgated by the T.U.C. 'Women's Conference' this April it was the most important step taken for many years in the promotion and co-ordination of the industrial rights of women. Framed to meet the needs of all unions with women members affiliated to the T.U.C., it had of necessity to embody those principles which were common to all of them. Yet it is not so much the words of the Six Points as the spirit and intention behind them that are important; and the fact that for practically the first time a co-ordinated policy was formulated. Its effect was quickly seen at a number of trade union conferences, and in the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions' Annual Meeting, as well as in the T.U.C. itself, and finally at the Labour Party Conference.

The importance of women's work goes largely unrecognised. Women are given little formal training. They are largely confined to occupations classified as women's work, often a device for avoiding payment of the rate for the job. This practice is more widespread than is generally recognised. Even in countries which claim to have established the principle of equal pay, often women are found working in departments where no men, or very few, are employed, on the lowest rates in the industrial wages schedule.

But why is a Women's Charter necessary? The answer is that there are more than eight million women employed in Britain today. Two in five women and girls above school-leaving age now go out to work, in occupations covering about a sixth of industry. In many

*This Conference calls upon the next Labour Government to ratify Convention 100 of the International Labour Organisation on equal pay for work of equal value and by legislative initiative to facilitate the achievement of this objective throughout industry and commerce within a specified period. (Resolution moved by the Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers.)

industries approximately half the women employed are married. This places a dual responsibility on them; they must somehow look after the home and also contribute to the family exchequer. Whether they are obliged to do this or not—and the majority of them work because they need the money—it is a plain fact that many industries could hardly continue without married women workers. Women now make an essential contribution to British industry and the work of the nation. Without women there would be little or no clothing production. The nursing profession would cease to exist. Their domestic contribution is incalculable and by that they contribute to the work performed by their men folk. They nurse and feed the nation. Their commercial value is demonstrated by the demand for their services. Not only are they engaged in the main production services, but also in many of the ancillary occupations without which the final product would be useless.

Women will become an even more indispensable part of the labour force as the population becomes bigger in the next few years, with growing numbers of children and older people unable to contribute to the increasing production requirements of the nation, necessitated by having to import more of the things we cannot produce ourselves, particularly food. This very fact of women's indispensability will entitle them to their rightful share of the national product. Indeed, they have reached that stage now; but unfortunately as yet women do not recognise their own industrial and economic potentiality. That is another reason why a Women's Charter is needed.

That they are now an indispensable part of the total national labour force makes nonsense of the claim that women regard employment as a temporary expedient. But what is quite a different matter is the fact that a woman's employment will be interrupted by child-bearing. Today it is essential to make such arrangements as will allow her to make her feminine contribution to the family. What is needed, for example, is to recognise immediately the principle of the shortest working week, providing her with adequate time to attend to her domestic duties and ensure that her children are not deprived of care and attention. If she wishes to work there are enough labour-saving devices nowadays to curtail the domestic humdrum of former days and allow free time; they should be made available on terms which women workers can afford. There should also be considerable increase in domestic help through the services of women especially suited to this occupation, paid at wages which

will induce them to take up this work. Equal pay, a planned policy of employment and proper facilities for the care of children would provide thousands of women with the opportunity not only to lead a fuller life but to make the maximum contribution to the increased standard of living which can only be achieved in a country the size of Britain by utilising every source of man-power and woman-power.

Foremost in the Six Points is the question of wages. The average earnings of women, particularly in manufacturing industries, are little more than half those of men. Last year the Trades Union Congress adopted a resolution that where equal pay did not yet apply, the principle of equal wage increases for men and women would help to reduce the gap. The last increase of wages in the engineering industry provided the same cash increases for women as unskilled men. The National Union of Tailors and Garment Workers has pursued this policy for a number of years, and has recently negotiated a wage increase of 4d. per hour on the minimum rates for men and women, and 2½d. per hour irrespective of earnings. But in a period of full employment other factors operate at district and branch levels which tend to act against this method. Some general legislation is therefore needed if equal pay is to be realised in the foreseeable future.

Facilities for training women and girls and re-training the older women who return after raising their family, are generally speaking, completely inadequate. Less than one in fourteen girls is apprenticed to a skilled trade and only 15 to 20 per cent, on leaving school, receive systematic training for a year or longer. This is an extremely shortsighted policy. It wastes the nation's resources. It reduces opportunities for promotion and would account for *any lack of interest of young girls in permanent* employment prospects.

Thanks to trade union endeavour women are not sweated and exploited to the degree they were fifty years or more ago. They are, however, still often greatly exploited. Confined to certain categories of work and making up a large proportion on the lowest incomes group, only about 25 per cent are organised in trade unions. It may be claimed that women have the same rights as men to exercise their power through the ballot box; but it is a long way from the ballot box to the statute book. The real opportunity is there if they will take it; fully organised in trade unions their case would be irresistible. Trade unions are just as necessary for women as for men; indeed more so. The adoption of the Industrial Charter for Women would bring this home, not only to the women but to their men folk and all trade unionists.

A NEW CLIMATE ?

Ivor Montagu

THE partial test ban treaty negotiated by Great Britain, U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. this summer represents, at last, 'an important step'.* In what respects important? One respect is obvious. It halts, at least for the time being, direct pollution—and harm to the present and to future generations—through the stopping of nuclear bomb test explosions in the air, on land and at sea. It does not stop all pollution because, of course, fall-out poison resulting from underground tests (not forbidden in the treaty) seeps through the ground. But the direct, immediate pollution is anyway much less. But this respect is not the most vital. The most important is that the treaty marks a change in climate from which it should be possible to move to further agreements. A change in which the peace movement should have vastly greater opportunities.

What do we mean by a change of climate? Has the imperialist tiger changed its stripes? Has its appetite diminished? Has the vicious ruthlessness of the American brass been tempered? Has Kennedy been suddenly transformed from a shrewd captain of American capitalism to a progressive saint? Certainly not. It is not necessary to assume such impossibilities to recognise that the partial test ban, whilst it does not altogether stop tests, contains escape clauses and is in itself not even a disarmament measure, yet marks a qualitatively new situation in the world. In what is this new? Because *it marks the first concrete agreement in this field*. It is not the result of any change of character or heart (heartlessness) on the part of the war forces of imperialism, but the registration by certain sections amidst their ranks of a new situation. It is the culmination of a long military development in which the socialist sector has become strong enough to be incapable of conquest by military force. The newly sovereign, ex-colonial (however neo-colonially entangled) sector has grown so numerous as increasingly to isolate the imperialist governments and the peace forces and progressive forces, within the imperialist countries themselves, have become more and more influential in demands of their governments that require at least positive gestures toward peace.

Human memories are often unfortunately short. Our span of life is too limited, our activities and best efforts too concentrated on

*The precise description used by Professor J. D. Bernal, F.R.S., in his declaration as Chairman of the Presidential Committee of the World Council of Peace welcoming the treaty. ■

the present, for us always sufficiently to realise the changes in the climates that we live through. But it is not necessary to make comparison between such hills and valleys as the formal slight détente and trivially increased politeness of this present autumn, compared to the peak crisis of the brink of world war and man destruction over Cuba, but a twelvemonth back. There is a larger-term and still more significant difference to be noted: that between the long years in which peace was a dirty word, negotiation of every kind was anathema, agreements unthinkable because the outlaw socialist world 'could not be trusted', and the cold war at its height sought to erect walls and create divisions of which reality has forced the breaking and the bridging, and the present time. Now every Western statesman who hopes for re-election must say (and some of the more intelligent among them even mean it) that the time is come to press on with new agreements and not to let the (small) beginning of the Moscow Partial Test Ban Treaty grow cold, but make progress however gradual.

It is this situation of which the peace forces must take advantage to make new gains. To say this does not mean in the slightest degree to see the world through rose-tinted spectacles, or close our eyes to ugly facts. Indeed, to achieve success we must be fully conscious of the continued evil character of our opponents. We must be aware of their continuing influence and power and unabandoned bellicose ambitions, of their unabated, active and actual, naked aggressions even today, and of the Himalayan magnitude of the obstacles that lie ahead. Indeed, about all this it is precisely necessary that we cherish no illusions whatever. The realities of the changed military balance between U.S.A. and subordinates on the one hand and U.S.S.R. on the other, conditioned by Soviet progress in the missile field; the increasing appearance and activity on the world stage of the ex-colonial forces, and increasing—however still limited—enlightenment of the peoples of the bemused and intellectually captive West, are the background to this first agreement. But they must not and will not make us overlook the U.S. mounted embargoes and increasing pressure against Cuba, the almost daily attacks against its soil launched under the aegis of the U.S. military and the almost daily statements by responsible U.S. statesmen insisting on the overthrow and destruction of the Cuban revolution. We cannot overlook the U.S. 'undeclared war' in Vietnam, its subsidies and military assistance which keep alive a conscienceless, corrupt and cruel regime rejected by every section of the

Vietnamese people, in a totally unjust and immoral intervention thousands of miles from American shores. The fact must not be forgotten that France, which refuses to adhere to the Test Ban Treaty and parades its planning of new tests (not of course on French soil but in Africa and in the Pacific) and its partnership in nuclear weapon development with the West German military, is retained as a Nato ally and a partner of the lily-white U.S. and British signatories of the Moscow Treaty. Nor must it be forgotten that the 'essential keystone' of the Nato set-up, indispensable to U.S. 'defence' plans, is the revenge-seeking, Nazi-dominated, Hitler-general-led regime in West Germany, which makes no secret of its determination to redraw the map of Europe by filching territory from half a dozen neighbours and forcibly incorporating the German Democratic Republic. It is a programme for war that West Germany's Nato allies keep open by refusing to recognise the German Democratic Republic and its frontiers. They pander to every Bonn aspiration for military reinforcement from larger submarines to finger practice on nuclear triggers in the mixed-manned nuclear force, and accepting the Bonn veto on any European military disengagement. We must remember that the Portuguese fascist colonial regime in Africa, the racialist South Rhodesian government and the apartheid monstrosity in South Africa persist only because they are supported economically, militarily and politically by the allies of the U.S. and, equivocally veiled but effective behind these, by the U.S. master. And above all there is the insane, insensate ostracism of China, the exclusion of the representatives of one fourth of humanity from world negotiation and world organisation, the occupation and maintenance of grotesque puppetry on Chinese islands, maintained with increasing difficulty and obscenity by the United States. In all this, and in much more, there is not the slightest doubt that the forces for war remain powerful, gigantic and headed by the United States.

But who doubts it? No-one. The point is that the objective situation, including the forces of peace, has been powerful enough to impose a first agreement, a first halt, a first step away from the direction in which they desire to travel precisely upon these forces headed by the United States. Over 100 countries have adhered to the partial test-ban treaty—an indication of the strength and universality of the forces ready to welcome any step to peace and from war, which will not be lost to attention. Differing from this attitude stand three objections, all disadvantageous to further progress to-

ward the goal the peoples desire. On the first, that nothing at all has happened, we need waste no time. This is the pretext given by the Labour Party Conference managers for not discussing foreign affairs and, as everyone knows, is the result not of honest calculation but simply of a misconceived alliance between left wing, rightly anxious to defeat the Tories and believing a fatuous silence necessary for electoral victory, and right wing, more intelligently believing such silence will give it a freer hand to double-cross after the election. Of the second, that the agreement, however welcome, is trivial, we need only remark that it comes from absolutist circles within pacifist ranks who use sentimentalist penny-in-the-slot reactions to save the burden of reflective analysis. The third stems from China. It is perfectly natural and comprehensible that the Chinese Government and people should have a particular attitude to the test-ban treaty. De Gaulle's objections to the treaty are inexcusable. Nobody threatens France, least of all with nuclear weapons, and its only military danger can come precisely from the West German militarist revenge circles with whom de Gaulle is plotting a partnership in nuclear weapons development. But China is in an entirely different situation. National territory—Taiwan and other adjacent islands—is occupied by an imperialist power (the U.S.) which actually stations nuclear weapons on this very territory and threatens China with them by land and sea based rockets and from the air. At the same time they decline every proposal to discuss Chinese proposals for negotiation of the Pacific as a nuclear-free zone. It is perfectly natural that China should regard this situation as unsatisfactory. Peace supporters in such countries as Britain and U.S.A., if they wish China to take a less narrow view of the treaty should ask themselves, in the first place, what they are doing to help restore China's territory of Taiwan and remove from this region the U.S. nuclear threat.

Nevertheless it is difficult to understand the Chinese all-out opposition to the treaty and particularly to accept as reasonable the grounds on which this seems to be founded. The placing on a level of U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. as nuclear monopolists does not fit, since the Soviet Union is a pledged ally ready to partner China against nuclear attack and its nuclear power has already sufficed to keep Cuba free till now of the all-out invasion that U.S. hotheads would certainly otherwise have launched months ago. The allegation that the treaty favours U.S.A. and is some sort of surrender to it, fails to fit because the evidence cited is totally misleading. True that the

U.S. government spokesmen in Congress declared it does, but can it be expected that they would commend the treaty for Senate approval on the ground that it is a disadvantage to them? True that the treaty does not ban underground test explosions, which Soviet negotiators used to say was essential, but the fact is, this is no disadvantage *now* to the U.S.S.R. If anything it is the reverse. The last series of tests—heavy weapons in atmosphere—showed the Soviet Union far in advance in this field by its superior rocketry power. It is indeed this fact that has ended forever the imperialist post-war dream of conquering the Socialist countries by nuclear war or nuclear blackmail. It made possible the discontinuance of the weapon race in this type, and the treaty makes it sure that U.S. will never catch up, let alone surpass in this respect. Where U.S. has any advantage, if it has, is in stockpile and in small weapons such as can be tried out underground. In this field the treaty leaves U.S.S.R. free to continue if it should so wish, though it is little surprise that it has not attempted underground tests, as the whole theory of limited nuclear war—for which these small weapons are supposed to be adopted—is made nonsense by the inevitability of retaliation. The U.S. tests in this field are much more to keep the arms merchants happy and the senate critics quiet than for any direct military usefulness.

But most misplaced of all seems to be the contention emanating from China that the treaty will deceive the peoples, lulling them into a false sense of security and making the peace movement relax. Who, anywhere, of the millions who welcome this treaty as a 'first step' overestimate it as anything more? But *as a first step* it cannot be overvalued, and the reaction of the peace movement is and will be utterly different. Everyone with wide experience in the peace movement knows that the problem in many countries is not to arouse people to the danger of war and the need for peace but to give them confidence that anything they do to win peace can possibly be effective in halting the drift to war. 'Yes, yes', the people say to the activists, 'we agree with you, but what can we do? We march, we sign, we vote, we demonstrate but who takes notice?' Now this first step has been achieved it alters the whole climate for the peace movement in this sense. It throws the cold war warriors on the defensive. No longer can they argue that it is impossible to negotiate, to reach agreement, to trust the socialist camp. The whole of their propaganda machine is thrown out of gear. A French proverb says 'L'appetit vient en mangeant'—appetite comes with eating.

The success of this first step, tiny though it is in itself, is going to reinforce a hundred times the demand for further steps to follow.

There is plenty for us to do and divisions need not and must not hinder us in doing it. As Professor Bernal said in his report to the World Peace Council Presidential Committee meeting at the end of September, it is perfectly possible to hold different evaluations of the treaty and yet to unite in actions absolutely essential to follow it up. We must learn to do this just as we have learnt in the peace movement to have different views of the responsibility for tensions or conflicts in the world different from those expressed earlier in this article for example—and yet unite to halt war and reduce tensions. The partial test ban must be made complete, the French tests must be stopped and a ban achieved on underground tests. The spread of nuclear weapons must be stopped, whether by Polaris, by the multinational nuclear fleet or any other plot. Nuclear-free zones must be established. Concrete steps must be taken towards the elimination of nuclear weapons themselves on the road to general and complete disarmament. The problem of European security must be tackled by a non-aggression pact, measures against surprise attack, the recognition of the fact of the two Germanies pending their eventual joining together, and an end to the pretensions of Bonn. The monstrous war in South Vietnam must stop and the gross intervention must be ended, with restoration of the Geneva agreement. The aggressions and threats against Cuba must be ended. The remains of colonialism must be ended and a stern front be presented against racialism. The relics of the cold war must be ended, world trade be expanded, cultural relations developed. And great China, whose participation is essential for the full effectiveness of every agreement toward disarmament and peace, must be accorded its rightful place in the United Nations despite the folly of the U.S. objectors. This is a wide programme but a pretty generally uniting one. Wide as it is though, the opportunity to fight for it is greater now that the *first step* has brought the movement confidence and undermined the obstructions of the cold war warriors who declared *any* step not only undesirable but impossible.

THE

RUSSIAN

MIRACLE

Carrying the documentary technique to the greatest heights this film, made by Annelie and Andrew Thorndike, shows the great transformation from the misery and oppression of Tsarist days to the era in which the new Socialist man goes spinning around the earth in a sputnik. We publish these stills* in celebration of the 46th Anniversary of the Soviet Union.

*These stills were supplied by Plato Films Ltd., 164, Shaftesbury Avenue, W.C.2, the U.K. distributors.



LIFE UNDER THE TSARS: Peasant women yoked like cattle were made to pull barges along the Volga watched by the overseer with his knout.



WARS OF INTERVENTION: Homeless citizens of Yaroslavl.



YOUNG PEOPLE OF THE SOVIET UNION TODAY: Planning an even brighter future.



YOUTH'S CAMPAIGN FOR JOBS

J. Reid

SCIENCE, the technological revolution, 'take Britain into the scientific age', 'train more scientists, technologists, and technicians', this was the theme of Harold Wilson's speech at the Scarborough conference of the Labour Party. As he spoke, 66,762 under eighteen-year-olds were trudging the streets, unemployed. The great majority of the same age group fortunate enough to be in employment were working in dead-end and unskilled jobs. Why is this? Is it because the Tories are such bumbling idiots, such tired old men that they are totally unconcerned about developing an advanced technological industry in Britain, which if it means anything means the training of young people with the skills necessary for modern industry? Anyone who thinks that the Tory leaders are fools only proves that he himself is a fool.

Youth unemployment and the wider problem of the failure to give our young people the opportunities for proper training are aspects of the fundamental contradiction of any declining society, *i.e.*, its inability to develop fully the new techniques of production at its disposal. If monopoly capitalism was able to develop these techniques then it would not be declining but would still be on the ascendancy and the economic conditions for the advance to socialism would not be ripe in this and in many other countries. Everyone knows that the possibilities of producing an abundance of all human needs is within man's grasp. The real problem is how to realise these possibilities. The only solution is to plan production not for profit but for the needs of the people, and this entails ending the rule of the Tories and of the monopolies they directly represent. In other words, socialism is the social system of the scientific and technological age. Socialism, as we see in the Soviet Union, produces limitless opportunities for young people; guarantees them the jobs, training facilities, and openings to the professions that enables them to develop their skills and talents to the full. However, much as we need to propagate among young people that socialism is the basic solution to all their problems, it cannot be left there.

Today in Britain there are tens of thousands of young people who cannot find a job. It does not help them a great deal in their immediate predicament to tell them that in a socialist Britain they would not be faced with this problem. The plain truth is that even

the most raving 'the revolution is round the corner' optimist would concede that a genuine working class and socialist government is not imminent in the months that lie ahead whatever the outcome of the next general election. Therefore, alongside the presentation of the socialist alternative must go the fight to compel the government to adopt a programme for emergency action now, that would guarantee for these young people the right to employment and training. Such a programme would include the taking over by the government of vacant factories and other suitable buildings to be used as emergency industrial training centres for youth, and the young people involved to receive government grants equal to apprentice wages; legislation rushed through Parliament to compel employers to take their full quota of apprentices and junior workers; instruction to nationalised industries to increase their intake of apprentices and young workers and discussion with local authorities to encourage them to do likewise. These and other measures would go a long way to resolving the immediate problem.

The response of sections of the trade unions and labour movement to the plight of youth unemployment has been good. But there is not enough anger at what the Tories and their class are doing to these young people. The Tories present the position in roughly these terms: the cause of the trouble is the bulge, the increase in the birth-rate in the immediate post-war years. This means that there are simply too many young people. Apart from the obvious answer, that any sane society would welcome the revitalising effect of eager young hands and minds entering the labour force, this approach reveals the ruling-class mentality and attitude towards working-class youth. In effect what they are saying is 'this is a crisis of overproduction, the supply exceeds the demands'. You would think that they were dealing with commodities like pots and pans instead of young human beings. Of course this is in fact their concept of the sons and daughters of working people. They are seen as profit fodder that is fed into their capitalist industrial machine at one end, as from the other end go the older workers from whom all profit has been squeezed.

What happens to the surplus youth? The same as happens to other surplus commodities; dump them, throw them on to the scrap heap, or keep them in storage (if the price of storage is not too high), for you might have some use for them next year or some time in the future. That is precisely what they are doing to these young people. The price of storage is not only cheap, it is free. There are

38,126 school-leavers still without a job, and as they have not had the opportunity to work, they have no national insurance stamps nor consequently any unemployment benefit. Our trade union and labour movement should explode with anger at this treatment of our young people. As well as anger we need action by the organised working class supporting the struggle of youth on this issue. The young people are already engaged in the struggle. Among them there is no feeling of fatalistic acceptance of unemployment, or tendencies to despair. On the contrary they are fighting back. They have demonstrated, marched, lobbied the T.U.C., organised conferences in various parts of the country, formed committees to lead **and organise the struggle**. Unity between Young Communists, Young Socialists, Christian Youth, young trade unionists, employed and unemployed youth has been forged in this campaign. Trade union district committees and branches, shop stewards' committees, Labour Party and Communist Party branches have sent delegates to conferences and meetings organised by the youth and have pledged their support for the campaign. It is worth noting that the employed youth are as active on this question as those without jobs.

Such developments should not surprise anyone, for the generation that refuses to accept that war is inevitable, has marched at Aldermaston and is fighting to change the cold war nuclear policies of the government, was hardly likely to accept unemployment as inevitable.

The next stage in the fight is the lobby of parliament called on November 12 by the Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers' youth committee in London. The youth committees in various parts of the country have taken up this call and see it as a national lobby where all the local activities and support can be brought together on a countrywide basis. Local petitions have been produced, signatures and money are being collected, coaches have been booked, train seats reserved. However, this is not a matter only for the young people. Every section of the working-class movement has a responsibility and a duty to play its part in this struggle. A start could be made by sending a delegate to the lobby and giving money to help send a young unemployed worker. What is really needed is for our labour movement to emerge as the champion of youth's rights to a decent job with opportunities for training and acquiring skills. Such a stand would not only prove decisive in winning this immediate battle against youth unemployment, but could start a process where thousands of splendid youth in Britain would see the labour movement as their own and be won to its banner.

ACCIDENTS, OR CRIMES ?

O. H. Parsons

THE very high figures of reported accidents in premises covered by the Factories Acts, and particularly the alarming rise in the figures for the construction industry, are matters of the deepest concern. Whilst we welcome the fact that the Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories for 1962 shows a decrease in the overall number of reported accidents from 192,517 (669 fatal) in 1961 to 190,158 (668 fatal) in 1962, this improvement has been offset by a rise in building and civil engineering of 8.5 per cent, from 23,356 (264 fatal) in 1961 to 25,338 (281 fatal) in 1962. It is particularly shocking that this high level of accidents should be occurring in industries which are the subject of a very strict safety code. The Factories Act itself, and even more, the detailed Regulations in respect of particular industries (particularly building and construction) contain safety requirements and provisions which, if obeyed, would prevent the very great majority of accidents.

The brutal fact is that these statutory requirements are very widely ignored and such breaches largely go unpunished. This allegation of widespread illegalities by employers coupled with a *laissez faire* attitude by the authorities to such criminal activities is a grave one. It is not made irresponsibly.

Take one instance blithely referred to by the Report itself. Section 80 of the Factories Act, 1961, requires all accidents involving disablement for more than three days to be reported to the Factory Inspector. The Chief Inspector made a special survey, in co-operation with the Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance, and this survey 'revealed that about two out of every five reportable accidents occurring in factories and more than half of such accidents on construction sites had not been notified to H.M. Factory Inspectorate as required by the Act'. Mass breaches of the Act; some 60,000 unreported accidents in factories, some 12,500 in construction. Yet what do we find? That there were 65 firms or persons (compared with 78 in 1961) prosecuted for failing to report accidents: sixty-five out of the thousands of firms who were breaking the law and could, without undue difficulty, be traced and brought to book.

Section 14 of the Act lays down very strict requirements with regard to fencing dangerous machinery. There were 24,369 accidents (81 fatal) in factories due to 'machinery in motion under

power' mostly caused by breaches of this Section. Do we find 24,369 prosecutions? Indeed we do not; the total prosecutions for failure to guard dangerous machinery came to the magnificent total of 486. One could produce many examples of this mass breaking of the law with singularly little official response. For all factories, docks, shipbuilding, iron and steel foundries and building and construction works there were a total of 1,695 prosecutions for all classes of offence, health, safety, welfare, employment, the lot. And a total of £38,758 in fines. What a complete travesty of justice! What an absolute breakdown of law enforcement!

The primary cause of this anarchy, this general condoning of illegality, lies in the inadequacy of the Factory Inspectorate. This department are the police force of industrial safety. Their job is to secure the enforcement of the Factories Act and Regulations under it, and there is a total staff of 477 inspectors to carry out this vital work costing £1,289,815. That is all the Tory Government sees fit to spend on enforcing industrial safety and saving the lives and limbs of those in industry.

The Inspectorate is grossly overworked. On an average, each inspector has under his control 451 factories, 5 docks and 13 warehouses, and in 1962 made 358 visits to factories, 63 to building and civil engineering sites, 7 to ships and 12 to other places under the Act as well as 77 other official visits. It is scarcely surprising, and no one would seek to cast any blame on the Inspectors themselves, if this understaffed organisation fails to perform its law-enforcement functions efficiently.

For the qualifications required and the responsibility of the job, the Inspectorate is underpaid. A new entrant normally must be at least 21 and have a university degree and preferably have practical experience in industry. For this, he is paid on entry between £714 and £930 (plus London rate of £55) a year, depending on age. He must stay on that basic scale, raising to a maximum of £1,221 a year, for at least 5 years. Then, if he passes a qualifying examination, he rises to the level of general inspector with a salary range of £1,337 to £1,923 (plus London rate of £65) a year. That, in the absence of special qualification and promotion to special posts, is his limit. Compared with what people of such qualifications could expect in industry or commerce, these rates are those of a sweated trade.

There are many things necessary if the present slaughter in industry is to be reduced; education, training, active workers' participa-

tion. But the most crucial is that the law should be taken seriously, that employers should realise that if they break the law they will be found out and prosecuted; and the first effective step to secure this is a dramatic increase in the police force of industrial safety by a really substantial expansion of the Factory Inspectorate and a raising of their financial status. Until the problem of industrial accidents is treated as a national disaster calling for a crash programme to remedy it, the present cynical disregard of the law will continue and the present mass slaughter will go on.

FORTY YEARS AGO

Soviet Russia has struggled long and vainly for recognition as a State. Because she proved herself too strong to be overthrown, it was necessary to suffer her existence, but no more. The States of Europe and America, from the great Powers to the tiniest neutralised zone, adopted a policy of neglect and oblivion, such as in good bourgeois families meets the undesired presence of an illegitimate child. Diplomatic relations being withheld, the young State turned next towards trade and commerce. . . . But there is still another avenue to public approbation and esteem, and that is by the royal road of Art. Till now, this has been closed to the Government of Workers and Peasants, for reasons both internal and external. A nation fighting civil war, invasion, blockades, and famine has little chance to cultivate the fine arts, much less to disseminate them in the outer world. And the hundreds of thousands of Russian refugees who inundated Europe after the November revolution of 1917 contained a goodly number of intellectuals and artists who have been devoting all their talents to earn a living in exile. . . . A little band of faithful believers remained to carry through the revolution in the field of art as well as in politics and social life. The struggle of these true artists is written in blood and tears, for they, too, were soldiers of the New Order. Here is not the time to chronicle their triumphs and defeats, their enormous faith and sacrifices, which enabled Revolutionary Russia of the Soviets to maintain and to create a literature, drama, and the opera for the relaxation and heartening of the fighting workers and peasants, while Denikin Kolchak, and Yudenitch were hammering at the very gates of Petrograd and Moscow. Those who have seen the flaming beauty of Russian opera, which is Russian history embodied and ensouled, and heard the haunting and melancholy magnificence of Russian music in those dark days—who have sat in momentary forgetfulness before the delicate dramas where Russian life was unfolded and interpreted with delicate and consummate genius—they alone can speak of the part which Russian art and culture played in the winning of the five-year battle fronts.

(From 'Polikushka', a review by E.R., *Labour Monthly*, November, 1923.)

WHY THE ROCHDALE PLAN?

Jack Dash

Chairman, Royal Docks Liaison Committee

THE shipping and docks employers, having seen the advantages the Road Haulage Companies, monopoly industry in general, and the land speculators will get from the 'Beeching Plan for Railways', now want their pound of flesh. They welcome with a few moderate modifications the Government's endorsement of the Rochdale Committee's speed-up recommendations for Britain's ports. The Committee, which was set up in 1961, makes a number of sweeping proposals, including the setting up of a 'National Port Authority' to supervise the national development of the dock industry, concentration of control, changes in expansion policy; all these proposals hinge upon a more intensive use of a smaller labour force in dockland with increased mobility, mechanisation and shift-work, and it is these proposals that are the basis of portworkers' suspicions and fears.

It is very significant that of all the many proposals in the Rochdale report, the employers focussed on the report's approval of their draft proposals for a so-called decasualisation scheme. Under the guise of seeking an end to unemployment and casual labour in the industry, the employers are trying to get the portworkers to accept intensive speed up, removal of all protective practices, round the clock working and complete mobility of labour. But the increased productivity accruing from all this is to go—apart from the raising of 'fall back' (unemployment) pay to the low basic rate of wages—to the employers.

These proposals would set the industry back for fifty years. Far from bringing decasualisation it would open the door to a 'victimisation pool' of the older workers, the less strong, the militant trade unionist, who could be kept on 'fall back' pay as the employers desired, until they became too old for the industry or left it through economic pressure.

The proposal to reduce drastically the number of employers, concentrating the existing 400 or over in the Port of London, for example, to two or three hundred, and giving them greater control of the allocation of labour, combined with large-scale mechanisation, could mean a halving of the present labour force over a period of a few years. In this way, increased exploitation would pay for the cost of the Rochdale expansion proposals while simultaneously

providing higher profits and reshaping the industry to meet the challenge of competition it would have to face from the 'common market' countries, if and when we enter the 'common market'. The government has not given up this idea, nor as yet have the Labour Party clearly reached a decision.

What is the attitude of the portworkers to changes within the industry? Are we Luddite minded? On the contrary, we would welcome any progressive change that would in our opinion put the industry on a healthier basis benefiting all. But to obtain this, the advice and opinions of those who work in the industry, the rank and file docker, stevedore, clerk, lighterman and tugman, the people with the practical experience, would have to be considered. Further to this, we ask ourselves why the setting up of a new authority? Has the 'National Dock Labour Board' failed in its purpose? Set up during the war years to bring about a speedy turn-round of shipping, it became a permanent scheme under government legislation in 1947 because of its success. Under this scheme we have enjoyed greater benefits and the employers greater profits. Both the employers and the Rochdale Committee say that the dockers will cling to their deep-rooted fears of unemployment, and in order to allay our fears go on to guarantee that there will be no redundancy. Who are they kidding? What confidence trick are they trying to sell? Haven't we been over 'the same course with the same horse'? We have long memories. The introduction of a mechanisation shed using fork-lifting trucks, some few years back in the Royal Albert Docks, where approximately seven gangs of men were employed (eight men to a gang, fifty-six in all) brought about a reduction to two gangs of three. What happened to the fifty? Its quite true they never lost their Port Registration, but they were forced to compete for work at other firms. At the same time, the general cargo rate of payment of 3s. per ton to the men, was reduced at the mechanisation shed to 1s. 6d. per ton! Was there any corresponding reduction of shipping charges to the port users?

As a result of dock gate meetings held by the 'Royal Docks Liaison Committee' and leaflet distributions explaining the employers' aims and objectives, a mass meeting was convened at the Public Hall, Canning Town, where the 'New Dockers' Charter' was proposed, discussed and unanimously accepted. The points set out in the Charter are as follows:

1. The National Dock Labour Board to maintain full control, i.e. Contractors of Labour, Discipline, Social Welfare. Present strength of

the register to remain; no cutting in the manning scales. Weekly worker register to be frozen. No make-up of wastage.

2. All unregistered Ports to be governed by the scheme.
3. £15 fall-back guarantee. Each day to remain on its own; no devaluation; no disentitlement on failure to prove.
4. 40-hour five-day week. One call a day.
5. Overtime payment to be excluded from fall-back guarantee.
6. Upward revision of all piece-work rates.
7. Sickness and accident pay.
8. Retiring pension £4 a week. Retiring age at National Insurance level.
9. Three weeks' holiday. Free, or reduced transport fares on all shipping.
10. The trade unions to enforce a 'No soliciting for work' rule.
11. Nationalisation of the industry.

There is growing support for these proposals and in port after port the 'decasualisation' scheme has been rejected. In the long run of course only a nationalised ports industry, democratically run on behalf of the people, can give the portworkers full employment with a rising standard of living and the country a modern, efficient ports industry, meeting the trading needs of a country prosperous, at peace, trading with all and building its socialist future.

SOVIET PUBLICATIONS

Indispensable for an understanding of current affairs

A REPLY TO PEKING—Soviet government statement 6d.
 OPEN LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF CPSU. On the international Communist movement and China 6d.
 GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT—what it means for Africa and Asia 4d.
 FRIEND AND ALLY IN THE STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE AND FREEDOM—Soviet aid to Africa, Asia and Latin America 6d.

SOCIALISM AND IMPERIALISM, PEACE AND WAR 4d.
 PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE AND THE LIBERATION STRUGGLE 4d.
 ON INTERNATIONALISM AND NATIONALISM 4d.
 FORCE OF EXAMPLE, NOT WAR 4d.
 FOR THE TRIUMPH OF CREATIVE MARXISM-LENINISM—against revision. Reprint from Soviet magazine COMMUNIST 6d.

From bookshops or:

SOVIET BOOKLETS, 3, ROSARY GARDENS, LONDON, S.W.7

VIETNAM: U.S. GUILT AND DILEMMA

Hilda Vernon

THE prolonged crisis of the U.S.-Diemist regime in South Vietnam is severely threatening its already unstable foundation. In Washington it has raised the question: Would there be a better prospect of winning the war there if a substitute were found for the ruling Ngo family with Ngo dinh Diem as president?

President Kennedy himself well recognises the risk that the collapse of Diem would bring with it the collapse of American policy to maintain South Vietnam as the bridgehead for their further imperialist inroads into Asia, alongside the positions they are managing to maintain in neighbouring Laos. 'I do not agree with those who say we should withdraw. That would be a great mistake . . . this is a very important struggle even though it is far away', and the U.S. must 'have a hand in the defence of Asia' (television interview September 2). In a further television interview on September 9, President Kennedy said the United States is

faced with the problem of wanting to protect the area against the Communists. That produces a kind of ambivalence in our efforts which exposes us to some criticism. . . . If you reduce your aid, it is possible you could have some effect upon the government structure there. On the other hand you might have a situation which could bring about a collapse.

Militarily the U.S.-Diem forces have not been doing at all well. Despite the overwhelming superiority of armament and means of transport and communication poured in by the U.S.A., time and again the People's Forces, with the primitive weapons fashioned by themselves, have inflicted defeats on the enemy. Increasingly, with captured American arms, they are bringing down their helicopters, driving them out of their strong-points and destroying 'strategic villages' (designed to isolate the mass of the peasantry from the People's Forces). There is much disaffection in Diem's army, and his American military advisers, as well as Washington officials, have many times complained of the unwillingness of many of Diem's troops to go forth into battle against their countrymen in the cause of 'defeating communism'. So much so, that the now notorious 'Special Force' was created, hand-picked and trained in terrorism and directly financed and run by U.S. agents.

It was in this situation that a new wave of opposition was sparked off last May by attacks on the Buddhists. Longstanding discrimination against Buddhist institutions in favour of the Roman Catholic minority religion took a new turn when the traditional Buddhist ceremony in Hue City was banned and a peaceful assembly of Buddhist believers fired on, resulting in several dead and many wounded. Attempts by the Buddhist leaders to reach a *modus vivendi* failed since the authorities did not abide by the agreement reached with them. Instead an all-out onslaught was mounted against Buddhist clergy and believers, their pagodas and holy places, which has already claimed many victims and is still in process. Even Western correspondents, who for years have been presenting Diem as a Christian gentleman of integrity and virtue, flanked by his equally virtuous and religious family, recoiled—either in disgust or embarrassment—at a state of affairs which led to the public self-immolation of Buddhists in protest.

However, this attempt by the Diemists to repress the traditional, national religion in favour of a foreign-imposed faith and to create a diversion amongst their opponents by sowing religious strife has misfired. All sections rallied to support the Buddhists, and the ranks of Diem's opponents have become more closely unified. Notwithstanding pious recommendations to be more 'liberal' and even sharp rebukes from their American paymasters, it was quite impossible for the Diemists to change or modify the methods which alone maintain them in power. Whoever heard of a tyrant reforming his ways?

Nor has it so far been possible to replace Diem himself by someone who might look a little better to the South Vietnamese and the world at large, and at the same time be more successful in quelling the determination of the South Vietnamese to free themselves from American neo-colonialism and establish the peace and independence guaranteed under the 1954 Geneva Agreements. For a time speculation centred around Diem's brother, Ngo dinh Nho, and his formidable wife, Tran Le Xuan, as possible replacements. True, as the man responsible for the 'security' of the regime he could be relied on to pursue operations against the people with all possible vigour. Further, he has at his immediate disposal the Special Force, centred in Saigon and other main towns which carried through the measures under the Martial Law of August 20. In the ensuing three weeks alone over 7,000, including hundreds of students and schoolchildren, were arrested, and hundreds killed and

wounded in attacks on demonstrations, on Buddhist buildings and in a renewed wave of terrorist raids over the countryside. How should Nhu be more acceptable to the people who have already given ample proof that they reject brother Diem?

There is only one alternative to the Diem regime, and that is the leadership developed by the people themselves in the South Vietnam Liberation National Front, embracing all sections, and which has included Buddhist representatives on its leading committee since its inception in December 1960. The range of the Front covers not only the military activities of the People's Defence Forces. Today it controls more than three-quarters of South Vietnam, inhabited by a half of the population, and there is nowhere in the country still under the Diemist administration where the supporters of the Front do not outnumber the Diemists.

In the Liberated Areas 1½ million hectares of arable land have been distributed to the peasants (the total arable land in the whole of South Vietnam is under 2½ million hectares). The Front has established hospital services and schools attended by half a million children. It organises many forms of cultural, social and educational activities, is equipping the villages with radio sets and is able to send accredited Missions to other countries to make known the situation in South Vietnam. A different picture indeed from that built up of a few sporadic guerrilla bands forcing themselves on an unwilling population by terrorism and only needing an extra spurt from the Diemist army and perhaps a few more American troops and dollars to be smashed. The high-powered mission, headed by Defence Secretary McNamara, sent to South Vietnam at the end of September with instructions to carry out investigations 'at all levels, from President Ngo dinh Diem to his main advisers as well as American and Vietnamese senior officers in Saigon and in combat zones', cannot have found much comfort there. Nor can the new U.S. ambassador, Cabot Lodge, who is currently reported as finding himself at loggerheads with the Ngo entourage.

Meantime the Ngos are conducting a publicity campaign designed to convince the world that victory over their opponents is within their grasp and that their regime is benevolent and enjoys the support of the people, though according to Diem 'some nations have been intoxicated by false information on Vietnam's internal situation and the Buddhist question' which he describes as having been created by the Communists in a 'last attempt to achieve victory'.

When the question of the persecution of the Buddhists was raised at the United Nations General Assembly, despite their immediate differences and difficulties, the United States worked to shield their protégés from the condemnation that seemed certain. In this they were successful, in that instead a United Nations fact-finding mission is to visit South Vietnam. Since this proposal was ostensibly put up by Diem's special representative at the U.N. it is obvious that a process of deception is going to be attempted. Moreover, such action in the name of the United Nations runs counter to the Geneva Agreements, which established the International Control Commission to conduct all investigations in Vietnam of any violations of the Agreements on democratic liberties, military questions, etc.

It is impossible to see any other solution to the situation in South Vietnam, which holds such a grave menace to peace in the whole of Asia, than through implementation of the Geneva Agreements. And the first essential step to this end, as has been stated many times both by the South Vietnam Liberation National Front and the government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, is that the U.S.A. should end its war of aggression against the South Vietnamese people and withdraw its troops and war material. That done, the Vietnamese people themselves will be able to solve their problems, and it is their declared intention to fight for the right to do so until victory is theirs.

A PROGRAMME FOR IRELAND

C. Desmond Greaves

DESPITE signs of a revival of interest, Ireland remains very much a *terra incognita* to the British working-class movement. Can it be, one imagines the trade unionist saying in his capacity as tourist, that this place that looks so similar and whose people palpably speak English, can really be politically so different? His first reaction may be to attempt to wreath the Irish picture into the British framework. This does not work. He may now conclude that Ireland is incomprehensible. He will be assisted to that view by all the organs of propaganda available to reaction in Britain whose ruling class has been successful in persuading even politically educated workers that Ireland is of no consequence to them.

An important factor in changing this situation could be the publication in Dublin and Belfast respectively of two notable

Communist programmes, *Ireland Her Own* (Irish Workers' Party) and *Ireland's Path to Socialism* (Communist Party of Northern Ireland). The fault that these are two separate programmes, instead of one for the whole country, must not be charged to the Irish. Ireland was partitioned by a British Act of Parliament in the year 1920 without any consultation with the Irish people. Two years after a General Election at which 81 per cent of the electorate voted in favour of an independent republic, the system of all-Ireland elections (hundreds of years old) was abandoned. The country was cut arbitrarily into two areas in which the most amateur psephologist could forecast the result and for the first time since before Cromwell there were two Irelands. The shattering of the political and economic unity of the country bequeathed to its parts (then broadly speaking economically complementary) extraordinary intractable problems which it has taken years for the labour and national movement to bring into theoretical perspective.

The all-pervading character of the partition issue is inadequately understood in Britain. Its effects can best be summarised by saying that economically it prevented the industrial north from developing in consort with the agricultural south and thereby condemned each to dependence on British imperialism. Politically it deprived the Irish people of an essential right, namely to decide their own affairs in a single national assembly in which the majority would have the decisive say, while taking due account (as happens in every democratic society) of the position of the minority. The position of the minority was not left for the amicable decision of the Irish nation as a whole; it was lifted out of its purview and decided in London. And to make matters worse, within the area which housed the minority, a section of the majority was made into an artificial minority. By this means not only was the nation disrupted, but the national movement also within the partitioned area.

The whole history of Ireland from that day to this has been a struggle between the popular forces aiming to break free from the straightjacket of partition, and imperialism and its agencies seeking to profit from the division of the nation by imposing and extending a 'neo-colonial' system of exploitation. What the 'neo-colonial' era has meant in Ireland is amply described in the two programmes. Naturally the area which possessed political independence fared best. Even the first post-partition Governments found it necessary to establish an important publicly owned hydro-electrical industry. During the critical thirties when imperialism strove to throw its

difficulties on the common people, the De Valera government not only fought back bravely but made important advances in which publicly owned industries played a vital part. But the citadel of British influence in the twenty-six counties was never stormed. There were other reasons for this besides the unwillingness of the national bourgeoisie to challenge private property. One of these was the economic and military weakness of a partitioned country. It is all very well to cry coward, but when men have the forces of a major world power sixty miles from their capital city they must take that fact into account. Indeed the significance of the Tory policy of keeping the Irish question at all costs out of British politics can be seen well enough in this context. An alliance between the British working class and the Irish national movement could not only render Ireland secure, but could enormously strengthen the forces of progress in both countries. That alliance was often envisaged but never filled out as a political reality. So today about two thirds of the directors on the boards of Irish banks are directors of British banks also. A section of Irish industry with £12 million assets is under British control, and the savings of the small farmers and businessmen are channelled through the banks into imperial investments while Irishmen emigrate in search of work.

The agricultural system still serves Britain rather than Ireland. Its basis is the large cattle ranch drawing its stock from small and medium farms and exporting to Britain. The failure to deal with the ranching class may be partially explained by the great importance of cattle to external trade. Deprived of the industrial north the twenty-six counties must find something with which to pay for the capital goods required for industrialisation. Cattle exports did that. So the ranchers were spared. Today as the pace of industrialisation quickens, foreign investments are sought. At the same time sections of the national bourgeoisie have 'made their pile' and are more compliant to the wishes of imperialism than in past years. The Workers' Party programme makes suggestions for meeting this situation. For the British reader or the Irishman living in Britain, it is essential to appreciate that his duty is not to blame the Irish bourgeoisie for its failure to overcome all the obstacles presented by partition; his duty is to fight against those who put it there.

The situation in the six northeastern counties is more complex and likewise more difficult. This is an 'integral part of the United Kingdom' in which 90 per cent of the taxation is collected by the imperial exchequer, but where British democracy is served notice

to 'keep out'. The powers of the six-county government are so derisory that it might be said that it possesses no right but that of assent. At first glance its emigration record seems better than that of the twenty-six counties. But the northeast is much more industrial. The effect of mechanisation of agriculture tells less on the unemployment figures.

It is in the towns indeed that the sorry picture shows itself most clearly. The rate of unemployment varies from seven to eleven per cent of the insured population and there is an annual emigration of 11,000. It is significant that as a result of a cunningly designed system of discrimination against the nationalist section of the people included in the northeastern area, emigration counterbalances almost exactly the natural increase of the nationalists while merely reducing political, is to create bitter divisions among the people and protect that of the unionists. The result of discrimination, religious and the interests of imperialism, whose monopolies are steadily eliminating the already weakened locally-owned industries by amalgamations and dismantling. As in the twenty-six counties the banks channel local savings abroad, but the powers of the six-county Government are too restricted to apply the financial controls which exist and can be used in the twenty-six.

As has been indicated the problem of liberating Ireland from imperialist exploitation does not lie in the absence, or even in the weakness, of the anti-imperialist forces, but in the difficulty of uniting them within the framework imposed in 1920 and re-enforced in 1949. One vitally important all-Ireland popular organisation exists, namely the Irish Congress of Trade Unions. Its existence is so distasteful to the Unionist Government in Belfast that it refuses to negotiate with its Northern Ireland sub-committee, on the plea that the general headquarters are in Dublin. It makes no such cavils at social or religious organisations with Dublin centres.

This fact indicates that what the Unionists (whose thinking most accurately reflects that of imperialist circles) fear most is the unity of the working class of Ireland and its leadership of a movement for national freedom. But other classes suffer from British domination, the small farmers squeezed off the land by low selling prices for their products and high buying prices for their materials of production; shop-keepers threatened by the advancing chain stores, hire-purchase firms and mobile shops; small manufacturers ruined by cheap imports and intellectuals denied local opportunity.

Both programmes see the road of advance leading to the establishment of 'progressive governments' with a programme of opposition to imperialism, national independence and satisfaction of the people's needs. But of course though the phrase is the same the powers, perspectives and possibilities of such governments must differ. The twenty-six county perspective is naturally plainer, since there is a sovereign state. The more complex conditions of the six counties, where a progressive government would begin its existence with no powers than those possessed by Stormont, are less easy to answer for. Class attitudes moreover are not exactly parallel in the two parts of the country, for example the national bourgeoisie is more revolutionary in the occupied north than in the politically independent south. These differences will be noted by those who read the two programmes.

Both programmes emphasise the need for the reunification of the country. They envisage its coming about as a result of a fusion of the struggles against imperialism as they develop on the two sides of the border. The conditions under which this will take place can obviously not be laid down in the form of a blueprint, and to some extent the matter will inevitably develop differently in the two areas. The six counties, for example, bear the full force of British legislation from which the twenty-six are protected.

Ireland Her Own stresses a point which British readers should especially take to heart.

The movement of the British workers for socialism is the natural ally of the Irish movement for unity and independence, since it is the same imperialist forces which oppose their struggle for a better life.

The Irish Workers' Party is one of the few organisations in Ireland bold enough to present that conclusion in the teeth of official Britain's long record of oppression and indifference. It is not a conclusion that will be taken for granted in Ireland. Though all nationalists distinguish between British Imperialism and the British people, few at present expect much from them.

It is up to British socialists and trade unionists to prove that the confidence of their comrades in Dublin is not misplaced. In doing so they will recall that the issue can be presented in reverse. 'The movement of the Irish people for unity and independence is the natural ally of the British workers for a better life'. British workers who want to see socialism in their own country should support the struggle of the Irish people, *in their own interests*.

The publication of these two pamphlets is probably the most important programmatic development in the Irish labour movement since 1912, and should dispel once and for all the prevalent notion that the 'Irish Question' is something that has not been solved, or cannot be solved. It has been solved. What remains is to put the solution into effect, and the British workers have a vital part to play in solidarity with what is being done in Ireland.

BOOK REVIEWS

Economic Competition Between Capitalism and Socialism

Josef Flek, Lubomir Kruzik, Bedrich Levcik

Publishing House for Political Literature, Prague 1962

484 pp. English price 25s. (from Collet's)

ACCORDING TO THE PUBLISHERS' description on the jacket 'this book is the product of several years of hard work on the part of a closely co-ordinated team which has used creatively much of the work previously done in this field and added to it'. In their Introduction the authors explain that: 'In this book we have sought to study individual aspects of the economic competition between the systems as a whole. . . . The determining force in the competition of the two systems is, of course, the Soviet Union. It was this country which blazed the trail to socialism for humanity and which, therefore, has the most experience. In addition, the Soviet Union from the economic standpoint is also potentially the strongest socialist country. Thus, it is only natural that we have devoted particular attention in this book to the rôle of the Soviet Union'.

It offers a rich mine of factual information about comparative pro-

duction figures, handled very competently by authors well qualified to deal with the subject and possessing a wide acquaintance with international statistical data and literature; and the data they marshal is used to demonstrate 'that superiority in the rate of economic development is a characteristic feature not only of individual socialist countries but of the socialist system as a whole. At the same time this superiority expresses itself not only in industry, but in agriculture as well, and as a result, in the dynamics of the entire social product'. The comprehensive data used by these Czech authors are set out, not only in numerous tables throughout the book and in a hundred-page statistical appendix, but also in some attractive diagrams in colour. They make use of, and also criticise, recent English and American estimates: in particular, the notorious G. Warren Nutter who maintained (on the basis of some highly dubious estimates) that Soviet industrial growth has been at the 'same average pace as American industrial growth' since 1913. They criticise also the advocates of the so-called 'declining growth curve': 'it is not increasing industrialisation, however—that is, the degree of development of productive forces—which causes this tendency . . . but capitalist production relations, which come into irreconcilable contradiction with the social character of the productive forces'.

In addition to discussing comparative figures of total production and of individual products, growth both absolute and relative, as well as output *per capita*, there are chapters on comparative living standards, on relation between socialist countries and under-developed countries and on future prospects. Figures are cited to show that, whereas total production in U.S.S.R. in 1960 was 60 per cent of that of U.S.A., and production *per capita* was 51 per cent, by 1970 the equivalent percentages will be between 120 and 130 per cent and between 101 and 111 per cent, assuming an annual growth-rate in U.S.A. of two to three per cent. In other words, Soviet production will have out-distanced American, both absolutely and per head of population, by the end of the present decade.

The introductory chapter summarises the political framework of this economic competition: in particular the idea of peaceful co-existence. If one were in a mind to be critical, one might perhaps say that this is a trifle stereotyped and that too little emphasis is here laid on what is *new* in the present situation ('socialism became a world system' and all that this implies)—although there is an incidental reference, it is true, to the 'change in the balance of power in the world'. There is (on page 18) what is perhaps a rather over-simplified formulation about state monopoly capitalism; and in speaking of rates of growth of total production there is no discussion of price-weights, although the authors are evidently well aware of the problems involved. Although there is a list of the statistical tables in the appendix and a list of statistical references, there is unfortunately no index. The translation into English seems to have been well and clearly

done (although in a few cases the rendering of Russian names into English is unfortunate—e.g. the Soviet economist A. Kac on p. 205 is presumably A. Katz). But these are minor blemishes on a very useful, informative and competent work.

MAURICE DOBB.

International Law and the Use of Force by States

Ian Brownlie

Oxford University Press. 532 pp. 75s.

THIS IS a learned and careful study of the development of a small but important section of International Law—namely, the restrictions imposed by that law on the resort by states to the use of force, or to the threat of its use, against other states.

Dr. Brownlie treats the subject historically, and gives a pretty vivid picture of the rapidity with which International Law—a complex conception, dealing with important fields of life and death—has developed and is developing. He writes optimistically about both the improvements already achieved in this field and those that may be expected; but he 'keeps both feet on the ground' and is well aware of the difficulties in the way of progress towards better law and towards peace.

That he should be optimistic, and not unconvincingly optimistic, at a time when the threats of resort to the use of force between states, and the expenditure on preparation for such resort, are far greater than they have been at any previous period, will puzzle many intelligent people who think that they know more or less what law is, and think that International Law is a branch of law! In truth, international law is not law at all in the sense in which jurists understand and define law; it is laid down by no one sovereign

state, nor are there any sanctions used by any state to enforce it. It is simply a set of more or less agreed rules for the conduct by states of their relations with one another, derived from many sources and possessed of no more than moral force in that least moral of all fields, international relations. It is inevitable, moreover, that it lacks certainty and definiteness. A superficial observer might think that 'law' which cannot be enforced, is difficult to state with precision, and is constantly broken, amounts to very little; but he would be wrong. Lawyers and laymen alike must realise that international law does exist, and is of great importance; it has long exercised great influence on the behaviour of states. In these days of wider and more vocal public opinion, when wars are more horrible and more clearly seen to be horrible, its influence can only increase, and is increasing. More than ever before, under its influence, even the worst of governments has to pause and reflect before doing what it wants to do in its own selfish interests, and to consider anxiously how much it will suffer at the hands of public opinion, both abroad and at home, if it persists in its evil ways. This imperfect 'law' has already helped to stop a good many wars, and will help to stop more.

If international law lacks precision—and it may be that in practice its uncertainties are little greater than those to be found in disputed cases of true law—it is still ascertainable. Its sources are many and varied; the old practices of states, their more modern practices, their treaties and agreements of all kinds, especially the Covenant of the League of Nations and the United Nations Charter, their actual behaviour in various situations, *including* their

frequent and flagrant breaches of well-established international law, and the views of writers of textbooks, all contribute to the ever-developing body of international law, so that it becomes almost impossible either to obey its precepts, or to disobey them, or to write about them, without making some contribution, great or small, good or bad, to its development.

Dr. Brownlie writes simply and straightforwardly, on a groundwork of thorough research. The book is designed primarily for international lawyers, but it could almost be read with interest and advantage by laymen. It reminds us, as it goes along, of the inherent rascality, hypocrisy, and lack of scruple displayed by capitalist governments, whose habits of doing what they want to do and then putting their propagandists to explain or excuse it by all sorts of reasoning that was not in their minds when they acted—a habit of course used extensively in internal affairs for the bamboozlement of their own nationals—and of constantly inventing new ways of dressing up aggression as self-defence (with an ingenuity scarcely paralleled even by their tycoons when arranging not to pay income-tax). None of these, nor any other of the bad habits of the larger capitalist states, makes the task of interpreting or of applying international law any easier; but Dr. Brownlie shows that it can nevertheless be applied and is being of use day by day.

I can make a few minor criticisms of the book, which do not detract from my general approval of it. The reader should, I feel, sometimes be told a little more of the background; for example, the *Caroline* case, which is cited—usefully—several times, would be more easily followed if the facts of it were

stated more fully. And the full and interesting argumentation based on several of the Articles of the Covenant of the League of Nations would be easier to follow if the full text of the Articles were given. And Dr. Brownlie is less emphatic in condemning the use of nuclear weapons as illegal than I would have expected; (see *Labour Monthly*, 1955, p. 301).

The book is a good book; it would be interesting to see a book by the author designed to tell laymen just what international law is, and to what extent it can serve the cause of peace.

D. N. PRITT.

A History of British Trade Unionism Henry Pelling

Macmillan. 288 pp. 42s.

CAMBRIDGE-EDUCATED, Oxford-based, 43-year-old Henry Pelling is emulating his master, the late G. D. H. Cole, in the quantity of his output in the fashionable field of labour movement history; and what may be called his Establishment short history of trade unionism is evidently intended for mass distribution, since it is appearing in a 5s. Penguin as well as the expensive, illustrated edition under review.

Mr. Pelling combines erudition (witness his formidable bibliographies) with a lively and readable style, and he competently covers the ground. Yet I find his book basically academic. Everything, including the

most dramatic episodes—like Tommy Hepburn in Durham—is donnishly dehydrated.

As for the author's basic approach, this can hardly be described as other than firmly right wing. His concluding perspective is one of a streamlined trade unionism operating an 'incomes policy' harmoniously as the labour associate of monopoly capital. He is avowedly anti-Communist, and carries this to the point where he lets it be assumed that the Communist Party approved of the E.T.U. ballot-rigging, without so much as a hint of the Party's public repudiation of these practices. This is scarcely scholarly.

But in general there is a certain subjective quality about Mr. Pelling's scholarship, evidenced by his strict exclusion of the obvious Marxist works—my own, for example—from his bibliographies. As he lists the most recondite papers and unpublished theses, it amused me to note that he is prepared to carry his animus to the point of not citing, for instance, a 1939 paper of mine which is the only documentation in English of the notorious anti-union campaign of *The Times* in 1901-2.

When forced to refer to a first-hand work by a Communist, as in the case of Wal Hannington's 'Unemployed Struggles', he adds with a perceptible sniff 'may be used with caution'. With respect, and no sniff, I would apply the same phrase to Mr. Pelling's book.

ALLEN HUTT.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

BOOKS


The Last Chronicle of Bouverie Street. G. Glenton and W. Pattinson. Allen & Unwin. 218 pp. 25s.

Africa: The Way Ahead. Jack Woddis. Lawrence & Wishart. 174 pp. 21s.

BOOKLETS

Marxism After 80 Years. Andrew Rothstein. Marx Memorial Library. 24 pp. 1s. 6d.

History of the Pan-African Congress. Ed. G. Padmore. Hammersmith Bookshop. 74 pp. 15s.



'UNDEMOCRATIC?'



A LABOUR Councillor tells me a story illustrating the Tory outlook on 'democracy'. During a council debate where the issue was how to enable property owners to increase the value of their dwellinghouses at public expense, my friend had threatened to discuss it with tenants, particularly council tenants whose rent was being raised; and remarked that there was likely to be a good attendance at the next council meeting. This horrified the Tory majority. To rouse the voters and encourage them to attend their own council chamber was 'quite undemocratic', they chorused. Hadn't the people elected official representatives? they should now go back to their place at kitchen sink or garden shed and leave public affairs to their elected leaders. To seek to influence events, except by very occasionally marking a ballot paper with their cross, was 'undemocratic'. Leave it to your leaders: a Tory outlook indeed. Yet there were even delegates at the Labour Party Conference at Scarborough last month so nervous lest discussion of a peace policy, public ownership or even wages might 'rock the boat', that they argued that any fight on policy could and should be left 'until we're in'. Leave it, in fact, to your leaders. You almost rub your eyes and say: which conference am I at? What a way to run an election! (Indeed, what a way to lose one!) In 1945 on the day the new Parliament assembled with its huge Labour majority at last ('give us the votes and we will finish the job'), I asked a Minister, now dead, how he planned to overcome the resistance that implementing his policy must rouse amongst vested interests? From which quarter did he think most trouble would come? He replied: 'From our own back benches, of course'. That was a typical Tory reply—from the lips of a Labour Minister.

A Scottish reader remarks that 'this is indeed a time when many people have reason to feel confused and uncertain. We have the prospect of an election in the near future when the people will, under our weird party system, be offered a choice between Tories who admit they are Tories and Tories who do not admit their guilt. It is bound to be very difficult for simple honest folk to know what they should really do. For me, of course, I have certain guiding lights and *LM* is one of the brightest'. The clear treatment of the relation of the fight for a Labour victory over Toryism and for Communist representation as an integral part of the fight against Toryism, has been found particularly helpful by many readers. Here are

a few examples of how *LM* is being used to defeat a Tory outlook and to clear confusion, both steps vital to democracy. A railway shopman, and a leading figure on his district committee, has found himself constantly using arguments from Ted Hill's hard-hitting *Trade Unions and the Labour Government* and R.P.D.'s October Notes *What Kind of Labour Government?* He tells me he cannot remember when there was so much discussion on basic questions. Many made most effective use of the September *LM* too: the Notes, *Problems of Trade Unionism*, and J. R. Campbell's *The Siamese Twins—Neddy and Nicky* were found invaluable to meet the argument: 'wage restraint is all right if you restrain profits too'. Will Paynter on *Automation* in August made a deep impression: not only were 1,000 extra copies sold, but it was reprinted in no less than four trade union journals. So those three issues alone contained authoritative articles from perhaps the two most widely respected trade union leaders, Paynter and Ted Hill, and *also* exclusive articles from premiers of two 'new countries': Jomo Kenyatta and Cheddi Jagan. We say to readers old and new: if you are keen to destroy quickly the typical Tory outlook once and for all and to clear confusion amongst the working class, extend *LM*'s influence. Look at *these* articles and consider how to plan to put *this* number into new hands.

ANGELA TUCKETT

FUND FIGURES

£70 14s. 10d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: B.J.M., 10s; B. W. Mackay, 4s; E. Strachan Rogers, £3 3s; J. A. Smith, 10s; 'Backslider', £1 5s; 'Anon', Whitechurch, 1s; L. Bates, 5s; H. Brindle, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 2s; Oldham Branch, 1s; H.H., £10; 'Daisy Bell', £10; S. Turner (for Daisy Mendez, Cuba), 5s; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; D. Sandwell, 3s 6d; 'Pax', 2s 6d; R. Dodd, £1; D. H. Strathern and friends, 10s; 'S. Mill', £1; R.F.B., £3; M. Illing, 10s; A. Corbett, £1; G.I., 2s; 'L'Humanité', 5s; S. Townsend, 12s 6d; 'Oliver Twist and friends', 15s; 'In Memory of Joe Brien', 3s; J. Tarver, 5s; N. Usher, 2s 6d; B. Ainley, 10s; Highgate Reader, £3; R. McLeod, £1; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; E.J.B., 10s; F.G.A. (Canada), 10s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; The Humphreys' family, 5s; A.M.T. for Fernando and Guilherme, 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: Mrs. E. Whelen, £1 1s; J. R. Smith, £1; H. S. Steward, 9s; A. W. Elliot, 2s 6d; E. S. Winley-Green, 4s; J. Hodgson, 10s; E. S. Williams, £1 1s; L.H. (New Zealand), 5s; S. Stables, £1; Mrs. M. Eady, £1 1s; A. A. Woolf, 4s; R. Small, 10s 6d; J. S. Butler, 1s 6d; G.J.G. (New Zealand), 5s; W. Wunsch, 4s; L. Miseldine, 9s; J. Cuthbert, 5s; J. Hammond, 10s; L. Goldman, 16s; 'Coventry', £1; T. D. Tyson, 5s; E. Walsh, 7s; A. A. W. Boyd, 6s; A. E. Moffett, 10s; R. J. Finnemore, 4s; H. Turner, 5s; 'Friend in Delhi', £5; W. N. Alexander, 10s; H. Wolff, 19s; F. W. Garley, 9s; Mrs. R. Herring, 4s 9d; J. H. Jowett, £2; C. M. Ford, 19s; K.N. (U.S.A.), £3 6s; H.P. (U.S.A.), 14s 2d; C.S. (U.S.A.), 7s 2d; W.M. (Canada), 3s 3d.

Our thanks to you all.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

Co-op. No. L.99482.

FINchley 5135.

WHY NOT BY POST?

NAME

(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS

.....

.....

.....

I enclose 21s. (Overseas, 24s.,
Canada and USA, \$3.50), for
year's subscription from the
.....issue.

(SIGNED)

To LABOUR MONTHLY

134, BALLARDS LANE,

LONDON, N.3.

From the U.S.A.

NEW WORLD REVIEW

The only American Magazine
exclusively devoted to East-
West relations and peace

**\$4.50 (£1. 12s. 0d.) for one year
sub. (12 issues)**

\$1.75 (12s. 6d.) for 5-month sub.

Send order to:

NEW WORLD REVIEW
34 WEST 15th STREET
NEW YORK 11, N.Y.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

*(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d.
Cash with order to: 'Class Ads',
Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane,
London, N.3.)*

COMRADES! Sell your BOOKS to a
modern realistic firm paying modern
realistic prices. Marxism, Labour &
T.U. Movements, Soc./Econ., Hist.,
Russia, Lit. Crit., etc. Stanley Noble,
24, Gladwell Rd., London, N.8.
MOU 2831. We call.

WE BUY BOOKS, pamphlets, Socialism,
U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We
collect: RIV 6807. The Hammer-
smith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6.

DUPLICATING, verbatim shorthand,
professional typing (tape m/ss),
translating. Mabel Eyles, 10, Beacons-
field Rd., N.11. ENT 3324.

Collet's

London Bookshop

for London's largest selection of progressive books, pamphlets and magazines.

Open 9.30 — 6 daily
Thursdays 9.30 — 8.

64/66 Charing Cross Rd., W.C.2
TEMPle Bar 6306

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating
by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

For all interested in the fight for Peace and Progress in the Countryside and the problems of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.

Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or
Send 9d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

27, Bedford St. Strand, London, W.C.2.

MIMETTE FURS LTD.

Wide range of furs, coats,
stoles and capes.

117, High Street, Croydon, Surrey.
Phone CROYdon 4328

LABOUR RESEARCH

Mr. Martell's Crusade.

Electricity Cuts: Whose Fault?
Houses—Empty and Half-empty.

Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

To All Trade Unionists

Each month we have something of interest to trade unionists generally, in our series "Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties." Full commentary, too, on current peace problems, international affairs, the socialist world and former colonies.

HELP US TO GET THIS SERIES WIDELY KNOWN

1. Show this copy to your mates and fellow trade unionists.
2. Get your branch or shop stewards' committee to order copies.

Reduced rates for trade unions and shop stewards' committees during this series: 2s. each, 10s. 6d. for 6. Back numbers available.

I encloses.d. for copies.

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor : R. Palme Dutt

NEDDY: THE CONFIDENCE TRICK

J. K. Dutton

★

WAGES CURB ON THE ROCKS

'Vulcan'

★

TEHERAN
MUNICH &
PEACE
TODAY

TWENTY YEARS AFTER, The Editor
HOME & THE CONSERVATIVES, W. Gallacher
TEHERAN & GERMANY, Conference Minutes

DECEMBER 1963

Two Shillings

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL. XIV

No. 12

DECEMBER . 1963

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Notes of the Month: Twenty Years After. <i>A Ghost as Premier—Let the Documents Speak—Must History Repeat Itself?—A New 'Mein Kampf'—'Peaceful' Expansion—Renewal of the Theory of the Offensive—How the West Divided Germany—Home's Maps—Beware of the Election Shop Window—Why Not Fight Home—Alternative for Peace.....</i> R.P.D.	529
Neddy: The Confidence Trick. Leading trade unionist explodes the myth of Neddy's planning..... J. K. Dutton	543
Wages Curb on the Rocks. Shocks forecast for the Government on the wages front..... 'Vulcan'	545
Home and the Conservatives. A contemporary's eye-view of the Man of Munich..... W. Gallacher	549
Dimitrov Acquitted. A lawyer's tribute on the thirtieth anniversary of this blow against fascism..... D. N. Pritt, Q.C.	553
Algeria: A Year of Ben Bella's Government. Description of the problems and successes since independence..... Desmond Buckle	556
Teheran and Germany. Minutes of the Teheran Conference throw revealing light on the question of partition of Germany.	561
Proust, Joyce and Kafka. Stimulating discussion of twentieth-century novelists by Soviet literary critic..... V. Suchkov	565
Illustration.....	John Heartfield 554
Book Reviews: 'Documents of the First International': <i>Clemens Dutt.</i>	569
A World Away.....	Angela Tuckett 570
Index.	572

Notes of the Month

TWENTY YEARS AFTER

As to peace, we are sure that our concord will make it an enduring peace. We recognise fully the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the United Nations to make a peace which will command the good will of the overwhelming masses of the people of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations.

TEHERAN DECLARATION signed by Roosevelt, Stalin, Churchill on December 1, 1943.

November 18, 1963

Alexandre Dumas the Elder wrote a novel *Twenty Years After*. In it he portrayed the fortunes of D'Artagnan and his Three Musketeers after the passage of twenty years. His tale combined all those elements of irony, bitterness and heroic pride which that master of the French romantic novel had at his command. This month we celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the famous Teheran Declaration of the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain, signed by Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill. The Teheran Declaration registered agreement on the plans for the final destruction of German militarism and the pledge of co-operation of the Three Powers for the maintenance of world peace. Here also there is occasion to add our sequel 'Twenty Years After'.

A Ghost as Premier

Twenty-five years ago was signed the Munich Agreement of Hitler, Chamberlain, Daladier and Mussolini, by which Premier Neville Chamberlain, with Home (then Lord Dunglass) as his right-hand man by his side, betrayed peace, handed over the living body of Czechoslovakia to be carved up by Hitler, and thereby opened the gates to the second world war. That second world war cost mankind six years of misery and destruction and fifty million dead. Eternal vows were taken never to allow German militarism to arise again.

It is our inflexible purpose to destroy German militarism and Nazism and to ensure that Germany will never again be able to disturb the peace of the world. We are determined to disarm and disband all German armed forces; break up for all time the German General Staff; remove or destroy all German military equipment; eliminate or control all German industry that could be used for military production. . . .

It is not our purpose to destroy the people of Germany; but only when Nazism and militarism have been extirpated, will there be hope for a decent life for Germans, and a place for them in the comity of nations.

(CRIMEA DECLARATION signed by Winston S. Churchill for the United Kingdom, Franklin D. Roosevelt for the U.S.A., and J. V. Stalin for the U.S.S.R. on February 11, 1945.)

Today the West German Army is the strongest in Western Europe. The monopolies which built Hitler, the Thyssens, Krupps and the rest, are larger and more dominant than ever. The West European Union has just sanctioned the increase of the size of West German submarines to 1,000 tons (shades of the Anglo-Nazi Naval Agreement of 1935, which was the real starting point, long before the connivance at the Rhineland armed occupation, in smashing Versailles and rearming Hitler). And now the surviving Man of Munich is installed as Premier, with the other main survivor, who as Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs defended Munich in parliament, by his side in charge of the Foreign Office. The new Premier openly proclaims his fidelity to the principles of Munich:

I certainly agreed with Chamberlain's analysis of the problem we were faced with and with the general direction he was trying to move in.

(Sir Alec Douglas-Home in the *Observer*, September 23, 1962.)

The Ghost walks again. It is time to lay this Ghost.

Let the Documents Speak

Is all this only digging up the Past? No, it is the Present. German militarism is a very present menace. On another page we print some extracts from the Minutes of the Teheran Conference summit discussions bearing on Germany. The documents are revealing and will repay study. There is indeed much more than the short extracts here given. Lest it may be objected that these are only the Minutes as recorded and published by the Soviet side (by all means let the United States and British authorities publish their Minutes; these will be of the greatest interest; the West should learn to be less secretive on information of public importance), it may be useful to recall Churchill's own account of his discussion on German rearmament at Teheran. In his memoirs of the second world war he describes how at the Teheran Conference in a conversation with Stalin he said:

We have now learned something. Our duty is to make the world safe for at least fifty years by German disarmament and by preventing German rearmament.

Whereupon, Churchill records, Stalin reminded him that the Western

allies had made similar pledges after the first world war and had broken them. To this characteristically merciless and inescapable reminder of the lessons of history, revealing that Stalin could not be so easily bamboozled as some of the British public, Churchill replied, according to his own account, with the confident assertion:

We were inexperienced then. It will be different this time.

(Winston Churchill, *The Second World War*, Vol. V.)

But it is not different this time. It is worse. And it was under Churchill as Premier that in 1954 the rearmament of German militarism was put through in violation of war-time pledges and treaty obligations. Nato is Munich in a new dress.

Must History Repeat Itself?

Lord D'Abernon, who as British Ambassador in Berlin after the first world war presided over the secret rearmament of German reaction in the twenties which preceded the public rearmament in the thirties, wrote in his private diary on November 20, 1920:

The French do not appear to understand that the military danger is past and that the real danger is Communist disorder.

There spoke Munich already in 1920, complete even to the suicidal blind eye to the real military danger of the next war. In 1948, in almost identical language, Lord Douglas, who was British Commander-in-Chief in Germany after the second world war, wrote:

The pressing danger today is not so much a revival of German militarism as the Westwards spread of Communism.

1920 and 1948. Nothing learned and everything forgotten. The second world war has passed through them and vanished from their consciousness like an unpleasant dream, not decent to be recalled in polite society. Potsdam has followed Versailles into the discard. They are back where they were. The first three Tory Premiers after the second world war, Churchill, Eden, even Macmillan, could make some claim to having expressed some criticism of Munich. Today Munich presides again over the Government Front Bench.

Testament of Nazism

Nato, the Atlantic-German Alliance, is the fulfilment of the testament of Nazism. The last order of Admiral Doenitz, Hitler's appointed successor, to the Wehrmacht on the eve of the surrender, on May 1, 1945, ran:

Against the British and the Americans I shall continue the struggle only so far and so long as they hinder me in carrying out the fight against Bolshevism.

Immediately before the surrender he had proclaimed in a speech intended for the Officers' Corps (reproduced in *The Times*, August 17, 1948):

Our political line is very plain. We must go along with the Western Powers and work with them in the occupied territories in the West, for only by working with them can we have hopes of later retrieving our land from the Russians.

Equally the official Nazi organ, the *Voelkische Beobachter*, proclaimed the line in its issue of February 21, 1945:

Sooner or later the peoples of the West will unite their forces with ours to ultimate victory.

Shrewd prevision, not only of Nato, but even of the 'Multilateral Force'. Nor was the nuclear element lacking in the final Nazi Testament. The last words of Goering before he cheated the hangman were (recorded in the *Evening Standard*, October 3, 1946):

American leadership in the atomic field is vital to the world's existence. If he had lived a year or two longer he would of course have said 'the free world's existence'. The line of Fulton and Nato was never original, any more than the formula the 'Iron Curtain'. The formula the 'Iron Curtain' to describe the countries of Eastern Europe freed from fascism by the Soviet armies was first used by Goebbels in February 1945; borrowed by Churchill in his Fulton speech in 1946 without acknowledgement to its author; and is since used by all and sundry today without even awareness that they are echoing Goebbels. So with Nato and the Atlantic Holy Alliance. Testament of Nazism.

A New 'Mein Kampf'

Music of the past? On the contrary. It is now that the dangerous harvest is ripening, now today when the closely linked German militarists and Ruhr monopolists have once again established their economic and military predominance in capitalist Europe and are reaching for nuclear arms. The expansionist aims of the resurrected German militarism and big capital, and of their spokesman, whether Christian Democrats or the Social Democrat leaders of the Schumacher-Brandt school, to expand the frontiers of West Germany at the expense of the territories of other states, are still as openly proclaimed as ever were the equally open expansionist aims set out

in *Mein Kampf*. The purpose of West German participation in the so-called 'European Army' was proclaimed by Chancellor Adenauer in December 1951, when he said:

Our chief reason for wanting to enter the European Army is to recover our Eastern territories.

Dr. Hallstein, when West German Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, before he became President of the Common Market, declared in the United States:

The chief aim of my Government is the unity of Europe up to the Urals. This was also Hitler's formula. Theodor Blank, Security Commissioner for West Germany, in charge of the rebuilding of the German army, declared in June 1954:

The new German Army will not be a defensive force.

Oberlaender, the war criminal, who continued as Minister in the Bonn Government until in 1960 he was forced out as a result of his exposure by the German Democratic Republic, set out, in a speech while he was still a Government Minister, at Bremen on June 14, 1957, the old Hitlerite programme:

In Russia the land is waiting for us. We must take root there. We must liberate, not only the 17 million people in East Germany, but also the 120 millions inhabiting the European parts of the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe.

Method in Madness

Insane ambitions? So also were dismissed the equally explicit programme declarations of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* as empty vapourings to be ignored. As Home has since so engagingly told us, the only mistake about Munich was that Chamberlain and he, in calculating that Communism was the 'greater danger' rather than Hitler, had not realised that Hitler was 'mad'. Perhaps; though not so mad as Chamberlain and Home. Madmen also can be dangerous, especially if provided with lethal weapons. Today it is universally recognised, even by the Munichites, even by Home, that the statesmen of the West would have been wiser to pay more attention to the very plain, explicit programme declarations of Hitler, and counter the danger in time, rather than let themselves be swept over the precipice by their anti-communist mania. But what is not recognised is that the same applies to the present situation. The lesson has not yet been learned. Once again they fondly imagine that they have got their powerfully rearmed West Germany, with already the strongest army in West Europe and rapidly increasing in numbers,

safely 'under control' through all the paper network of Paris Agreements, West European Union, joint commands and the rest of it. Once again they would be wiser to take more seriously the very plain and explicit programme declarations of expansionist aims of West Germany today, of all the leading statesmen of West Germany, and to consider the best steps to diminish the danger. They would be wiser to return to the path of Teheran, to the path of co-operation with the Soviet Union in order to hold in check the resurrected German militarism and maintain peace in Europe.

'Peaceful' Expansion?

But surely, some innocents still urge, all the more responsible official statements of the West German Government, if we overlook the wilder clamours at highly organised mass rallies of former storm troopers and the like, always emphasise that the aim of expansion of the frontiers of West Germany, not only to annex the German Democratic Republic, but also at the expense of the frontiers of Poland, Czechoslovakia and other states, are only intended to be accomplished by strictly peaceful means. It is extraordinary that there should still be any innocent enough to find this formula credible. Perhaps Munich by this reasoning might be regarded as a triumphant model of a 'peaceful' alteration of frontiers, because the entire force of British and French imperialism was brought to bear to compel the Benes Government to submit to the invasion of German troops. Annexations of territory between states are forceful actions. The profession of the desire to accomplish such forceful aims by peaceful means is a familiar conventional formula, and not least familiar in the records of German militarism. Stresemann, when Foreign Minister of the Weimar Republic, replied to the question of a Hamburg journalist in 1926:

You cannot expect the German Government and German diplomacy to be so naïve as to inform the *Entente* (Britain and France) that Germany intends to alter its frontier by force.

Hitler declared at a Nazi press conference on November 10, 1938, that is, after his Munich victory:

Circumstances forced me for decades to speak almost exclusively of peace. Only on condition of constantly underlining the German will to peace, and its peaceful intentions, was it possible for me to give the German people the armaments which were always necessary as a preliminary to the next step.

As the outcome showed, when the time was deemed ripe, when the rearmament had been accomplished by the aid of the Western

powers, the mask was thrown aside. We are too dangerously near that point in West German rearmament today.

Hopeful Sheep

But surely, the sheep continue to argue, blind to the lesson of the thirties, it is inconceivable that the West German High Command, however much stronger their army now than the armies of the other West European powers, would be so mad as to venture on military action in face of the immeasurably greater strength of the Soviet Union today than in 1941 and the firm alliance of the Warsaw Pact socialist powers in place of the rotten fascist dictatorships of the thirties with whom Chamberlain made his alliance. Once again it may be noted that by this argument the sheep are looking hopefully to the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact to save them from the menace of the resurrected German militarism they have helped to rearm, oblivious of the previous experience that last time the first thrust of the uncaged beast was to the West. Certainly the balance of forces in the world is decisively changed. Certainly the new balance in the world means that in the long run any new war offensive of the resurrected German militarism, even though utilising Nato, even though a victorious Ultra-Right in the United States should back it, would be doomed to utter defeat. But to reach such an outcome countless millions of the innocent would also be doomed in a catastrophe of incalculable proportions. We do not want such a path. And it is precisely here and for this reason that the immediate present danger arises, not in the long term, not in the world balance of forces, not from accident (as the fiction writers imagine), but from the very real possibility of a planned short-term adventure of the resurrected German militarism to put through a lightning stroke with success, gambling on the desire of the major powers to avoid a general war.

Theory of the Offensive

The theory of the German High Command is and has always been the theory of the offensive. Only the failure to put through the Schlieffen Plan bogged down the war of 1914, giving time to the Western powers to gather their superior forces and eventually (but only after the opening of the socialist revolution in Eastern Europe and its powerful repercussions in Central Europe had changed the whole situation of the war) inflict defeat on the old Germany of the Kaiser. After that crushing defeat the revival of

German militarism from utter prostration to complete domination of Europe from the Atlantic to the borders of the Soviet Union within twenty-two years was only made possible, first by playing on the anti-communist mania of the West to shatter the bonds of Versailles and secure rearmament, and thereafter during the thirties by the new application of the theory of the offensive—the successive lightning thrusts of Hitler, with inferior forces in face of far superior potentially opposed forces, but gambling on the unwillingness of the Western powers to enter into a conflict with fascism.

Renewal of the Theory of the Offensive

This is the key to the strategy of the West German High Command today. For the benefit of those who are still slumbering ('While England Slept'), let us never forget the words of the then Defence Minister Strauss in his speech at Santa Rosa in California on July 25, 1961:

For us the Second World War is not yet finished.

General Heusinger, Chief of General Staff Operations under Hitler, who subsequently became, with the usual appropriate continuity, Chairman of the Nato Military Planning Committee, laid down as his guiding principle of strategy for the West:

Attack whenever a chance presents itself. This is the method of fighting which the West should use in its encounters with the East.

Nor has this theory been confined to the military representatives. Schumacher, who was the Leader of the Social Democratic Party in West Germany, after the British and American authorities had forbidden the socialist-communist unification, pledged during the anti-Nazi resistance, to take place (the unification was only fulfilled in East Germany), laid down in January 1951:

It is necessary that if war starts it should at once be carried East of the German frontier.

And again in 1950:

Dr. Schumacher said that the first aim of a West German Army would be to reconquer what is now West Poland, and that it must try to fight its battles East of the Vistula.

(*Manchester Guardian*, September 9, 1950.)

Brandt has not repudiated his predecessor, nor did he repudiate his own openly proclaimed support of the expansionist aims for West Germany when he was accorded the platform as the principal guest speaker at the Scarborough Labour Party rally in October. Mikardo's protest went unanswered. The blueprint of the West

German High Command for a lightning stroke to overrun the German Democratic Republic in twelve hours—of course in response to an ‘appeal for help’ from an ‘uprising’ of planted agents—has long been familiar as the typical Hitlerite gambler’s calculation that, once a *de facto* situation has been created, the other powers will hesitate to begin a general war. The Berlin Wall since 1961 has placed obstacles in the way of this plan by hampering the previous free passage of agents. This is one of the many ways in which the Berlin Wall is a key bastion of peace in the present European situation.

Who Divided Germany?

But surely, argue the sheep, is not the partition of Germany an injustice? Does not this injustice justify the claims of the West German Government and political leaders? Have not the German people the right to self-determination? Just so in the thirties the wrongs of Versailles were cited by Hitler as the justification for his expansionist aims; and many were the innocents in the West who, beating their breasts in belated remorse for the guilt of Versailles, danced to Hitler’s tune. It is time for the innocents to realise who divided Germany and who fought for the unity of Germany. Let them consult the Minutes of the Teheran Conference which we print on page 561.

STALIN: What are the proposals on this matter (the question of Germany)?

ROOSEVELT: The partition of Germany.

CHURCHILL: I am for partitioning Germany.

ROOSEVELT: I want to set forth a plan for partitioning Germany into five states, which I personally drew up two months ago.

Thereupon Stalin explained the objections to partition by stating that the German soldiers fought as Germans, irrespective of what part of Germany they came from, and concluded by a proposal for further discussion, thus blocking the adoption of the American-British plan for the partition of Germany:

STALIN: There are no steps that could exclude the possibility of Germany’s unification. . . . I don’t know that there is need to set up four, five or six independent German states. This question must be discussed.

Clear enough. The Western Governments were already then for the partition of Germany. The Soviet Government blocked the plans for the partition of Germany.

How the West Divided Germany

For nine years from the ending of the war the Soviet Union fought against the West for a united Germany. Already at the Potsdam Peace Conference Stalin proposed the immediate setting up of a Provisional Democratic Government for the whole of Germany. The Western powers opposed this, and from the outset sought to make permanent the temporary zones of military control, established only as a provisional expedient to ensure the fulfilment of the Potsdam decisions for demilitarisation and disarmament and the destruction of Nazi organisations, and thereby create the conditions for a united democratic disarmed Germany and a peace treaty with such a Germany. The Western powers created successively Bizonia and Trizonia; sabotaged the Four Power commission for a single currency reform for the whole of Germany by unilaterally introducing a separate West German currency (printed in Washington), thereby initiating the Berlin crisis of 1948; and finally established unilaterally the West German State, thereby compelling the *subsequent* establishment of the German Democratic Republic. Hitler's generals, neo-Nazism and the big monopolist backers of Hitler were restored in West Germany. West Germany was drawn into the anti-Soviet alliance of Nato to be rearmed as a member of Nato. With ceaseless protests and proposals the Soviet representatives throughout these years opposed these illegal measures of the West and strove for the fulfilment of the Potsdam agreement for a united democratic disarmed Germany. The last Soviet Note was delivered as late as 1954 immediately prior to the adoption of the plan for the rearmament of West Germany as a member of Nato. This Soviet Note of 1954 made a final proposal for free democratic elections under agreed international supervision over the whole of Germany in order to establish a united democratic disarmed Germany which should not be linked in any military alliance with either side. In the event of refusal of this offer, the Soviet Note gave the final warning that the establishment of a rearmed West German state as a member of the sectional military coalition Nato would close the door against German reunification. The West had the choice. Either a united peaceful disarmed Germany with free democratic elections, or the division of Germany for the sake of rebuilding German militarism in a West German State. The Western powers, and also the West German political leaders, the Adenauers and the Brandts, deliberately chose the division of Germany in order to secure the rearmament of German militarism as a member of Nato. They are

in no position now to complain of the division of Germany and try to make this a justification for their expansionist aims.

Home's Maps

Where does Premier Home stand on this serious question of Germany and the expansionist aims of German militarism, which is more and more manifestly crucial for the peace of Europe and the world? Home as Foreign Secretary has already given a significant indication. In December 1961 the Foreign Office under Home published a Blue Book entitled 'Selected Documents on Germany and the Question of Berlin' at the price of 25 shillings, followed by a pamphlet next month 'The Meaning of Berlin' at one shilling. Both these give a map of 'Germany 1962' in which the 'international frontiers' of Germany are given as those of Hitler's Germany of 1937. Not only is the Oder-Neisse line thus displaced in favour of the claims of the German militarists, but the very bulky volume of 'Selected Documents', by some strange oversight, omits the specific pledges of the British Government and Foreign Office, set out in the famous Cadogan letter of November 2, 1944, and Churchill's statements as Prime Minister to parliament on December 15, 1944, and February 27, 1945, to support the Oder-Neisse line, and prints instead an unofficial subsequent speech by Churchill, when not in office, attacking the Oder-Neisse line. Sir Alexander Cadogan, then Permanent Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office, declared in his letter of reply to the Polish Foreign Minister on November 2, 1944:

You enquired whether His Majesty's Government were definitely in favour of advancing the Polish frontier up to the line of the Oder to include the port of Stettin. The answer is that His Majesty's Government do consider that Poland should have the right to extend her territory to this extent.

When this pledge was confirmed by Churchill as Prime Minister in his statement to parliament on December 15, 1944, he said that he was

speaking on behalf of His Majesty's Government in a way which I believe would probably be held binding by our successors.

But not by Home. Britain's solemn pledge has been repudiated by Home in favour of the expansionist aims of West German militarism. It is at this moment that the prospect of German militarism winning access to nuclear arms is brought dangerously closer by the prospect of the multilateral nuclear force and it is worth noting that it was Home who, as Foreign Secretary, agreed to participation in official consultations on this project. There has been a spate of books and

discussions recently on what happened at Munich, and even on the first world war. It would be well if a little attention were given to what is happening today to prepare new explosions—and not least to what is being smuggled across by Home in the decisive sphere of foreign policy under cover of grandiose talk of the ‘modernisation’ of Britain.

Beware of the Election Shop Window

All the proceedings of the new parliamentary session, the Queen’s Speech and the Home Government’s programme, and of the sham debate (‘with dummy swords, and nobody got hurt’, *The Times*, November 13, 1963) have indicated that the Tory Government and Labour Front Bench are united in endeavouring to concentrate public attention on home affairs, as if these could be separated from the decisive issues of world policy which govern home affairs. The competition is in schemes for the ‘modernisation’ of Britain, with each side accusing the other of stealing its best suit. The Government programme announced in the Queen’s speech presented a vast electoral shop window of promises and perspectives and platitudes, exceeding even 1955 and 1959. A Queen’s Speech is normally a terse summary of bills to be presented. It is doubtful whether any Queen’s Speech has offered such an array of generalities and abstractions as that offered to the public on November 12, 1963:

EXPANSION OF THE ECONOMY.

GROWTH WITHOUT INFLATION.

A HIGH AND STABLE LEVEL OF EMPLOYMENT.

MODERNISATION OF BRITAIN.

A MODERN TRANSPORT SYSTEM.

AN EFFICIENT AND PROSPEROUS HOME AGRICULTURE.

ECONOMIC GROWTH MATCHED BY SOCIAL ADVANCE.

Wonderful. Wonderful. Simple Simons, Walk up and buy! Such a chance may never occur again.

Grimmer Content

But a closer examination of such hard content as there is would reveal a different result from the glowing prospectus. *The Times* inferred 24 Bills from the speech, of which four were described as ‘major bills.’ The four ‘major bills’ cover (1) Defence reorganisation and strengthening; (2) Police centralisation; (3) Industrial training, necessitated by the changes in industry; (4) Housing. Thus the main concentration is on strengthening the state machinery of coercion and meeting the requirements of monopoly capital. Only

one of the four touches a social question; and here justified exposure has not been lacking of the fantastic character of a 'Housing Bill' which does not touch the key problems of land, inflated land prices and land ownership; rents and rent control; interest charges; or the public building of houses and flats to let at rents within reach of workers' wages. The parade of vast figures thrown out to indicate future astronomical expenditure on public investment, health and education, is usually found on examination either to be characterised by such vagueness that the aggregate total is a matter of dispute, or to represent targets and aims over a period of years totted up together to make a single large figure, or to constitute a compilation from plans already in hand, leaving finally a considerably smaller hard residue which may be regarded as the normal Tory election year special expenditure to give a boost to the economy until the election is over. But for the really urgent social needs of the old age pensioners, or the dismally low level of unemployment and sickness benefits, nothing is offered. A hard-faced programme of Big Capital behind the mask of Santa Claus.

Why Not Fight Home?

The challenge of the Tory programme is inescapable. But in face of this challenge the Labour Front Bench has chosen the fatal ground of fighting it on the charge of excessive expense. Wilson estimated that the Tory new expenditure proposed would amount to 'over £1,000 million between now and 1969', and hotly demanded how this would be paid for. 'Inflation', warned Callaghan. 'A spending spree' became the favourite Labour term of denunciation. Once again, as at the Scarborough Labour Party Conference (see last month's Notes pp. 491-2 on 'The New Asceticism' and 'Labour Austerity') as the grand prophets of Austerity, sackcloth and ashes, and wages restraint to build up British capitalism. Not surprisingly even the far from agile debater Home seized on the opportunity to pose the unanswerable question: What would Labour cut? Would Labour cut expenditure on Health? Or Education? Or Housing? Or other Social Services? Unanswerable for the Labour Front Bench, because the Labour Front Bench was tied hand and foot and could not make the obvious answer which would occur at once to any rank and file: Cut the Arms Bill, and there will be plenty of money for social needs. Official Labour policy is pledged to maintain, and even possibly increase, the present inflated arms expenditure, diminishing the proportion on nuclear arms only to increase the propor-

tion on 'conventional' arms and armed forces, so as to maintain Britain's world imperialist role in the Persian Gulf or South East Asia. Thus the world imperialist role of Britain in fact governs the domestic issues and possibilities, and its acceptance paralyses official Labour policy also on the home front.

Alternative for Peace

Never was there such need for a real alternative policy which fights Toryism on the whole front, equally on foreign and domestic issues. Only a policy for peace can open the way to tackle the burning social and economic needs of the people. That is why the fight to bring down Toryism needs to be combined, both before the election, during the election and after the election with the fight for such an alternative policy. That is why the battle of the Communist candidates, however hard and difficult at the moment in the existing electoral conditions and with the denial of the main means of mass communication, is of such vital importance for the whole labour movement and for the future of Britain. It is necessary to tell the truth to the people. It is necessary to make understood why the seemingly 'remote' questions of foreign policy and the cold war, of nuclear strategy and Nato and Polaris bases, of German militarism and Malaysia and vast overseas military expenditure, are in fact decisive for the future of every man, woman and child in Britain. We cannot afford to repeat the deadly error of the 1935 election, when Labour went into the electoral battle applauding the Tory Foreign Minister Hoare's proclamation of unfaltering fidelity to collective security and the fulfilment of the League of Nations Covenant against Italian fascist aggression—and the outcome was the Hoare-Laval Pact and Munich. Every one today recognises that the one saving grace of that 1935 election was the return of the single Communist M.P. Gallacher, who alone raised his voice in parliament against Munich when every other M.P. either applauded or was silent. The situation is more urgent today. It is time to move to the alternative policy. It is time to advance anew to the principles of Teheran, the principles of co-operation of the Great Powers (including now the Chinese People's Republic) at the head of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace, to bar the road to new aggression of German militarism, and to 'banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations.'

R.P.D.

Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties

NEDDY: THE CONFIDENCE TRICK

J. K. Dutton*

REFERENCES to the 4 per cent 'growth target' put forward by the National Economic Development Council are frequent, and frequently misleading: misleading because it fosters the false assumption that the present Government is converted to economic planning. It can be said that the idea of planning is no longer condemned by the conservative press, but this is a bowing to political necessity, rather than a change of heart. We live still in a competitive and essentially unplanned economy dominated by financial and commercial interests with virtually complete autonomy in deciding the policies which seem to them at any one time to be potentially profitable: although government intervention can take powerful forms and has done so, the 'stop-go' characteristic imparted to our economy by successive Conservative Chancellors has arisen from Government intervention, but hardly constitutes 'planning' in any scientific sense. An analogy might be found in the conduct of a car-driver suffering from intermittent cramp in his right foot: his actions would be unscientific but would exert a considerable influence on the movement of the car and the safety of its passengers.

The National Economic Development Council asked a cross-section of public and private industry to assess the impact and feasibility for them of a national growth rate of 4 per cent per annum—an interesting exercise in economics. But of what significance is the result of the exercise unless the Government has—or takes—powers of control that give the conclusion reality? In fact, half-way through the 1961-66 quinquennium, the growth target is still just a target.

NEDC's reports are interesting and to an extent informative documents: they must nevertheless be seen as expressions of opinion emanating from a very strange set of bedfellows. The chairman is the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the councillors include trade union leaders, industrialists, Lord Robens and Dr. Beeching, and any opinions that are expressed must presumably be based on the lowest common denominator of agreement between them all. Odd that this should have included the famous dictum that wages, salaries and

*Mr. J. K. Dutton, General Secretary of the Association of Scientific Workers, is here writing in his personal capacity.

profits would need to rise more slowly than in recent years if exports were to rise sufficiently to meet the 4 per cent growth target. Did the President of the Federation of British Industries really mean it? And if so, did he also subscribe to the different view that 'Economic growth on stable foundations would be thwarted by keeping profits at all times in step with other incomes' (July 25th) expressed by the F.B.I.? Some of the trade union representatives were at pains to explain what they really meant in Brighton: the explanations were pretty tortuous. The context of the NEDC report in which the statement on wages, salaries and profits was made, exonerates at least the F.B.I. President, for the rate of increase which is criticised as too fast, is that of the rise in total money income per person employed, if you can work that out. It can be expected that future reports on 'incomes policies' will be more circumspect.

To my mind the most dangerous implication of the Council's reports is that the trade union movement can become tied to economic theories that ought to be challenged, even inside a capitalist society (and it is of little use for us to say simply that socialism is the prerequisite to economic planning, for we have to live with capitalism meanwhile). There is, unfortunately, no indication that the Council questions the basis of our industrial effort, no indication that they see the implications of insufficient research and development. If trade in the manufacturing industries which have grown fastest in world trade is examined, we find the following:

Exports in \$ million, 1961 (Prof. Barna, *The Times*, August 12, 1963).

					U.K.	U.S.	W. Germany
Plastics	134	292	251
Misc. Chemicals	142	431	175
Scientific and Photographic Instruments					99	258	274
Organic Chemicals	113	245	284
Machine Tools	104	251	288

This clearly reflects our failure to enter effectively into the scientific age: this failure is the subject of comment of all kinds and recent reports illustrate the problem and its context—the Fielden Report, the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy on its Annual Report and that of its scientific manpower committee, and in education the Newsom and Robbins Reports. Perhaps NEDC will realise that this is becoming an attractive bandwagon and will attempt now to climb on. The criticism will nevertheless remain that through the smoked glasses of orthodox economic theories they saw the trees rather than the wood. The General Council of the T.U.C. have

said that the resources of the trade union movement have been strained through participation in Neddy, with the implication that participation in the bodies called grotesquely 'little neddies' will be an added strain. The extent to which this comment indicates reliance on economists trained in Treasury thinking is quite frightening. There was a time when socialist thinking, even of a 'reformist' nature, was said to be the common basis for the labour movement, yet nowhere in the Neddy reports is anything said which would cause an eyebrow to be lifted in the boardrooms of industry, the lowest common denominator factor appearing to be the acceptance of capitalist economics without question.

This is our problem: the trade unions are involved in a so-called 'planning instrument'—an overstatement in any case—without apparently any clear concept of their own on how the economy should develop; and on the left of the labour movement thinking on this question is all too currently shelved with the slogans of 'socialism now' and 'no wage-restraint'. These are excellent slogans, but no substitute for an effective trade union policy on the new problems facing the economy: a lot more serious thinking is needed inside our movement if we are not to become the victims rather than the makers of policy.

WAGES CURB ON THE ROCKS

'Vulcan'

WAGE restraint is on the rocks. The New Year is going to see some sharp shocks whichever political party provides Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer. For in practically every industry substantial claims for wages and shorter hours are pending or already in, usually backed by threats of drastic action.

Once there was a wage freeze, introduced by a Labour Chancellor, Sir Stafford Cripps, to help the last Labour Government out of its difficulties: to meet the cost of the cold war, the colonial wars, and its vast arms bill. In 1948 most trade union leaders accepted the principle of a 'temporary wage freeze, not to rock the boat', except in special cases. Their members were having none of it. They all proved to be special cases. The wage freeze policy foundered.

Of recent years wage restraint, 'incomes policy', 'planned growth' or what have you is recommended as a permanent feature and the trade union movement is urged to commit itself to it in advance of

a Labour Government. That this is equally a non-starter has now become clear. Take three outstanding examples.

The engineers, rejecting the employers' offer of a Government-inspired 3 per cent, demanded last month 'a substantial rise' in minimum rates and the 40 hour week, backing it with threat of official bans on overtime and piece-rate working. The shipbuilding workers, with similar claims, stood by, in reserve: 3,000,000 in all.

The hard-pressed railwaymen, whose industry is the reverse of a 'growth industry' under Dr. Beeching, put in a claim for 11 per cent. The railway shopmen stood by, in reserve; over half a million.

After tendering official strike notice, the dockers won the 40 hour week without loss of pay, although there were certain suspect clauses attached to the agreement. The busmen and other transport workers were in support of the dockers, pressing sizeable claims on wages and hours.

Their leaders, Sir William Carron (Amalgamated Engineering Union: 986,500 members), Mr. Sydney Greene (National Union of Railwaymen: 310,572 members) and Mr. Frank Cousins (Transport & General Workers: 1,331,000 members) have been the leading figures of the six-man delegation from the General Council of the Trades Union Congress on the National Economic Development Council which insists on

policies to ensure incomes as a whole rise less rapidly than in the past.

We have the spectacle of the currently best known Director of the Bank of England actually proposing the overtime ban in support of the engineers' claim. For it was Sir William Carron who put that forward to the Executive Council of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions last month. (Well! maybe anything can happen in an election year.)

Perhaps these are special cases? Mr. Greene's men were promised the principle of comparability with other industries by the Guillebaud Report, produced hurriedly four years ago to stave off a national railway strike; their claim is based on that principle. Mr. Cousins' members include many of the lowest paid, not least the women. But these are not the only 'special cases'. There are the miners (563,000) whose 'substantial' claim will also include compensatory payments for those displaced by automation; the building trade workers, who have won 5 per cent and reduced hours; civil engineering, with a similar claim; electricians, whose renunciation of a three-year agreement and 3 per cent with the Electricity Council in favour of a 'substantial' rise has taken the shine off the much-

pushed long-term agreements. Nor are these all. Others with substantial demands, often linked with reduced hours and other claims, such as non-contributory sick pay schemes, include seamen, hosiery and garment workers, shop assistants and furnishing trades. The last have a thoroughgoing 9-point charter, including holidays, pension and sickness schemes.

Another feature is the wide range of actions, officially endorsed, in support of claims. One factor has been that unions are reacting to the Government's interference with conciliation machinery, of which a gross case was the National Incomes Commission intervening to prevent the agreement between Scottish builders and employers for a 40 hour week being implemented. Defending the recent settlement of the English builders' claim from rank and file criticism, the October Journal of the Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers said:

We were fully aware, if only judging by our own experience in 1962 and that of other industries this year, that arbitration would not have awarded more than the Government-inspired 3½ per cent. . . . As events turned out our refusal to go to arbitration in conjunction with the one week's strike on selected sites had the effect of influencing the employers to agree to the resumption of negotiations . . . (the settlement was) a massive blow against Government policy—a crushing blow to the National Incomes Commission!

This, from a body which is far from having a left-wing leadership, is a straw in the wind.

The other side were quick to note and lament the new climate. *The Times* saw as an immediate danger 'the wage claims and negotiations now taking place against a background of rising activity.' When the Ford car-workers won an increase of 5 per cent, followed by a similar advance, during the Luton by-election, of that town's workers at Vauxhall Motors, *The Times* declared (November 2) that this, together with

the bus dispute, and the lesser known (though highly significant and important) claims of the Scottish builders are all part of a threat to the Government's incomes policy.

The Ford settlement was a threat 'in its most virulent form' and 'a major breakaway from the Government's "guiding light" of 3½ per cent', and 'bound to set off a similar round of claims in allied trades'. Whilst it admitted the need 'to recognise the special claims of the growth industries', it sternly condemned 'unjustified claims by the less efficient or less well-placed'.

That is the voice of the employer, an outlook not shared by the

millions who have been feckless enough to get themselves into 'non-growth industries', over whose expansion they can have no control short of taking over 'the commanding heights' of basic industries. What is in the workers' minds increasingly is speed-up, automation and unemployment. Linking together two demands, more money, less hours—amongst varying types of workers simultaneously can also bring into action simultaneously sections whose interests have long been seen not only as different but even at variance. Increasing basic wages is vitally important to those on scandalously low wages, especially where they cannot augment earnings by shift-working or overtime. This includes ever-increasing numbers of part-time workers, predominantly women, forced to go out to work to reinforce the low family wage packet. Demanded at the same time, the shorter working week can be of great significance in three directions. It can lay the basis for strong collective defence in areas where unemployment is chronic or in industries affected by automation. It can stimulate local negotiations for improved earnings where there is strong organisation at workshop level, and allay the fear of the skilled worker, whom post-war conditions have given cause to be abnormally preoccupied with loss of differential. Thirdly, it can meet the plain need for shorter hours to combat the horrifying effects of Yankee-style speed-up.

Linked, the two demands can bring home forcibly to all a basic lesson which should never be overlooked: the employer has more than one method of extracting surplus value from the worker; to make him work as long as possible, as fast as possible, and for as little as possible—and all three, if possible. The combined struggle for increased wages and shorter hours puts workers in a position to turn these possibilities into impossibilities.

Back in the summer we wrote of the engineering and shipbuilding industries: 'Leadership, democracy, a policy of struggle—or something will have to give'. Something has given. The wage restraint policy is on the rocks. It will take more than smooth words from a Labour Shadow Chancellor about a policy of 'planned growth of wages' to salvage it. The workers in many industries now are going in for some incomes policy-making of their own. It is: more money, less hours—now. A powerful beginning, if only a beginning.

But there is yet another lesson which increasingly needs to be grasped by all workers game enough to react vehemently on the shop floor. Recognition of it would open a new phase indeed. The insoluble problems created by monopoly capitalism in Britain are

reaching the stage where the struggle for wages, hours and the right to work itself cannot be successfully won solely in the workshop, however strongly organised; nor, indeed, in one industry alone. Each economic struggle has got to be seen and fought as a class struggle. The problems of automation in a class society raise directly the question of working class power. But that is also true of all the problems: unemployment, hours, 'incomes policy', the social services and peace. It means a challenge to break the whole power of the monopolies. It is much, much later than you think.

HOME AND THE CONSERVATIVES

William Gallacher

POOOR old Rab, there he was, twice ready to pass the post, in the Downing Street Handicap when a no-good gang moved the post and left him standing there utterly bewildered. All the other jockeys jammed up around him and while they were looking for the vanished finishing post, a rank outsider who was in the know, went slipping past and was proclaimed winner. Surely, said one unreliable correspondent to the woesome Rab, 'surely there never was anything the like of this in the history of racing?'. 'You are wrong in that', Rab might have answered, 'the same thing happened twice with Herb Morrison. First little Attlee slipped past him, and then "Old School Tie, Gaitskell" left him standing where the post had been. In the latter case there were 157 in the gang that ousted him, and I heard somewhere that he was alleged to have made a statement something like: "I dragged the party to the Right; expelled all who were loyal; and then the Old School Tie brigade foiled my well-laid plans".' So the new Tory motto has become 'We must preserve party unity'. As for Maudling, he was busy making sure that the gang that had 'worked the oracle' did not get themselves committed to anything that could in any way interfere with the holy practice of piling up profits.

But now let us get to the really serious side of this all too dirty piece of shuffling that has ended with a gross insult to the people of this country. Look at what they have presented us with! When he was in parliament no one paid him any particular attention. In fact, if he had not been a wealthy, very wealthy, landowner I am quite certain that he never would have been selected. But there is one thing about him that commends him to his kind—he has a

deep-seated hatred of the Soviet Union arising from the menace its example offers to all their rape-won privileges and pomp.

It was that hatred, shared by his, then, leader Chamberlain that brought upon us the Second World War. That's a pretty strong statement but, it's true! Recently he made an attempt to white wash Chamberlain in which he stated that the mistake he had made was not having recognised that Hitler was mad. What a miserable attempt at a get-out from this most despicable and craven act of Chamberlain's. What is the meaning of Munich? At the time, it was so cunningly stage-managed that many of those involved had no realisation of what had been going on. Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia constitute Czechoslovakia. Bohemia borders on Germany and the Czechs had exceptionally powerful fortification on the bordering mountains. In western Bohemia (Sudetenland) there was a considerable population of Germans. Konrad Heinlein had organised the toughs amongst these into Nazi groups, attacking and brutally beating up all known anti-Nazis. When the Czech Government tried to control these thugs, Hitler in Berlin raved at his wildest about how 'the scoundrels Benes' was persecuting 'our German brothers' in Bohemia. This was the technique that had been applied to Austria; now there arose the 'Sudeten question'.

Early in May 1938 Chamberlain was in that centre of Fascist conspiracy, Cliveden. A group of Canadian and American journalists were invited to meet him. The following day reports appeared in the Canadian and American press that in an interview, Chamberlain had expressed the opinion that the Sudetenland (Western Bohemia) should be ceded to Hitler. Several weeks later the German army marched towards the Czech frontier. The Czech Government mobilised the army and troops, and tanks thundered towards the fortifications. France declared that if Czechoslovakia was attacked she would honour her treaty and side with the Czechs; the Soviet Union made it known that their agreement with France would be honoured. If Britain had joined with France and the Soviet Union such an encirclement would have put finish to Nazi pretensions and there would, in all probability have been no Second World War. But Chamberlain and Home wanted otherwise. Even without Britain the combination was too strong for Hitler and there was nothing for him but to withdraw his troops, a bitter humiliation! Chamberlain's first trip was Berchtesgaden where, no doubt, the next step was discussed, and the next step was to get France to repudiate its alliance with Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union.

All the running to and fro that followed was directed towards that end. Godesburg! Hitler 'patience exhausted' handed Chamberlain a document for the latter to pass on to the Czechs: the German army to occupy Western Bohemia without a shot being fired and all fortification to be left intact to be taken over by the invading army. This unspeakably nefarious document was handed over by Chamberlain 'without *comment*' which meant that the Czech Government had better accept—or else! Then back to Britain, the next stage in the preparations. A real war scare: reserves called up, naval squadrons at battle stations, gas masks issued, preparations for food-rationing; something like panic created. The House of Commons was brought together on September 21. A packed House taut with nerves, heard Chamberlain start a long wail of how he had laboured for peace; he had not stopped trying; and he had sent, in a last effort, a letter to Hitler. In an atmosphere deliberately created, he read the letter to which scant attention was given. No sooner had he read it than there was a stir in the benches behind him; a telegram had been handed in and was being passed along. He held it for a moment in his hands. There was a silence that could be felt. Then he looked at it, turned and gazed with a hypocritical grin to his followers: 'Hitler', he told them, 'has agreed to another meeting. I must leave immediately for Munich'. Pandemonium. A surge of relief brought cheer after cheer with one certifiable Tory shouting 'Thank God for the Prime Minister'.

Off went Chamberlain and Home with 'Godspeed' from Attlee and Sinclair and general cheering. But Churchill sat in his corner seat with his jaws clamped and his brows drawn down, clearly opposed to all that was going on but realising that he would not be listened to if he made a protest. What I met with in such an effort was enough to convince him of that. Here is the letter that was sent to Hitler; a letter that shows that France had been won over:

Dear Herr Hitler, After reading your letter I feel certain that you can get all the essentials without war and without delay. I am ready to come to Berlin myself at once to discuss *arrangements for transfer* with you and representatives of the Czech Government, together with representatives of France and Italy, if you desire. However much you distrust the Prague Government's intentions, *you cannot doubt the power of the British and French Governments to see that the promises are carried out fairly and fully and forthwith.* (My emphasis in both cases.) As you know, I have stated publicly that we are prepared to undertake that they shall be so carried out.

Having deliberately prepared the way, he and Home went off to complete the betrayal of Czechoslovakia and, thereby, opened wide

the road to war. War came, but not as they had contemplated.

Now, Home has the brazen audacity to say that we will be able to talk with the Communists 'if they give up the use of force'. What impudence! Apart from the fact the Americans have bases and Polaris all over the place; apart from Suez, and our soldiers in Aden and other parts of Arabia, he himself claims to own a very considerable part of Scotland, and how does he come to possess it? Thomas Johnston, now a very respectable citizen, in his unregenerate days wrote a book entitled, *Our Noble Families*, dealing with the Scottish nobility. Murder, rape and all sorts of skull-duggery, including the basest forms of treachery.

During the past weeks there have been great celebrations, with quite a show on television in connection with the 800th Anniversary of the Paisley Abbey. On the television, the present incumbent Dr. Rogan gave a long and interesting history, leading up to the modern version of the old structure. But I am not aware that any mention has been made in all the proceedings, of its most famous incumbent, Rev. Patrick Brewster. About 130 years ago he delivered a series of Chartist sermons, from which we may take a word or two applicable to Home's ancestors. After an exposure of how the small body of exploiters robbed the people, he went on:

Yet are they the only patriots—the only lovers of freedom and humanity! This is their unceasing boast. Let us try them also by this test. Wherever the cause of freedom has been nobly contested—wherever the hopes of humanity have pointed to a glorious deliverance, upon which side have we invariably found them arrayed? . . . Their power, their wealth, and their most devoted exertions are still, as they always have been, in every quarter of the world, on the side of the oppressor, and against the oppressed.

It applied then, and it applies today, and this peculiar product of a peculiar exhibition of bourgeois democracy, who is Prime Minister, is an outstanding example of those he condemned, as this further quotation makes clear:

Cast your eyes over the land, count the number of the idlers who are each consuming the bread of a thousand families—consuming what neither their own labour, nor the labour of their fathers ever produced, but what they acquired at first by the hand of power alone.

Yes, by *force* and *fraud*! Will this relic of robber feudalism voluntarily hand back the land his forebears stole? If not, then let him be sure that I will do all in my power, as a Communist, to get the organised working class, at the earliest moment, to take back the land which properly belongs to the people.

DIMITROV ACQUITTED

D. N. Pritt, Q.C.


IT is thirty years this month since the great hero of the Bulgarian—and the world's—working class, Georgi Dimitrov, was acquitted by the Supreme Court of Germany of the charge of burning the Reichstag building, set on fire on February 27, 1933.

All the world knows today, and much of it knew already then, that the fire had in truth been set by the Nazis to create a pretext for blaming the Communists, outlawing their party, invalidating their votes at the General Election of March 5, 1933, and thus establishing the Nazi dictatorship that lasted for twelve awful years.

But the Nazis had their difficulties, as well as the advantages that gangster-politics, plus the tacit approval and support of British and other Tories, brought them. Their principal difficulty lay in the facts that, having staged the fire provocation, they had to go on and hold a trial which should convince the world that the Communists were really to blame; also convince the ruling classes of Western Europe that the Nazis could be relied on to destroy the political power of the working class, and therefore deserved their support. To hold such a trial, they had to find some Communists to 'frame' as accused; they had to have evidence of some sort; and they had to prove that the one man caught on the scene of the fire, a poor half-blind, half-witted Dutchman called van der Lubbe, must have had accomplices to help him, whom of course they called Communists.

Their difficulties worked out in this way. Firstly, for the accused, they picked among others Georgi Dimitrov, thus catching the greatest of all tartars. Secondly, for evidence they found nothing better than a string of liars, perjurers and criminals. Thirdly, every effort they made to prove that van der Lubbe had accomplices, made it more and more clear that the only route any accomplices could possibly have used was the tunnel which ran from the residence of the President of the Reichstag, namely Goering, to the Reichstag itself, with the inevitable inference that the fire had been laid by the only people who could have access to Goering's entrance to that tunnel, the Nazis. But their greatest difficulty was Dimitrov. He had not known the German language very well; he had known nothing of German law or procedure; and he had spent some five months *in fetters* whilst waiting trial. In that time, in spite of every handicap, he improved his German, and mastered the elaborate Criminal Procedure Code; and he came into court equipped with that knowledge, and with his own superb courage and political sense.

A BLOW...



AGAINST NAZISM

(Cartoon of Dimitrov's trial by John Hearfield)

He seized the initiative from the start, and never lost it. He not merely proclaimed the innocence of himself and his compatriots, Popov and Tanev, who were charged with him; he went further, denounced the Nazis as the real criminals, defended the working class and the Communist Party and virtually turned the case into a trial of the Nazis. And then, when the prosecution tried to swing the case round again by calling Goering to prove that the tunnel could not have been used by the Nazis, Dimitrov dealt the mightiest blow of all. He cross-examined that swaggering bully, the idol of the Nazis and the second most important Nazi personality, into a state of gibbering rage, completely destroyed his evidence, and—in the words of the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, one of the most important newspapers in Europe—rendered the whole trial useless at one blow. One, but only one, result of this was that Dimitrov and his compatriots had to be acquitted by the Court.

Thus did Dimitrov inflict upon Nazism, in the early stages of its horrible life, a blow which should have been fatal, and would have been fatal, if the reactionary elements of the West such as Chamberlain and his running-dog Lord Dunglass—alias the Earl of Home alias Sir Alec Douglas Home—had not given them invaluable support. But the acquittal of Dimitrov was not the end of the story; for acquittal did not, in a Nazi state, lead automatically to release. The Nazis plotted either to murder him ‘while attempting to escape’ or to keep him indefinitely in a concentration camp, or to hand him over to the Fascist rulers of Bulgaria, who would no doubt execute him. There followed a long battle behind the scenes between Goering, Himmler and one or two other Nazi gangsters on the one side, who wanted to kill him, and other Nazis, with more regard for public opinion, on the other. The latter won by the skin of their teeth, and Dimitrov was released, to continue his invaluable work for the working class for another fifteen years, during three of which he was guiding as Minister-President, the early growth of the People’s Democracy of his own dearly-loved Bulgaria.

The atmosphere of public opinion which made it impossible for the Nazis to kill Dimitrov had been built up partly by the Counter-trial held in London in September 1933, just before the trial before the German Supreme Court began, and partly by Dimitrov’s conduct, which I have described above, in the Leipzig trial. But the matter was really clinched by a bold and intelligent step of the government of the U.S.S.R. which conferred Soviet citizenship on Dimitrov and his two compatriots and made a stern demand on the Nazis for their release—which followed almost at once.

ALGERIA: A YEAR OF THE BEN BELLA GOVERNMENT

Desmond Buckle

A LITTLE more than a year ago Algeria lay prostrate, bleeding and exhausted. And when Ahmed Ben Bella was invested as the country's premier in September, 1962 the immediate task confronting him and his Ministers in restoring some semblance of order and normal life to a people that had suffered much, was immense.

After seven and a half years of the most brutal war ever fought on African soil, in the course of which the Algerian people sacrificed more than one million of their best sons, Algeria endured for three and a half more months between the signing of the Evian Agreement in March, 1962, and the declaration of independence in July the same year, the most murderous period of O.A.S. terrorist activity. For two of those months the F.L.N. (Front de libération nationale) which had won a great victory for the Algerians was in the throes of a serious political crisis and civil war threatened.

From the day of the declaration of independence a flood of refugees and displaced persons filled the country. The two million Algerians who had been forced out of their localities and 're-grouped' by the French army during the war of liberation left their new villages to return to their more familiar *douars*, while the several hundred thousands who had fled into Tunisia and Morocco recrossed the frontier into the country they could now call their own. The widows, orphans and war wounded bore yet more poignant testimony to the cruel suffering of the Algerian people.

Even before independence the Europeans had begun to leave the country and the closing factories filled the towns with unemployed. Of the one and a quarter million French Algerians more than half a million left the country immediately on the declaration of independence. Many were fearful of possible Moslem vengeance for the crimes of the O.A.S. during the last days of French rule. Many also left as a result of intimidation by the O.A.S. whose policy of sabotage included the driving away of as many Europeans as possible to cripple the Algerian economy. There has been a steady outflow since that time and it is estimated that by the end of 1963 there will be fewer than 70,000 Europeans left in Algeria.

From the ranks of the 'pieds noirs' (as the French Algerians are called) came the managerial class running farms and factories, tech-

nicians on the railways, leading personnel in the electricity, gas, postal service and other public utilities. They provided most of Algeria's doctors as well as the shop owning class and the artisans. Their departure from the country paralysed its economy to such an extent that industrial and commercial activity in the summer of this year was only thirty per cent of what it was two years previously when Algeria was still at war. Quite a considerable section of the 'pieds noirs' were ordinary workers and they were just as exploited by the rich colons as were the Moslem Algerians. Most of them and others like them scattered throughout the country did not feel themselves to be in any physical danger, but the O.A.S. insisted otherwise and ordered them to leave. Indeed, there have been remarkably few acts of Moslem reprisals for O.A.S. atrocities.

Not only was the economy in a state of collapse, there were even no funds with which to finance the administration when Ben Bella assumed power. There was a monthly deficit of something like £11 million; the state-owned railways, postal services and other public services were all running at a loss. And while gas and electricity were being maintained, meters had not been read for a year in some cases and no bills had been sent to customers. The salaries of civil servants were several months in arrears and though half of the fifty million dollar oil royalties was supposed to be for the army, they were no better off. The O.A.S. organised an effective non-payment of taxes campaign and systematically destroyed as much of the country's social security records as they could lay hands on. With so many war widows, orphans and unemployed to say nothing of the war incapacitated to be cared for, the Government faced what appeared to be an insuperable task. Questionnaires were compiled and sent out all over the country. Municipal authorities, the police and the press were appealed to for help. Slowly and laboriously the indexes were built up again. Staffs necessary for the social security pay offices had to come from the Algerians themselves, who had to do jobs previously done almost entirely by Europeans. A very large number of staffs thus recruited were young people many of whom were barely adult. The Government had little choice in the matter for of the Algerian population of nearly eleven million, no less than seventy per cent are under the age of twenty five years.

If in reorganising the social security service the Government had to bow to the pressure of circumstances and 'Algerianise' the service, it was under even greater pressure from the people to implement the Tripoli programme which had been adopted by the National Council

of the Algerian Revolution shortly before independence. This programme provided for agrarian reform, proposed industrialisation, control over foreign capital, state ownership of mines, quarries and cement works and envisaged nationalisation of insurance companies and banks. In his speech of investiture Ben Bella outlined a long term programme, the fundamental objective of which was 'a socialist economy which would lift the country out of its under-developed state'. He promised that in the coming year the first quota of available land would be redistributed in accordance with the Tripoli decision. He announced that the Government would shortly begin to run those farms 'declared vacant' as the owners had left for France. But before the Government could act, management committees were already being formed by the peasants. After independence the peasants occupied abandoned land in some cases burned the crops for fear the Moslem rentiers might inherit them and replace the colons as the new privileged class. The decrees adopted by the Ben Bella Government on March 18, 1963, legalised many of the take-over acts already undertaken by the management committees and at the same time gave a further impetus to agrarian reform. These decrees, which dealt with the 'Regulation of Unclaimed Property' and the 'Establishment of a National Office of Agrarian Reform', came as an appropriate and sharp retort to the French imperialists who chose March 18, the anniversary of the signing of the Evian Agreement, to carry out an atomic test in the Algerian Sahara, a crude reminder to the Algerians of the fetters which still bound them to France. Ben Bella was to say later that he would step up the pace of socialist construction every time the French exploded a nuclear device.

Ben Bella has always supported the peasantry in their actions in taking over vacant properties. The Tripoli programme recognised that 'the Algerian peasantry has been the active base of the war of liberation in which it carried the heaviest burden' and Ben Bella commented on his assumption of power that 'this peasantry intends that the revolution should bring to it, at the same time as independence, a perfectly legitimate well-being'. On the morrow of independence the property of 9,000 European farmers who had decided to carry on in Algeria still covered some two and a quarter million acres for 9,000 cultivations. Today there is no longer an acre of cultivable land in Algeria which is the property of a Frenchman. To his French critics—and some Algerian too—who complain that the pace of agrarian reform is too fast Ben Bella points out that the principle of agrarian reform in Algeria was accepted even by the

French imperialists at Evian. It was agreed that 2.7 million hectares (out of a total of seven million) of the best agricultural land which were in the hands of the colons were to be redistributed.

Nevertheless, President Ben Bella insists that the Evian Agreement is out of date and will have to be revised. Last month he said the French Government realised the accords were no longer valid because there were no longer 500,000 French in Algeria but only 100,000. For all Algerians, then, the call to revise the Evian Agreement means a demand to break the bonds which still prevent the realisation of full sovereignty.

'I am not saying that what we are doing pleases everybody, but the common people and the immense majority of Algerians are in agreement with what we are doing', says Ben Bella. Certainly, most of the measures he and his Government have carried out so far have their inspiration from another of his sayings—'We must let the masses choose for themselves'. Hence the immense popularity that he personally enjoys throughout Algeria. Even in the Kabylie Mountains region where the fewest voters were recorded in the presidential election, his erstwhile comrade and friend, Hocine Ait Ahmed, failed miserably in his efforts to raise the banner of revolt with his Front of Socialist Forces.

It is generally agreed that the nationalised farms are being well run by the peasants, but the Government has not met with the same degree of success in the industrial enterprises taken over, either, by the Government itself or by the workers. There have been a number of drawbacks and failures in this sector. There have been problems of honouring debts incurred in colonial times, of disorganisation of the internal market, so that some factories cannot easily dispose of their products. The Tripoli programme declared that, 'it will be necessary to allow a private sector to exist' for a time, and during this limited period the import of foreign private capital is desirable on certain conditions. It is intended that such capital should function only in mixed enterprises and that the transfer of profits must be strictly regulated. Moreover, a certain proportion of the profits must be re-invested in the enterprise. In carrying out faithfully the Tripoli programme the Government plans to develop light industry. A number of factories will soon be established in the Algiers area.

To President Ahmed Ben Bella and his colleagues such as Colonel Houari Boumedienne and M. Mohammedi Säid belong the credit of having been sufficiently vigilant in the difficult days and weeks of the spring of 1962, when other F.L.N. leaders were preparing to halt

the revolution and to liquidate it. They recognised the fact that the tasks of the revolution were by no means completed, and that in consolidating and extending the independence won at such a great sacrifice, it was necessary to preserve not only the image of the F.L.N. but also to maintain its revolutionary momentum.

Ben Bella pointed out that if the F.L.N. had been allowed to dissolve itself when hostilities ceased, in the objective conditions of Algeria there would have emerged a plurality of bourgeois parties with rival policies, with each party liable to become a bridgehead for neo-colonialism.

In the circumstances the ban on the Algerian Communist Party in November, 1962, must be seen as a tactical political measure taken in the interests of the country as a whole and not simply as a blow against Communism. Indeed, when President Ben Bella received the editors-in-chief of *Pravda* and *Izvestia* in September, 1963, he stressed the role of the F.L.N. as the leader and organiser of the construction of socialism in Algeria and added:

The construction of socialism is incompatible with anti-communism. Anti-communism will find no place on Algerian soil.

Algeria's Communists, who in alliance with the F.L.N. inspired the courageous struggle of the Algerian people, are not hounded and persecuted, despite the ban on the separate existence of the Communist Party. Many leading Communists are in fact today active in the F.L.N., state organisations and at all levels of the committees of management, and are widely respected for their contribution towards the country's regeneration. Above all, Algeria's Communists are for the interests of the nation.

Under the leadership of the Ben Bella Government and the F.L.N., the Algerian people are tackling the problems of peace with the same dauntless courage and unity of purpose that characterised their heroic fight for national liberation. Algeria has taken a non-capitalist road to social and economic regeneration and in committees of management, workers and peasants gain experience of democratic procedures. In the past year the Algerians have not only achieved considerable successes in rehabilitating their war-ravaged country; they have richly fulfilled their role as 'Arabo-Islamic Maghrebian and African peoples'.

TEHERAN AND GERMANY

TWENTY years ago, in December 1943, the historic Teheran Conference of the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union, represented by Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin, reached the completion of its work with united agreement. The military conversations at Teheran provided for the opening of the Second Front in the West in May 1944 (in fact, D-day actually took place on June 6, 1944). The political agreements reached, provided for co-operation of the three powers in Europe after the war.

From the Minutes of the Teheran Conference published in the Soviet Union (*International Affairs*, July/August 1961) we print the following extracts of the discussion on the question of the future of Germany as of current interest:

‘STALIN: What other questions are there for discussion?’

ROOSEVELT: The question of Germany.

STALIN: What other questions are there for discussion?’

ROOSEVELT: The partition of Germany.

CHURCHILL: I am for partitioning Germany. But I should like to consider the question of partitioning Prussia. I am for separating Bavaria and the other provinces from Germany.

ROOSEVELT: In order to stimulate our discussion on this question, I want to set forth a plan for partitioning Germany into five states, which I personally drew up two months ago.

CHURCHILL: I should like to stress that the root of evil in Germany is Prussia.

ROOSEVELT: I should like us to have a picture of the whole before we speak of the separate components. In my opinion, Prussia must be weakened as far as possible, and reduced in size. Prussia should constitute the first independent part of Germany. The second part of Germany should include Hanover and the north-western regions of Germany. The third part—Saxony and the Leipzig area. The fourth part—Hessen Province, Darmstadt, Kassel and the areas to the south of the Rhine, and also the old towns of Westphalia. The fifth part—Bavaria, Baden, Wurttemberg. Each of these five parts would be an independent state. In addition, the regions of the Kiel Canal and Hamburg should be separated from Germany. These regions would be administered by the United Nations, or the four Powers. The Ruhr and the Saar must be placed either under the control of the United Nations or under the trusteeship of the whole of Europe. That is my proposal. I must add that it is merely exploratory.

CHURCHILL: You have said a mouthful. I think there are two questions: one—destructive, the other—constructive. I have two ideas: the first is to isolate Prussia from the rest of Germany; the second is to separate Germany's southern provinces—Bavaria, Baden, Wurttemberg, the Palatinate, from the Saar to Saxony inclusive. I would keep Prussia in strict conditions. I think it would be easy to sever the southern provinces from Prussia and include them in a Danubian federation. The people who live in the Danube basin are not the cause of the war. At any rate, I would give the Prussians harsher treatment than the other Germans. The southern Germans will not start a new war.

STALIN: I do not like the plan for new associations of states. If it is decided to partition Germany, no new associations need be set up. Whether it is five or six states, and two regions into which Roosevelt proposes to divide Germany, this plan of Roosevelt's to weaken Germany can be examined. Like us, Churchill will soon have to deal with great masses of Germans. Churchill will then see that it is not only the Prussians who are fighting in the German Army but also Germans from the other provinces of Germany. Only the Austrians, when surrendering, shout 'I'm Austrian', and our soldiers accept them. As for the Germans from Germany's other provinces they fight with equal doggedness. Regardless of how we approach the partitioning of Germany there is no need to set up some new association of Danubian states lacking vitality. Hungary and Austria must exist separately. Austria existed as a separate state until it was seized.

ROOSEVELT: I agree with Marshal Stalin, in particular, that there is no difference between Germans from the various German provinces. Fifty years ago there was a difference but now all German soldiers are alike. It is true that this does not apply to the Prussian officers.

CHURCHILL: I should not like to be understood as not favouring the partition of Germany. But I wanted to say that if Germany is broken up into several parts without these parts being combined, then as Marshal Stalin said, the time will come when the Germans will unite.

STALIN: There are no steps that could exclude the possibility of Germany's unification.

CHURCHILL: Does Marshal Stalin prefer a divided Europe?

STALIN: Europe has nothing to do with it. I don't know that

there is need to set up four, five or six independent German states. This question must be discussed.'

The 'Declaration of the Three Powers at Teheran' read :

WE, the President of the U.S.A., the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the Premier of the Soviet Union, have met these four days past in this capital of our Ally, Iran, and have shaped and confirmed our common policy. We expressed our determination that our nations shall work together in war and in the peace that will follow. As to war, our Military Staffs have joined in our round table discussions and we have concerted our plans for the destruction of the German forces. We have reached complete agreement as to the scope and timing of the operations which will be undertaken from the east, west and south. The common understanding which we have here reached guarantees that victory will be ours.

And as to peace, we are sure that our concord will make it an enduring peace. We recognise fully the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the United Nations to make a peace which will command the good will of the overwhelming masses of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations. With our diplomatic advisers we have surveyed the problems of the future. We shall seek the co-operation and the active participation of all nations, large and small, whose people in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance. We will welcome them as they may choose to come into a world-family of democratic nations. . . . We look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences. We came here with hope and determination. We leave here friends in fact, in spirit and in purpose. (*Signed: Roosevelt, Stalin, Churchill.*)

POSTSCRIPT: No doubt inspired by the Teheran Agreement and later the Crimean Conference, in April 1945, Quintin Hogg, M.P. (lately Lord Hailsham) wrote in *Labour Monthly*: 'There will assuredly be another war if the present partnership between the three Great Powers is permitted to dissolve. To maintain this partnership neither pious aspirations nor ordinary diplomatic usage can suffice. There must be regular and frequent consultations both between the Foreign Secretaries and between Prime Minister, President and Marshal. . . .

There will assuredly be another war if either Germany or Japan is permitted to re-emerge as a great power. This, as the Foreign Secretary said last autumn, is the "key" of our foreign policy. This object cannot be obtained at one blow by a satisfactory peace treaty. It is very largely technical and involves continued co-operation for many years and consultation by the experts of the several Governments. Our special contribution will be to keep in harmony the realism of Russia and the idealism of the U.S.A.'

The Engels-Lafargue Correspondence

"... a remarkably fine production of letters which throw so much light on working-class history" — R. Page Arnot in *Labour Monthly*

Volumes I and II : 6s. each

Volume III : 9s.

Documents of the First International

"... In the pages of this book live again the hopes and aspirations of some of our forerunners in the Labour Movement" — T. & G. W. Record

21s.

Lenin: Collected Works (40 volumes)

This first complete edition in English of Lenin's writings was launched three years ago, and is now almost half-way to completion. The latest parts to appear are Volumes 16 and 17, covering the years 1909–1912 (Volume 15 is still awaited). Also available is Volume 38, containing the *Philosophical Notebooks*

Volumes 3–13 and 38 : 7s. 6d. each

All others : 12s. 6d.

Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844

Karl Marx

The first draft of the philosophy of Marxism, containing Marx's early criticism of classical political economy and of Hegelian metaphysics

3s. 6d.

Lenin Anthologies :

Against Liquidationism

5s.

Against Revisionism

6s. 6d.

LAWRENCE & WISHART

PROUST, JOYCE AND KAFKA

V. Suchkov*

THE modern novel has become the arena of open struggle between heterogeneous trends stemming from dissimilar sources. The great tradition uniting the socialist and critical realists, Gorky, Sholokhov, Rolland, Thomas, Mann, Hemingway, Galsworthy, Wells and Heinrich Mann—the novelists responsible for the epos of our times—is now countered by the tradition stemming from such prominent writers of the twentieth century as Proust, Joyce and Kafka. A number of West European and American writers and critics proclaim this tradition to be the only creative and fruitful one harmonising with the spirit of our century and most fully reflecting its essence. The poetics of Proust, Joyce and Kafka are held up by some as a model to be followed by the artist of socialist realism. They claim that real innovation was feasible only on the path of this tradition, and so we shall do well to explain why this heritage is alien to the aesthetics of socialist realism.

The world of Proust and his heroes has been compressed to the proportions of a drawing-room humming with sophisticated talk, the mundane chatter of the habitués of the Parisian salons at the end of the last century and first decades of the present century. Though a murmur of life did penetrate these heavy draperies sometimes, those poor sounds had little vitality. The life of the French bourgeoisie and aristocracy, their limited interests, the intrigues, the immoral distractions of the highly refined dandies of his times, constituted the material from which Proust wove the complex texture of his voluminous novel. Though he perceived and described some features of the upper strata in an ironic light, he none-the-less regarded their lives as the only ones truly worthy and valuable. He even idealised such a life in his image of Robert de Saint Louis, the French brass, the myrmidon of order, thereby paying tribute to nationalism, as well. Proust was flesh and blood of the society he described, and shared all its prejudices. This sociological aspect of his works, which should never be forgotten or ignored, is simply by-passed by his modern apologists.

As an artist Proust destroyed the basic principles of realistic art, though his novel was crowded with externally common details of

*The recent European Writers' symposium in Leningrad provoked such wide interest amongst the readers of *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, that V. Suchkov, their critic responded to requests from readers for his opinion of Proust, Joyce and Kafka by writing this article, which, through lack of space, we can only print in an abridged version.

daily life. With the philosophers Bergson and William James, Proust, working in his own way in the sphere of art, strove, as he thought, for a withdrawal from the rational cognition of the world, but actually from cognition as a whole, turning the intuitive feelings of man, the uncontrolled stream of his consciousness, and the arbitrary associations stemming from his soul into the only media of perceiving the surrounding world. He regarded inner experience of the individual as a value in itself; the realia of true life lost their reality in his lines; came to be unsteady, vague and indefinite. The characters of his heroes came to be elusive and deceptive, not because they changed in the course of their development, but because they were constantly transformed in the inner perception of the narrator, depending on his frame of mind and physical condition for the instant. Through the recollections and unbroken stream of thoughts of his hero Marcel, a frail, sickly person, Proust meant to convey the dynamism of life, its constantly changing nature. The same was pursued by the poetics of his novel, by his syntax—the stratified and complex Proustian phrase with its abundance of definitions, interjected and explanatory clauses. His attempt to convey the fulness of life through his hero's chain of thoughts was not successful, however. His novel in fact turned into a detailed psychological analysis of the people belonging to the narrow circle of the French bourgeoisie and aristocracy on the eve of the first world war. All the artistic media of his novel were subordinated to this essentially local aim stripping his 'Remembrance of Things Past' and particularly 'Le Temps Retrouvé' of universal human content and binding him firmly to a specific historic epoch. The emasculate, hot-house art of Proust can find no continuation in critical realism, let alone in socialist realism playing an active part in changing the world, for his prose is too short-winded for that.

If Proust did not destroy the world's materiality in the novel, Joyce did so with gusto and perseverance. Speaking of Joyce, however, one must differentiate between the Joyce of 'Dubliners' and 'A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man' and the Joyce of 'Ulysses' and 'Finnegans Wake'. He wasted his great and original talent on laborious works whose formal peculiarities and conceptions of man have turned them into a bible of modern decadence. From his tales of the modest plain people of Dublin, tales so clear and full of sadness, and his conscientiously perceived and detailed pictures of the limited and stifling lives of an Irish bourgeois family in 'The Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man' he slipped into a world of his

own visions in 'Ulysses', into visions retreating from and indeed distorting reality. The domestic quarrel of the bourgeois intelligentsia with its bourgeois mainspring and environment, a quarrel which is not allowed to culminate in a break, however, and is reflected in the novel by the juxtaposition of the high-brow intellectual poet Stephen Dedalus and the low and vulgar Philistine Mr. Bloom, is endowed with the aureole of timelessness and universality by the author who presents it as the central conflict of our epoch. The real and essential contradictions of life never entered his range of vision. He hated Mr. Bloom, so limited, shifty, sick with his own sense of inadequacy, and painstakingly described his unsavoury nature in all its ghastly details. Hypertrophied by the author this character turned into the symbol of a great part of humanity if not the whole of mankind. Meaning to extol the spiritual wealth of Stephen Dedalus, he burdened his hero's soul with dead bookish knowledge, cold aestheticism and nihilism. Joyce did not manage to hide the close fraternal kinship between his pretended protagonists, Bloom and Dedalus. Attempting to combat Bloom, Joyce was eventually beaten by him. He finished with 'Finnegans Wake,' an esoteric work comprehensible only to the initiated, written in an intricate language concocted of all the tongues Joyce knew, and abstruse to the extreme. The formal aspects of Joyce's prose are unrestrained and often indecipherable symbolism, endless inner monologues—direct or indirect—conveying his heroes' chain of thoughts, all confirming Joyce's main and most cherished idea of the baseness of human nature and man's inability to master his destiny.

Joyce has exerted telling and pernicious influence on a series of West European and American writers (particularly through the agency of his exponent Gertrude Stein). His aesthetics are alien to realism and offer a classical example of formalism's invasion of art. I. G. Ehrenburg said that Joyce was 'the writers' writer', comparing his works with essence 'not to be drunk unadulterated, but mixed with water'. From I. G. Ehrenburg's metaphor, it would seem that the essence of Joycism can be used to flavour any literary meal, or that the Joycian traditions are allowable in our art. One cannot agree with this. Nothing could be more alien to socialists: they feel he assumed the role of their ideological and aesthetic opponent.

It is difficult, too, to agree with I. G. Ehrenburg's appraisal of Kafka, as a prophet who foresaw the 'fearful world of fascism'. This fairly common view is based on the hazy allegory of his works, but is borne out neither by the facts of history nor the contents of

his writing. His destiny was a strange one. He died forty years ago, wrote three unfinished novels and some scores of short stories and fables unknown when he was alive, though noticed by the major figures of German literature in those years. In our times, however, the foreign critics regard him as the leading figure of the *modern* literary process. To what does Kafka owe his posthumous fame? Not to the formal peculiarities of his works, for he is a traditionalist writer in style. The reason is to be found in his fear of life, in his perception of its crisis dominating his works and constituting a shade in the social mood of the foreign intellectuals.

Kafka was a man who dreaded life in the world of private ownership and was able to convey his fears to his readers very well. He was sincerely convinced and fervently conveyed his conviction that man was not the crowning glory of creation, but a poor knot of quivering protoplasm, a creature helplessly raising its hands to the heavens begging unknown forces for forgiveness for unknown and uncommitted sins. Crippling fear, helplessness, terror of an unknown menace with which life itself was fraught, dominated Kafka's works describing the horrors preying on his mind in prosaic detail. But the evil Kafka saw around him was a nameless, faceless evil. It loomed before him sometimes as a bureaucratic official machine, sometimes as an abstract law, or assumed shape, like that of the torture device in his story 'In a Punitive Colony'. It is this story, written in 1914 and published in 1919, which is usually cited to prove Kafka's alleged antifascism. Nowhere and never did he define the social nature of evil, however, for he regarded it as an eternal, invincible feature of life itself. Kafka's passivity to social evil, his vision of man as an abulic toy of fate turned him into the sort of writer who was far from the ethics and ideals of socialist realism. It is precisely his indifference to the real sources of social conflicts in the twentieth century and his substitution of a phantasmagoric world for reality that have turned Kafka into the signal bearer of the art rereating from reality'.

Departure from reality robs art of more than authenticity. The description of the vital and historic truths, comprehensible and perceptible on the basis of the communist world outlook is law for our art of socialist realism. Faithfulness to the truth spells faithfulness to reality. If the novel is threatened now, it is not by the exhausted possibilities of the genre, but by the invasion of fiction leading the artist away from reality, away from the truths of history.

BOOKS

Documents of the First International, 1864-1866

Lawrence & Wishart. 484 pp. 21s.

AS SOCIALISM SPREADS over the globe, more and more millions of working people will come to recognise the outstanding place in history occupied by the International Workingmen's Association, the First International, the centenary of whose foundation will be celebrated next year. Its significance is, above all, due to the part played by Karl Marx in inspiring and guiding its activities for the practical realisation of its great watchword 'Proletarians of all countries, unite'. Now at last we have a full record of those activities. This first volume contains mainly the actual Minutes of its General Council up to 1866. They reflect the great organisational, political, international and propagandist work accomplished by the Council, and valuable details of the part played by the English trade unionists and representatives of other countries. Above all, they reveal the indefatigable day-to-day labours of Marx to ensure the working class character of the organisation and to prevent liberal, bourgeois and reformist politicians from using the movement for their own ends. The Inaugural Address and Provisional Rules written by Marx are world famous, but there are many other documents here, some written by Marx, of great historical value. This well-produced and scholarly text has useful explanatory and biographical notes, and a good introduction.

CLEMENS DUTT.

MIMETTE FURS LTD.

Wide range of furs, coats,
stoles and capes.

117, High Street, Croydon, Surrey.
'Phone CROydon 4328

POLITICAL ECONOMY

A Marxist Textbook

John Eaton

The best and simple introduction to Marxist economic theory. New, revised edition

21s.

SPAIN 1936-39

J. Sandoval and M. Azcarate

The Spanish people's fight against Fascism

7s. 6d.

GILD THE BRASS FARTHING

Brian Almond

"uncommonly true in the way it captures the hopes, fears and spirits of those who were in cotton in the difficult days of the 1930's"—Preston

Labour News

18s.

THE TORY YEARS

Alan Brown

The record of 1951-62; ■ General Election approaches, this book is indispensable

12s. 6d.

SOCIALISM IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

John Eaton

Now at new, reduced price of 7s. 6d.

LAWRENCE & WISHART



A WORLD AWAY



THIS spring again there will be a World Fair in New York. I often visited the last held there, in 1939. What a world away! I have vivid recollections of three of the nations' pavilions. Czechoslovakia's was left unfinished when Hitler marched in after Munich, as our present Prime Minister stood by, with his predecessor Neville Chamberlain. There it was, a mute but eloquent protest against fascism and the friends of fascism. Near by was Britain's: elegant, in the best taste, containing nothing but highest quality exhibits of superlative craftsmanship. Yet from it no one could picture anyone living here who did not wear gowns suitable for the Court of St. James, or riding boots, and inhabit distinguished country houses. And there was the Soviet Pavilion, always crowded to the doors. I used to stand outside and watch them troop in. On the porch there was a vast combine harvester; by its side a tiny wooden hand plough of the most primitive kind. I saw a first generation American family, the father an emigrant from Tzarist Russia, stand there in amazed silence. Slowly the old man was drawn to the plough. He stretched out his arms and gripped the worn handles. 'Yes', he said. 'So it was. *That* was how it was'. When I saw his face as he leaned on the plough and slowly looked up at the combine harvester, I had to turn away. What a world away from Tzarist Russia—and what a world away today from the combine harvester in that Old World Fair. Last month we published stills from the documentary *The Russian Miracle*. In that film you can see Gagarin setting out on man's first journey to the stars—and where that journey started from. For there are shots of the hand plough in use and Tzarist peasants in a famine winter feeding the thatch off their roof to their only animal.

With what breath-taking speed the world is changing and moving into socialism. Africa and South-East Asia, where the notion of patient submission to foreign overlords is already as far in the past to the peoples as the hand plough is to us. Latin America and the Middle East, where the oil monopolies have been trying to fix new terms with local royalty owners who threaten nationalisation under pressure of their peoples. A reader said of the contortions of imperialists trying to cope with their insoluble problems: 'Sometimes they remind me of Uncle Remus' story of how Brer Rabbit got bogged down in his fight with the Tar Baby. Wham! there's his right paw stuck. "Turn me loose or I'll knock the living day-

lights out of you!" Biff! there goes his left. His next solution was to start kicking and butting'. For the imperialists there are no solutions without problems. For us who have the future on our side there are no problems without solutions, only—how fast can we find them? The nearer to the maw of the beast the more complex the problems; but socialism has come in our time, and nothing is impossible. Journals like *LM* always have played a vitally important part in changing people's thinking. We suggest to those who sometimes feel Socialism is a long time coming here, what have you overlooked? Turn to the contents page and the Index for the year. Look at these articles and consider how to plan to put this magazine into new hands.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

Below you will find a brief report from **Helen Falber** who has undertaken special responsibility for the Fund.

There is no more heart-warming job than dealing with the fund letters of our readers. These are the very life-blood of *Labour Monthly*. Take this example from a long-standing supporter: 'Glad to say I've a new reader for *LM*. Our local lit. sec. takes my old copies to "plant" where the seed is likely to grow. He wants to start a collection for *LM* each month', or this letter from a new subscriber: 'I am holding a Workers' Educational Association class on "Current Affairs" and a friend recommended *LM* as a journal that would help in preparing the lectures'.

To all of you who make our work possible, our warmest thanks.

FUND FIGURES

£62 12s. 9d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: 'Daisy Bell', £10; 'H.H.', £10; S. Morrissy, £1; B. W. Mackay, 4s; Marie Philibert, 10s; 'The Butcher family', 10s; E. Strachan Rogers, £3 3s; R.F.B., £3; S. Turner (in memory of Daisy Mendez, Cuba), 5s; D. H. Strathern and friends, 10s; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; 'S. Mill', £1; 'L'Humanité', 5s; L. Bates, 5s; H. Brindle, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 2s; Oldham Branch, 1s; A. Corbett, £1; 'In Memory of Joe Brien', 3s; M. Brandt, 2s 6d; 'Pax', 2s 6d; 'Oliver Twist and friends', 15s; D. J. Perry, 2s 6d; F.G.A. (Canada), £1; 'Humphrey's family', 5s; R. Dodd, £1; R. McLeod, 5s; M. Illing, 10s; J. A. Smith, 5s; Nellie Usher, 5s; Southend C.P., 15s 6d; E.J.B., 10s; Socialist Sailor, £1; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: E. Maguire, 9s; P. W. Norman, £1 1s; G. Cameron, £2; A. Robins, 19s; D. Kelly, 9s; H. Ulyatt, £1 1s; Miss B. King, 9s; W. and N. Cockren, £1; D. R. Morrison, 10s 6d; J. E. Atkinson, 3s 9d; A.C. (Canada), 8s 10d; 'Anon' (Essex), £3 19s; G. Shuttleworth, 17s; 'Anon' (Leith), £1; W. J. Fairman, 4s; E. J. Wright, 4s; Mr. and Mrs. Truelove, 4s; G. S. Robertson, 4s; P. T. Register, 10s; C. Rainbow, 4s; A.G. (Canada), 8s 9d; J. Ruffell, 9s; E. M. Beryn, 4s 3d; D. Grove, 19s; D.R.McL. (Canada), 2s 2d; D. L. Evans, 3s; 'Woodcraft', 2s 6d; G. Meredith, 9s; C. G. Roberts, 14s 6d; K. Harling, 10s; Finchley Y.C.L., 2s 6d; J. Walkinshaw, 13s; 'Odd Donor', 2s 6d; H. B. Preesall, 5s; E.K.F. (U.S.A.), 18s 6d; J. Slater, £1.

Our thanks to you all.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

Co-op. No. L.99482.

FINchley 5135.

Index to Volume XLV

I—AUTHORS

	Page
AFRO-ASIAN People's Solidarity Conference	185
ALLEN, Les	
ARNOT, R. Page	
ASH, William	
BANNISTER, P.	
BEAMISH, Dick	
BLAKE, Fred	
BOWMAN, Dave	
BROWN, Alan	
BUCKLE, Desmond	
BURNS, Emile	
CAMPBELL, J. R.	
CARRITT, Bill	
CASTRO, Fidel	
COLLINS, Diana	
COX, Idris	
DASH, J.	
DOBB, Maurice	
DOUGHTY, G. H.	
DU BOIS, Dr. W. E. B.	
DUNCAN, Drew	
DUTT, Clemens	
DUTT, R. Palme	
DUTTON, J. K.	
EATON, John	
ENISAH, C.	
EVANS, The Rev. Canon S.	
FEILER, Eliezer	
FLYNN, Elizabeth Gurley	
FRENCH RAILWAYMEN	
GALLACHER, William	
GARDNER, Jim	
GREAVES, C. Desmond	
GREEN, Horace	
HART, Finlay	
HARVEY, James	
HILL, E. J.	
HOBBSBAWM, E. J.	
HOOD, Katherine	
HOSTETTLER, John	
HUTT, Allen	
ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS	
IRAQI STUDENT'S SOCIETY	
The Moshi Resolution	185
Battle for Jobs Advances	72
Frederick Engels—The Vol. III (R)	478
Politics and Society in India (R)	192
Battle for Jobs: Unemployed in Birmingham	214
Battle for Jobs: The Forward March	213
Victims of Fords	261
The Beeching Plan	161
Planning for What?	180
Karl Marx (R)	430
Algeria: A Year of the Ben Bella Government	556
The Prevention of War (R)	94
The Siamese Twins—Neddy and Nicky	403
The Nature of Politics (R)	95
How Cuba Was Saved	328
A Message for Aldermaston	168
Africa in World Politics (R)	240
Why the Rochdale Plan?	512
Economic Competition between Capitalism and Socialism (R)	523
Aircraft and British Economy	111
Last Message to the World	455
Trades Councils and Jobs	274
Man and Evolution (R)	96
The Appeasers (R)	379
Vneshnaya Politika Anglii (R)	379
Documents of the First International (R)	569
Notes of the Month	3
1963—Britain and the World	51
Britain's Hour of Truth	99
Marxism After Eighty Years	147
Arms and the Man	195
May Day's Call to Action	243
Election Prospects	337
Morality and Politics	385
Problems of Trade Unionism	433
What Kind of Labour Government? Science and Socialism	481
Twenty Years After	529
Hail African Unity! (R)	300
Neddy: The Confidence Trick	543
Factors in Economic Development (R)	46
Theories of Economic Growth and Development (R)	46
Income Distribution and Social Change (R)	139
Takeover (R)	139
The Fight for New Trade Policies	215
Economic Planning in France (R)	474
Arab Problems	229
The Vatican Council	41
Israeli Socialism?	84
This Monstrous Law	307
The Strikes in France	233
Journey into the Past (R)	44
The Third Labour Government (R)	375
Home and the Conservatives	549
Trade Union Growth	135
To Katanga and Back (R)	141
A Programme for Ireland	518
Battle for Jobs: In The North East	127
The Boilermakers Conference	323
The British Political Elite (R)	474
The Trade Unions and the Labour Government	449
Problems of Contemporary History (R)	238
South American Journey	329
Liberal Party Policy	33
Housing and Homeless	225
Britain and Ireland	281
A History of British Trade Unionism (R)	526
Extracts from Report on Anti-Slavery Demonstration 1863	117
Stand by Iraq	184

	Page
WARREN, Stan	169
WEAVER, Harry	400
WHITE, Olwyn	472
WILLIAMS, W. Morgan	123
WILLIAMS, Ted	19
WINTER, Tony	73
WINTERTON, E. M.	107
WODDIS, Jack	95
	364
WOOD, John	264
WOOD, Willie	467
ZAIMMAN, Lazar	93
	93

II—SUBJECTS

AFRICA	95
	133
	185
	240
	300
	458
	461
ALGERIA	556
AUTOMATION	349
BRITISH GUIANA	364
	410
CHINA	79
	456
	460
CUBA	328
DIMITROV	553
ECONOMIC SITUATION AND COMMON MARKET	3
	16
	51
	72
	180
	215
	165
	425
EDUCATION	233
FRANCE	38
GREECE	312
	493
HOUSING AND RENTS	222
	225
	276
	420
ISRAEL	84
IRAQ	184
IRELAND	281
	518
LABOUR MOVEMENT	89
	107
	195
	243
	255
	289
	337
	375
	433
	451
	549
	481
LIBERAL PARTY	33
LITERATURE	565
MALAYSIA	266
MARXISM	99
MIDDLE EAST	229
OBITUARIES	455
RAILWAYS	161
	210
	429
	467
	41
ROMAN CATHOLICISM	125
SCOTLAND	274
	333
	469
SOUTH AMERICA	329

	Page
SWEDEN	
TRADE UNIONISM in the SIXTIES, Problems of (See also: Railways, Automation, Unemployment and Economic Situation)	
Swedish Labour: The Facts	319
Shipbuilding and British Economy	19
Foundries and British Economy	67
Aircraft and British Economy	111
What Are We Here For, Mr. Woodcock?	174
Defend the Railways	210
Nicky and the Builders	258
Victims of Fords	261
Modern Conditions and the Unions	271
The Case for the 40-hour Week	314
The Boilermaker's Conference	323
The 'Confed' and the Right to Work	360
Delegates at Conference	369
Trade Union Fraternal Relations	372
Problems of Trade Unionism (Notes)	385
A Case for Closer Working	400
The Siamese Twins—Neddy and Nicky	403
The Trade Unions and the Labour Government	449
A Charter for Women	494
Accidents, or Crimes?	509
Why the Rochdale Plan?	512
A History of British Trade Unionism (R)	526
Neddy: The Confidence Trick	543
Wages Curb on the Rocks	545
UNEMPLOYMENT	
Battle for Jobs	16
Battle for Jobs Advances	72
The Lobbies	123
On Clydeside	125
In the North East	127
'Prosperous' Areas	170
From Yorkshire	172
The Forward March	213
Unemployed in Birmingham	214
Trades Councils and Jobs	274
UNITED NATIONS	
U.S.A.	
United Nations Voting on Colonial Independence	133
Figaro and Columbia	75
Jews in the U.S.A. (R)	93
Negro Emancipation	117
Black and Yellow	128
From the Halls of Montezuma	187
American Foreign Policy and The Cold War (R)	286
This Monstrous Law	307
Washington—Capital of 'Free World'	471
A Page of History	358
The Bolshoi Ballet (R)	382
The Russian Miracle	504
From the Halls of Montezuma	187
Vietnam: U.S. Guilt and Dilemma	515
Arms and the Man (Notes)	147
A Message for Aldermaston	168
From Yalta to Disarmament (R)	289
Test Ban Negotiations	354
The Moscow Treaty	415
Memo. for Scarborough	470
A New Climate?	498
Twenty Years After (Notes)	529
Teheran and Germany	561
West German Scandal Trial	27
Lord Avon's Warning	89
Menace of the Miracle (R)	287
New West German Outrage	325
Charter for Youth	472
Youth's Campaign for Jobs	506
U.S.S.R.	
VIETNAM	
WAR AND PEACE	
WEST GERMANY	
YOUTH	

BOOKS REVIEWED

Author or Editor	Title (and Reviewer)	Page
Abosch, Heinz	Menace of the Miracle (Gordon Schaffer)	287
Adelman, Irma	Theories of Economic Growth and Development (John Eaton)	46
Aptheker, Herbert	The Fraud of 'Soviet Anti-Semitism' (L. Zaidman)	93
Aptheker, Herbert	American Foreign Policy and the Cold War (Andrew Rothstein)	286
Bagwell, Dr. Philip S.	The Railwaymen (C. R. Sweetingham)	429
Brownlie, Ian	International Law and the Use of Force by States (D. N. Pritt)	524
Cairncross, A. K.	Factors in Economic Development (John Eaton)	46

	Page
Cole, Hubert	334
Dobb, Maurice	381
Dutt, R. Palme	238
Engels, Frederick	478
Flek, J., Kruzik, L. and Levcik, B.	523
General Council of Int. Work- ing Men's Associations	569
Gilbert, M. and Gott, R.	379
Guttsman, W. L.	474
Hackett, J. and A. M.	474
Hatch, John	95
Hobsbawm, E. J.	191
Kettle, Arnold	430
Labour Party	333
Lewis, John	96
Maisky, Ivan	44
Manvell, R. and Fraenkel H.	143
McKay, Vernon	240
Mennell, William	139
Miller, J. D. B.	95
Murray, P.	286
Nkrumah, Dr. Kwame	300
Novick, Paul	93
O'Brien, Conor Cruise	141
Peck, M. J. and Scherer, F. M.	47
Pelling, Henry	526
Phillips, C. H.	192
Pritt, Q.C., D. N.	375
Schaff, Adam	476
Simon, Brian	382
Sloninsky, Yuri	94
Strachey, John	139
Titmuss, Professor R. M.	379
Trukhanovsky, V. G.	93
Young, George K.	93
Laval: A Biography (D. N. Pritt)	334
Economic Growth and Underdeveloped Countries (Hugo Rathbone)	381
Problems of Contemporary History (E. J. Hobsbawm)	238
The Correspondence with Paul and Laura Lafargue, Vol. III. (1891-1895) (R. Page Arnot)	478
Economic Competition between Capitalism and Socialism (Maurice Dobb)	523
Documents of the First International (Clemens Dutt)	569
The Appeasers (Clemens Dutt)	379
The British Political Elite (James Harvey)	474
Economic Planning in France (John Eaton)	474
Africa Today and Tomorrow (Jack Woddis)	95
The Age of Revolution—Europe 1789-1848 (Lionel Munby)	191
Karl Marx (Alan Brown)	430
Signposts for Scotland (G. McLennon)	333
Man and Evolution (Clemens Dutt)	96
Journey into the Past (William Gallacher)	44
Goering (D. N. Pritt, Q.C.)	143
Africa in World Politics (Idris Cox)	240
Takeover (John Eaton)	139
The Nature of Politics (Bill Garritt)	95
From Yalta to Disarmament (Andrew Rothstein)	286
Africa Must Unite (R. Palme Dutt)	300
Jews in the U.S.A. (L. Zaidman)	93
To Katanga and Back (C. Desmond Greaves)	141
The Weapons Acquisition Process: (Judith Todd)	47
A History of British Trade Unionism (Allen Hutt)	526
Politics and Society in India (William Ash)	192
The Labour Government (William Gallacher)	375
A Philosophy of Man (John Lewis)	476
The Challenge of Marxism (D. N. Pritt)	476
The Bolshoi Ballet (Joan Lawson)	382
The Prevention of War (Emile Burns)	94
Income Distribution and Social Change (John Eaton)	139
Vneshnaya Politika Anglii, 1918-1939. (Clemens Dutt)	379
Masters of Indecision (D. N. Pritt)	93

Labour Monthly

**Bound
Volume
for
1963**

A history of the year's events !

A permanent record

A 'must' for every labour
movement Library.

ORDERS BEING TAKEN NOW!

Through your usual newsagents, price £1 10s 0d, or send 10s 6d
plus 1s 6d postage and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

**THE MANAGER,
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.**

WHY NOT BY POST?

— and it's cheaper too!

NAME

(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS

— Or why not make it a
Christmas present to a friend?

NAME

ADDRESS

I enclose 21s. (Overseas, 24s.,
Canada and USA, \$3.50), for
year's subscription from the
..... issue.

(SIGNED)

To LABOUR MONTHLY

**134, BALLARDS LANE,
LONDON, N.3.**

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating
by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

For all interested in the fight for Peace and
Progress in the Countryside and the problems
of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.

Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or

Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD
27, Bedford St. Strand, London, W.C.2.

LABOUR RESEARCH

New L.R.D. Guide

'Contract of Employment Act'

O. H. Parsons

1s. or 1s. 2½d. by post

Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

CLASSIFIED

ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d.
Cash with order to: 'Class Ads',
Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane,
London, N.3.)

COMRADES! Sell your BOOKS to a
modern realistic firm paying modern
realistic prices. Marxism, Labour &
T.U. Movements, Soc./Econ., Hist.,
Russia, Lit. Crit., etc. Stanley Noble,
24, Gladwell Rd., London, N.8.
MOU 2831. We call.

WE BUY BOOKS, pamphlets, Socialism,
U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We
collect: RIV 6807. The Hammer-
smith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6.

DUPLICATING, tape-typing. Mabel
Eyles, 10, Beaconsfield Rd., N.11.
ENT 3324.

*five important new paperbacks containing
selections from statements by N S Khrushchov*

**IMPERIALISM—ENEMY OF THE
PEOPLE, ENEMY OF PEACE**

125 pp

**THE NATIONAL LIBERATION
MOVEMENT**

96 pp

**THE REVOLUTIONARY
WORKING-CLASS AND COMMUNIST
MOVEMENT**

128 pp

TO AVERT WAR, OUR PRIME TASK

192 pp

SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

176 pp

*6d each · 2s 6d the set · postage 4d each or
1s 3d the set*

LENIN ON PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

256 pp 1s postage 8d

*from your usual suppliers
or from*

CENTRAL BOOKS
27 Great Innd Road London WC1

