

Socialist Review

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW,
BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

DECEMBER 1961

4 d.

TORY 'PLANNING'

MICHAEL KIDRON

IT is futile to suggest—as is often done in the labour movement—that the Tories are incapable of some form of national planning, or that capitalism must necessarily buck or block it. The massive concentration of capital inherent in the system, which allows 100 top firms to receive one-third of all profits in industry; the growth in economic importance of the state which now takes one-third of gross national product in taxes; the complete interdependence of the state and private economies, particularly, but not only, in the war industries; the shortage of labour resulting from the arms-sustained boom, have already imposed a rudimentary form of planning.

This finds expression as much in concrete projects, such as the Iron and Steel Federation's *Plan for Steel* or the Transport Commission's ten-year modernization plan for British Railways, as in the shift of economic studies from micro-economics (price, the firm, marginalism, consumer studies) to macro-economics (national income analysis and the battery of concepts known, loosely, as Keynesianism).

As capitalist Britain edges towards cartel-Europe the pressures for planning the necessary adjustments—killing off some industries, fattening others, shifting the direction of trade, linking Britain and European capital, coordinating legal systems, and so on are becoming greater. Selwyn Lloyd's National Economic Development Council is only one straw in the wind. There will be more, and it is for the labour movement to clarify its attitude towards them. One thing must be clear from the start. Whatever the form capitalist planning takes it can

never be more than a very primitive, partial and highly irrational affair. There are a number of reasons for this.

Capitalism can exist only if there is a strictly-defined function for the ruling class to exercise, namely the control over investment. This is not to say that the class as a whole takes common decisions on the matter. On the contrary, except in time of war or other major crises investment is presided over in an uncoordinated way by different sections of the class dispersed throughout the economy. The only way they have of telling what investment policy they should adopt—whether more or less, in this form of

production or that—is **R**illy by reference to actual and al competition amongst themselves. Competi- tion—the 'anarchy of the market in Marx's phrase—and the versal of investment decisions th (2) implies are vital to the system, so vital as to make full capitalist planning a contradiction in terms.

But not all planning is ruled out of court. The more severe the competition the greater the need for concentrating capital into larger (and fewer) units in order to compete, the easier it becomes to coordinate between the units as against an alliance of competitors elsewhere and the more does this coordination appear necessary to the hitherto warring segments within each national or even supra-national sphere. The process is fraught with complexities. No one will deny the ferocity of military and economic competition between East and West. Yet a glance at the strenuous bargaining between British and Franco-German capital about the conditions of the former's entry into cartel-Europe is enough to realize how difficult it is to attain even minimum collaboration between different centres of capital and that under maximum pressure. And what goes on a European scale goes within each national unit.

There is another, ultimately more important limitation on capitalist planning. For capital, labour is a factor of production; no more, no less. It has to be planned for like any other. But workers are more than hands, as capital finds out to its annoyance in

● contd on page 3

HOW TO UNITE LABOUR

JOHN FAIRHEAD

AT Blackpool, Mr Gaitskell tried to rig the unity of the Labour Party. Predictably, he failed. Real unity must proceed from political agreement on principles, programme and method. There was never any way around this basic truth, and there never will be: that is a lesson which many have learned to their cost, and at the price of a certain amount of damage to the Movement, as well as to themselves.

As the fake "unity" of Blackpool crumbles around their ears; as they witness the renewal of conflict in the parliamentary party, and the attempts of commentators in the enemy press to assess the strength of the rival caucuses; as they try to digest the unpalatable record of fresh electoral failure, the men and women who do the real daily work of the Party are nearing

despair. Is Labour doomed to split and destruction, or can the movement still be saved?

The harvest of Right-wing leadership is being reaped. Asked to choose between New Look politicians and candidates who openly declare for capitalism, most voters continue to prefer the genuine article. Appalled by the race to destruction, some nuclear disarmers are mistakenly advocating the running of CND candidates. And when, at last, an issue—the Tory Immigration Act—arises which should unite all socialists as a matter of course, the Right-wing leaders find that years of miseducation have taken a terrible toll, and that persons are to be found, prominent in the parliamentary party, who are not even

● contd on page 8

SHOULD WORKERS USE THE COURTS ?

ASKS A SOCIALIST LAWYER

TWO recent cases in the courts have revived discussions of the function of the law in our society and of what should be the attitude of consistent socialists either to making use of the machinery of the Courts in their struggles, or when proceedings are brought against them by others.

One of these cases was *Rookes v. Barnard* in which the Court of Appeal upheld an award of damages against trade unionists who had sought by threats of strike action to induce their employers to dismiss a non-unionist. Previously it had been thought that workers were protected under the Trade Disputes Act 1906 against actions in the Courts arising from "acts done . . . in the furtherance or contemplation of a trade dispute" (which this was admitted to be) but by finding that the acts if done individually would be actionable as intimidation and that the threats to strike were unlawful

means to reach the defendants' ends, the Court has made it clear that it will interpret the Act more narrowly in future.

For revolutionary socialists there is no demand more basic than that the workers in a given concern should have the right of hiring and firing, which directly challenges one of the most sacred prerogatives of management. Clearly the law has been brought up to date to make more difficult such challenges, which happily have become more and more frequent lately. Readers will not be surprised that it is a well-settled principle on the other hand that the Courts will not entertain an action by a trade union against a member who ignores a decision, however "official," to come out on strike. It was a decision of the Courts in 1902. The *Taff Vale Railway* case which was conclusive in persuading many trade unions that independent political action was

necessary to defend their interests. It is hardly likely that the *Rookes* case will bring about a new turn towards militant politics, because then it was the union treasuries that were threatened, whereas now it is the "unconstitutional" activities of the shop stewards that are sought to be curbed.

The other case is of course the "ETU case," or *Byrne v. Foulkes* as it is known to the lawyers. This is now going to appeal and therefore *sub judice* so we will recall only that Mr. Justice Winn held that five officers of the ETU had fraudulently conspired to prevent the election of Byrne as General Secretary, and declared him properly elected to that office. Here the Court was not purporting to discover any generally applicable principles, but merely applying the known law to a particular set of facts. Whether or not any readers of *Socialist Review* believe that the defendants are in fact innocent, we all know that ballot-rigging can and does happen frequently in union elections—where there are elections at all—and that other undemocratic practices are daily occurrences. The question arises whether more harm than good, from the point of view of advancing socialist consciousness, is done by resorting to the Courts in such a case.

Probably none of us would dispute that a worker is completely justified in taking his employer to Court in the case of an injury at work and similarly we would most likely approve of a trade union doing the same where this seemed likely to assist in clipping the wings of an employer—even if we felt able to suggest better additional or alternative means of struggle. But perhaps the answer is different when we are faced with a conflict with an organization or person apparently part of the working class movement.

Surely there is no situation of this kind which cannot be better dealt with by a conscious and militant membership than by the Courts. Without such a membership an imposed replacement of bad men by good men can achieve little of lasting value. On the contrary, to go to the Courts for a remedy for the oppressive activities of right-wing or stalinist bureaucrats must, whatever our private reservations, encourage illusions as to the state machine being an impartial arbitrator, ensuring "fair play."

Should we not take the same view

● contd on next page

Power Workers Pay Award

JOHN PHILLIPS

MANY people have regarded the pay award given to the electricity workers as a great victory; already the infamous wage pause has been broken—the break-through we have been waiting for for months. However, even though we may have some cause for jubilation, we need to temper it with some sober thinking about the "peculiarities" that the papers have been talking about.

First of all it was very interesting to see the government register alarm after the award had been made. Assuming that the government is not so stupid as to not know what was happening, it can be deduced that the mock alarm was merely to preserve its wage-policy virginity in the eyes of the world at large—thus leaving it "morally free" to wave the big stick the next time it meets an opponent it thinks it can defeat.

This raises point number two. This delaying tactic by the government is only operable on workers who are poorly organized or who are not in unions that can exert pressure in the way that the electricians threatened to do. Obviously the workers that can threaten a strike that is in any way dangerous to the government or to industry as a whole have a good

chance of getting the advantage. If only the electricians had collided with the government before the teachers and civil servants' claims were rejected, it might well have beaten the pay pause in a much more decisive way. As it is it will obviously have some effect on the claims of the railwaymen, miners etc.

Despite all this, the most depressing aspect of it is the sell-out (no apologies) by the union negotiators. So often it has happened, but it still goes on. At a time when the rank-and-file were in a militant mood, when there was every reason for the government to avoid a strike at all costs, the unions gave in. Apart from giving in over the date of the increase, the worst thing was the widening of the differentials agreed to. For example:—a worker (on London Transport) will get an increase of 7/- per week on January 28th—plus 8/- per week if he has two years' service. Thus a new worker will be getting 8/- a week less than his mates for doing exactly the same work. A sell-out indeed!

It is all too easy for us to shout victory from the sidelines when the workers involved only see defeat. Let us hope that the railwaymen are preparing for their struggle. It cannot be far away.

WELFARE STATE DISMANTLED

ALASDAIR MACINTYRE

ON January 1st the British Transport Commission is due to disappear. One more step will have been taken towards dismantling the welfare state. But what can transport have to do with welfare? Free milk, orange juice, the health service, this is the kind of thing we mean by welfare, isn't it?

In 1947 the Labour government set up the commission by an act which laid down its task as the provision of "an efficient, adequate, economical and properly integrated system of public internal transport." The difficulty was to make it both adequate and economical. This difficulty was increased when the Tories came to power and in 1953 removed profitable road transport from the commission and handed it back to private enterprise. In their bill they redefined the task of the commission. Now the objectives were a regard to "efficiency, economy and safety of operation and to the needs of the public, agriculture, commerce and industry." Notice how the needs of the public now lay behind economy in the list.

But one central ideal still remained over from the Labour conception. The commission was supposed to try, and did try, to provide a cheap service whose people needed it. Unfortunately they were also supposed to try to balance the books, to make the railways pay. And you can't do both these things. Relatively cheap transport, as

● COURTS—from page 2

when defamatory statements are made about us by Tories or "Labour" opponents? The recent spectacle of a Labour MP indignantly—and no doubt truthfully—assuring the Court that she had *not* attacked the British Army is rather pathetic. If this journal were to be criticised as "Communist-dominated" or for "lining up the workers behind imperialism" might it not be best to publish an accurate description of the character and motives of the accuser in such terms as to invite *him* to take the matter to Court, if he cared to risk what would emerge about himself?

A related and very important problem is the reappearance in Britain of political "crimes," arising from the growing struggle of the Committee of 100, with the feudal procedure of "binding over" being used to gaol and intimate the protesters. We will consider this development next month.

a public service, cannot be provided without heavy government subsidy. Such a subsidy can only be provided if the government has the kind of taxation policy which no Tory government would operate.

It could only be avoided if industry were charged rates for freight-carrying which, in the present Tory system, would merely drive industry to abandon rail transport in favour of the roads. The joke is of course that a Tory transport system is unlikely to work anyway—the lack of expenditure on the roads, which is a symptom of the lack of care for the public sector of the economy, spells chaos on the roads within ten years. What we need is a planned, co-ordinated transport system. The new Transport Bill takes us further away from this than ever.

But what about welfare? Where does that come in? It comes in because the railways are to be given a new mandate. Now they are to pay, and this is their first task—where they cannot be made to pay either lines will be closed down or fares will be raised. "You can pay or you can go without railways." This is what the government is now saying to the public.

The ideal of a cheap service has been abandoned. And who will this hit? It will make a fresh inroad upon the wage packets of all workers who use the railways. It will hit the lower paid sections of the working-class extremely hard. For all workers who cannot avoid travel by rail the new fares will function as a compulsory tax. What you are about to get is a concealed wage cut. Who said that transport had nothing to do with welfare?

● TORY PLANNING—*contd*
its day to day activities. In much the same way as planning is constantly upset because relations *between* centres of capital cannot be planned within the system, so relations between capital and labour are fundamentally unstable and resist a rigid mould. Not that capital does not give it a good try. 'Profit sharing', tame union bosses, the encouragement of class collaborationist ideas ('both sides of industry must pull together'; wage pause and dividend freeze can together 'save sterling' and so on) are all invoked to spread the illusion of common interest, common assumptions and therefore the possibility of long-term harmony. But so long as workers are robbed of responsibility for

running industry, capital cannot hope for lasting success. And its planning, as always occurs when planning is divorced from mass participation and initiative remains a bureaucratically conceived, imposed and irrational half-measure.

Nonetheless, the labour movement needs a policy; and none need it more than the small minority of revolutionary socialists. Very broadly, such a policy would require to include two major elements.

First, we cannot reject planning. To do so would be to deny one characteristic—a major one at that—of a contemporary system which enjoys the acquiescence of an overwhelming majority of the working class. As the system becomes more closely administered, it is up to the labour movement's organizations to transfer their reformist activities to that administration and pay less single-minded attention to dying parliamentary institutions. The change from exclusive involvement in such institutions, which in any case are becoming steadily less meaningful in gaining improvements for workers within the system, to involvement in those which count might even save the reformist soul of our mass organizations from withering away utterly. Whatever the case, if the prime function of the trade unions and Labour Party is to get 'more', let them ask for it and fight for it where it is most likely to be found, in the administration, the new Development Council or wherever, and not in the draughty void of Westminster.

We must advocate this shift in emphasis. But we cannot, obviously, be satisfied with this as our only or indeed our prime role. After all, our justification is the revolutionary potential of the working class to effect a change in society, and our activity must be geared to actualizing this potential. As association with capitalist planning corrupts the reformist organizations—and it inevitably will—our work must concentrate more and more on breaking the ideology of class collaboration and embodying the ideas and reality of class struggle in organizations that can never be wholly absorbed within the new, all-embracing, administered capitalism: in shop-stewards committees, rank-and-file movements and such like. These are the badly-policed, imperfectly-'pacified' areas of capital's empire. Increasingly they should become our strongholds as other areas of open opposition and conflict tend to be smothered in the administrative machinery of capitalist planning.

A LESSON FROM HISTORY

Why were Krupps not expropriated?

TONY CLIFF

ONE of the important turning points in post-world war II history, kept rather dark, was the struggle around the question of the ownership of heavy industry in Western Germany immediately after the defeat of Hitler. The story is worth retelling, and some important lessons can be learnt from it.

BIG BUSINESS AND THE NAZIS

The collusion of German big business with the Nazis is quite well known. For many years the big industrialists and bankers financed the Nazi Party. Thus, a couple of months before his rise to power, Hitler received a contribution to his election fund from Gustav Krupps of 3 million marks. As a Chairman of the Reich Association of German Industry, Krupps organised other big businessmen to lend their might to the Nazi Party coffers. Big business was handsomely repaid by the Nazi regime. Thus, for instance Krupps was one of the main beneficiaries from the occupation of Europe by Hitler, seizing plants in France, Belgium, chromium ore deposits in Yugoslavia, nickel mines in Greece, and the iron and steel plants of Russia. The book value of Krupps's firm rose from 170 million marks in 1933 to 513 million marks in 1943. Net profits soared from 57 million in 1935 to 111 million in 1940. In 1939 the firm controlled at least 175 internal and 60 foreign subsidiaries.

The Nuremberg trials showed that the 81 Krupp plants employed between 1940 and 1945 a total of 69,898 foreign civilian workers, and 4,978 concentration camp inmates, as well as 23,076 prisoners of war.

Krupps was aware of the intimate historical connection between his concern and German militarism. "After the assumption of power by Hitler, I had the satisfaction," wrote Gustav Krupp during the war, "of being able to report to the Fuehrer that Krupps stood ready after a short warming up period, to begin the rearmament of the German people without any gaps in experience." (Quoted in *The Times*, December 12, 1947).

German big business as a whole did extremely well out of the Second World War, at least during the first three years of Nazi military successes.

Thus the German economy, by a rough estimate, took more than fifty years before 1939 to increase its means of production by an amount equal to the increase achieved by plunder and pillage in the years 1939 to 1942. (J. Kuczynski, *Short History of Labour Conditions in Germany*, Volume II, London, 1947, p. 47).

POPULAR DEMAND TO NATIONALISE HEAVY INDUSTRY

During Hitler's rule—despite the legend that all Germans were Nazis—a not insignificant minority of the German people continued the unequal fight against fascism. "From 1933 to 1945 about 800,000 German political dissidents passed through the Nazi concentration camps and prisons..." (R. Hill, *Struggle for Germany*, London, 1947, p. 49).

This is an extremely good record, especially when one remembers the dangers facing the anti-fascists, the demoralisation in their camp as the result of the capitulation to fascism of the large workers' parties—the Social Democrats and Communists—the Hitler-Stalin pact, and last, but not least, the Morgenthau-Van Sittart-Ehrenburg crusade under the banner, "The only good German is the dead German".

When the war ended, the mass of German workers were determined to liquidate big business. Under popular pressure a number of laws were promulgated to put this into effect. Thus, for instance, the Parliament of Hesse, in the American Zone of Occupation, in December 1946 included in its constitution (Article 41) the automatic transfer to public ownership on the entry into force of the constitution of all mines, iron and steel works, power stations and transport undertakings, and for State supervision of large banks and insurance companies. (*The Times*, December 11, 1946). However, this was rejected by the Military Government. Several dozen undertakings which were nationalised were later ordered to be restored to private ownership.

Again, on 13 February, 1947, the Municipal Assembly of Berlin adopted a "law for the transfer of trusts and other important industrial undertakings to public ownership." Out of

a total of 130 deputies, as many as 118 voted in favour of this proposal.—The Western Allies again threw out this law.

Much more important than the case of Hesse and Berlin, was that of North Rhine-Westphalia in the British Zone of Occupation. Here was the famous Ruhr, the heart of German heavy industry. The *Landtag* of this State promulgated a law in favour of the nationalisation of all heavy industry at a special meeting on August 6th, 1948. The powerful Christian Democratic Union abstained, and political observers are disposed to regard this abstention as a recognition of the strength of the feeling in the Ruhr behind the demand for socialisation. *The Times*, reporting this, added, however: "To become effective such a decision requires the approval of the British and United States Military Governments, and without a reversal of attitude by Washington—of which there is little sign—approval cannot be given." (*The Times*, August 9, 1948).

BEVIN PROMISES HIS SUPPORT FOR NATIONALISATION

The British Labour Government was committed to support the nationalisation demands of the German people. Thus, Bevin in a speech to the House of Commons on October 22, 1946, stated: "...we have also to consider the ownership of the basic German industries. These industries were previously in the hands of magnates who were closely allied to the German military machine, who financed Hitler, and who in two wars were part and parcel of Germany's aggressive policy. We have no desire to see these gentlemen, or their like, return to a position which they have abused with such tragic results. As an interim measure, we have taken over the possession and the control of the coal and steel industries, and vested them in the Commander-in-Chief. We shall shortly take similar action in the cases of the heavy chemical industry and mechanical engineering industry. Our intention is that those industries shall be owned and controlled in the future by the public. The exact form of this public ownership and control

● contd next page

is now being worked out. They should be owned and worked by the German people..." (*The Times*, October 23, 1946).

A few months later Bevin restated the same theme: In a speech to the House of Commons on May 15, 1947, he said: "We adhere to the principle of the public ownership of the basic German industries. At the moment, the coal and steel industries in the British Zone are vested in the Commander-in-Chief. He is not, however, the owner: he holds them, as it were, in trust. It would be impossible if he wished it, or if any wished it, to return these industries to their former owners. Public ownership is the only remedy..." (*The Times*, May 16, 1947).

If German industry in the British Zone were nationalised, it would have had a considerable impact on the whole of Germany, and with it, Europe. After all, the British Zone contained the main centres of German heavy industry, 67.6 per cent of all the miners in the country being concentrated here in 1939, 39.2 per cent of steel workers, and so on. (*Wirtschaftsprobleme Der Besetzungszonen*, Berlin, 1948, p. 17).

BEVIN BETRAYS HIS PROMISES

The failure of the British Government to carry out its promises was, to begin with, the result of the fact that the Government relied on the army and its bureaucracy to carry out its policy of nationalisation in Germany. However, the capitalist army command was far from enthusiastic about nationalisation. As *The Times* said: "...only a minority of the Commission can be said to cherish Labour views; and with execution (of nationalisation of industry in Germany—TC) long delayed, it is the majority, the soldiers and practical men of affairs, mainly responsible for administration, who have necessarily carried the burden." (October 20, 1947).

Then again, the increasing dependence of capitalist Britain on capitalist America played havoc with all nationalisation plans for Germany.

One result of this was the merger of the British and American Zones (Agreement of December 2, 1946). Some Labour M.P.s suspected the effect of the merge, and in the House of Commons, Hugh Dalton was asked on December 3, 1946: "Does this decision (Anglo-American agreement—TC) affect the socialisation of the Ruhr industries?" "Mr. Dalton said that the Foreign Secretary stated the Government's policy on that on

October 22nd. Having quoted from that statement, Mr. Dalton said:—This policy still stands. It is not in any way prejudiced by the agreement. The United States Government has been so informed." (*The Times*, December 4, 1946). But this was a bluff. He who pays the piper calls the tune.

The American politicians were much more frank. Thus, for instance, Mr. Royall, U.S. Secretary of the Army, in his evidence before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the occupation costs in Germany, stated that, seeing that it carried the main burden of the cost in the British-American zone, "the United States would soon have the controlling voice over the financial, economic and political policies of the joint zone. Under the new agreement, he said, General Clay would have the power of veto over the economic life of Germany." (*The Times*, December 10, 1947).

A statement issued by the Foreign Office on December 17, 1947, stated that the United States would increase its contribution to the bi-zone by \$400 million in 1948. *The Times* editorial entitled "Dollars for Germany", said, "in the aggregate the United States will be bearing three-quarters of the total cost of Germany, and this country a quarter." (*The Times*, December 18, 1947).

"One of the results of the agreement will be to place the bi-zone in effect within the dollar area. This however is a situation which has in any case been developing in fact."

OUT NOW!

INTERNATIONAL
SOCIALISM

No 7

includes:

KRUSHCHEV'S CONGRESS
DECLINE OF WELFARE
REFORM AND REVOLUTION
CUBA

2/9 post paid from

47 Fitzroy Rd., London NW1

American big business was too intimately tied up with German big business to allow any "socialisation experiments". The collusion between German industrialists and their colleagues abroad was clearly exposed in evidence before the Kilgore Committee of the United States Senate. On October 5, 1939, for instance, I. G. Farben wrote to the German Ministry of Economics: "Since the outbreak of war we have carried on negotiations with Standard Oil with the aim, in the interests of both parties, of preventing the passing of laws concerning patent ownership in favour of a third party." I.G. Farben's letter explained that the "two parties" were themselves and Standard Oil, "so at the end of the war—it makes no difference what position the United States takes—friendly co-operation will again result." (*The Times*, September 17, 1945). The Senate's evidence showed that such cases were and are very common. "Agreements between the cartel members of countries now at war", wrote the United States Assistant Attorney General, Wendell Berge in 1944, "provide for a resumption at the war's close." (*W. Berge, Cartels: Challenge to a Free World*, New York, 1944, p. 13).

The result of the merger of the British and American Zones was that the Krupps, the Thyssens and the Stinnes's are as rich as ever and in complete control of the West German economy and State.

SOME LESSONS

Above all, the open sabotage of the German workers' deep desire to put an end to the economic empires of Krupps and his ilk was frustrated by two factors: one, the dominance of occupation troops in Germany, a situation in which the Labour leaders, including leaders of the Communist Party, acquiesced; two, anti-German chauvinism that left the German workers' struggle against the Krupps' isolated internationally.

Anti-German chauvinism strengthened Hitler's rule over the German people, demoralised the anti-fascist forces during the war, and made it possible for Krupps to retain their power behind the protection of the occupation forces.

The fight against anti-German chauvinism in the British Labour Movement as well as elsewhere, together with a fight for the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas, including Germany, is as timely and urgent as ever.

NON-VIOLENCE — DOGMA OR TACTIC?

PETER SEDGWICK

THE Committee of 100 is, for the most part, animated by a political approach which has been fairly accurately termed "anarcho-pacifism." The presence of Russell on the Committee, and the inevitable publicity surrounding his name, has to some extent masked the dominance of the followers of the coupled slogans of Direct Action and Non-Violence. In what follows I shall try to assess the value of this approach as it has been expressed in personal discussion with pacifist-anarchists and in the weekly *Peace News*.

To begin with, a simply immense amount has to be conceded to the anarcho-pacifist cause, both as a set of ideas and as an actual movement. Direct-Action pacifism is part of the same family of beliefs as revolutionary Socialism; *Peace News* shares with *Socialist Review* a commitment to "permanent-revolutionary" politics, that is to say politics which see struggles on particular issues extending in a continuous dynamic to other and wider issues, and from particular places to other places and other countries, up to the point where an international revolution against the whole existing social order becomes the objective. The anarcho-pacifist and the revolutionary Marxist share a deep distaste for any form of "Popular Front" politics, in which incompatible allies muck in and shut up about their differences on the wider issues involved, and for any two-stage view of struggle: *first* get rid of the Bomb, *then* talk about socialism, *first* reduce international tensions, *then* deal with domestic issues, *first* unite with anybody and everybody against Fascism, *then* (when the war is over) start to think about dealing with capitalism. The all-embracingness of their approach helps to explain why so many pacifists are in social work, and why the only effective International in the world just now is the Pacifist International (using that label to cover War Resisters, San Francisco-Moscow marchers, and the host of contacts in different lands that fill the pages of *Peace News* every week).

And quite apart from the merits of the movement, a great deal of the ideology of non-violence deserves consideration and absorption on the part of thinking Socialists. What pacifists are largely saying is, after all, that violence is evil, that violence corrupts. One would have thought that these simple truths, after two World Wars

and the experience of Nazism and Stalinism, would win home among the majority of people, but it seems not. Far too many people, and far too many Socialists, appear to take the view not that violence is evil, but that violence which achieves desirable ends is good. Think of the flogging craze, boxing audiences, Stalin, the colonial policy of the last Labour Government, speeches about standing firm over Berlin, American war magazines, the Cheka, the crime figures: then you may see what the pacifists are getting at. Certainly one can think of very few historical heroes of the revolutionary Left who give any impression of really hating violence as such; Rosa Luxemburg is about the only one.

Certain techniques used in Direct Action demonstrations could well be examined by Socialists in general. I am thinking of the "shame-inducing" tactics of going limp and refraining from provocation, even of a verbal kind. Employed on the second Holy Loch sitdown, these methods did have some effect on the police, who refused to manhandle demonstrators as ordered. (They were of course replaced by other policemen who did obey orders.) The importance of passive methods goes beyond their immediate affects. Most of us tend to write off the police as one reactionary mass when we think of long-term struggle and the transition to Socialism; we need too to combat the gratuitous and vengeful violence that tends to rise within us in the course of bitter struggle, and which is only one more form of emotional thinking.

However, even once so much has been agreed, it remains true that anarcho-pacifism is an absurd and defective political creed. The stock argument against pacifism is unanswerable: that while all violent action is evil, there are circumstances in which abstention from violence will lead to the commission of greater evil. In order to deal with this objection, pacifists are driven both to exaggerating the effects and importance of violence in itself, and to making ridiculously optimistic claims for the efficacy of non-violent methods of resistance. Social evils such as war and Stalinism are completely abstracted from their background of historical fact, and traced to sources in the violence-loving psychology of individuals. Once violent methods are initiated, we are assured, a chain-reaction of ever-

increasing violence and counter-violence is set up. This is a fairly good description of the danger of nuclear war through "escalation"; it has very little further application. There are a great many examples of violent struggle with a non-violent aftermath, relations between Britain and Ireland being an obvious instance.

In attempting to prove the worth of passive methods, pacifists are fond of quoting such precedents as Indian Gandhism and the non-violent struggle of the Norwegian teachers against quising. It has already been pointed out on these pages (*SR*, May) that the Indian struggle included at times atrociously violent techniques. Norway, it will be remembered, was liberated by armed forces, not by pacifists; and even the Norwegian teachers' leader quoted in the *Peace News* pamphlet on the incident, denied that passive resistance was a self-sufficient method against an invader. It was, he implied, a useful ancillary to armed might, and no more.

Such, in fact, would seem to be the role of non-violent resistance: either as a first line of defence in certain situations, in an attempt to win over an opponent, or else as a limited technique of opposition where armed combat is impossible, redundant or unwise. However, most pacifists will refuse to admit the applicability of any other method but their own. We are not even allowed to envisage violent methods as a second line of defence, to be reserved for use if non-violence fails to stop the enemy. No, even the reservation of violence, even the hint of its possible use at the back of our minds, would falsify and damn the deployment of the passive technique. All has to be staked on a single card, which is to be played again and again as long as there are players. The last player left may conclude that non-violence was after all a losing game, and sadly admit that he was wrong; or he may decide that pacifism is in any case absolutely and morally valid, irrespective of the consequences, unfortunate as these have been.

Quite apart from the lunacy of this logic (which in its wild carelessness of consequence resembles nuclear strategy), anarcho-pacifism is guilty of a more fundamental political vice. It makes no allowance for the spontaneous action of masses. The non-violent resisters must be minutely briefed and

● *contd next page*

ROY WELENSKY'S AFRICA PARADISE

STAN MILLS

SIR ROY WELENSKY is in the news again with stories of how well the Africans are progressing in the 'welfare' Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland. Just over a year ago a London firm of public relations experts—Voice and Vision Ltd.—were hired to advertise the 'benefits' that the Africans were receiving in the Federation.

They are reported to have been given £17,000 for the job—and newspapers have already been plastered with high

● NON-VIOLENCE—contd

drilled in the spirit of active passivity. A few deviationists breaking a cordon, smashing a shop-window, shouting at the police or locking up the Prime Minister—or even one such benighted idiot—and the dreadful provocation will have been offered. If the attempt fails, it fails because of the undisciplined few.

It is difficult to know whether the total demandingness of this approach will interfere with the success of the present movement of disobedience. It should merely be noted that Gandhi had a habit of calling off his campaigns whenever they overflowed into violence. The Committee of 100 shows every sign of being more empirical than this. However, if anarcho-pacifist tactics are to be taken as applying to the whole long-run business of social transformation, it is hard to see any sense in them. Mass struggles are just not like that, especially mass struggles with a successful outcome in the overthrow of a ruling class. If the anti-nuclear campaign expands to include active working-class support—as it must if we are not to be incinerated—one may take it that not everybody will read their briefing very carefully, and there may not be enough marshals to go round.

None of these arguments are to be taken as opposing the tactic of the sit-down, or the practice of non-violence in the present situation, or the closest possible work with pacifists in the various Committees of 100. If anything, they imply that non-pacifist supporters of the Committees should get right in there. It is quite easy to prove yourself far more non-violent in argument than your pacifist opponent.

display ads. entitled, "Good news for Africa—Let facts have a hearing." You would think from the presentation in these ads. that Central Africa is a land of happy, smiling Africans, without a care in the world, secure and content with their lot, and looking forward to a prosperous future under the paternal care of their European masters.

"New hope for African Farmers" boasts the ads. Farms owned by African freeholders are being established it says. How many? How much land are they given? What is the quality of the soil? The ad. doesn't say. Nor does it tell you what has happened to all those who aren't being established as freeholders. The fact is that in Southern Rhodesia, under the Land Apportionment Act and Land Husbandry Act thousands of Africans are being driven off the land. In 1959 the Southern Rhodesia African National Congress claimed that already "over a million have been declared landless." The Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, Sir Edgar Whitehead, is reported to have admitted in a speech in Bulawayo, in 1958, that out of nearly 2,500,000 Africans, only 307,000 would be able to get land holdings.

LIVING STANDARDS

In Northern Rhodesia it is much the same picture. An Order in Council of 1959 allows the Governor to grant land to Europeans out of the African Reserves—although only a fraction of European land, the richest in the territory, is actually being used. In Nyasaland, Africans working on European estates under a share cropping system are steadily being driven off. The number of families living under the system have been reduced by 34,000—which must mean at least 100,000 people. This mass dispossession of African farmers—and the establishment of a minority of them on small farms of six to eight acres each of a poor quality soil—is the "new hope for African farmers" which Welensky's publicity pals boast about.

"Africans' living standards rise," runs another heading. This in the face of the appalling land hunger! It then declares boldly that African money income in the Federation has risen from

£46,600,000 in 1952 to £100,000,000 in 1959. It looks impressive in cold figures. But there are about 7 million Africans in the Federation. So in seven years their *annual* income per head has risen from about £6 12s. 6d. to about £14 6s. 0d.—an increase of £7 14s. 0d., or less than 3s. a week!

But African poll tax has risen in that period. So have the prices of many goods, including cheap cotton goods, footwear, cooking pots and iron tools which are among the main purchases of the Africans. In 1955-56 taxes on the cheapest cigarettes bought by Africans were raised in the Federal budget. In the 1958-59 budget the subsidy on maize, the main African food item (often the only one) was reduced. The European maize farmers lost nothing by the change. To them the government continued to guarantee an artificially high price. It was the African who had to pay.

ELECTORATE

So by the time we have taken into account the higher prices and increased taxation it is clear that not a great deal is left of the skimpy 3s.-a-week increase in African money incomes.

The "electorate." Ah, yes, the vote. Sounds fine and progressive. But let the facts have a hearing! The facts are that the educational, property and income qualifications for Africans are so high that only a handful can qualify. The actual registration of Africans for the November 1958 Federal election showed 642 in Southern Rhodesia, 89 in Northern Rhodesia, and 16 in Nyasaland. A total of 747. Remember the African population of the Federation is about 7 million.

And this is called "the taking of the Africans into . . . the electorate of a modern state"! But why go on? These advertisements are just designed to fool the British people. For the Africans know only too well how they have fared under Federation.

And their mass demand to escape out of the "hell of Federation," as they call it, is the most convincing reply one can give to Sir Roy Welensky and the British Tories.

IN THE RED

EVERY revolutionary socialist should support the appeal of Mme. Sedova, Trotsky's widow, to the Praesidium of the Supreme Soviet. Mde. Sedova is demanding that the truth about Trotsky's role in the Russian revolution should at last be told openly in the Soviet Union. And this is not just an issue for the Soviet Union. Every Communist Party now faces a moment of truth. The Gollans and the Kettles, who peddled second-hand untruths for years now crawl in the direction of truth at the same rate as Moscow does. And, as Moscow does, they stop short before the old Bolsheviks. "Trotsky," said Dr. Kettle in Leeds recently, "was a bit of an ass." It tells you nothing about Trotsky, but a bit about Kettle.

ONE difficulty that the Soviet leaders would have in allowing Trotsky's writing to be published in the Soviet Union is that it would undermine all their own explanations of Stalinism in terms of the cult of the personality. In his *History of the Russian Revolution* Trotsky analyses the role of the Tsar and of the Tsar's personality and of the Tsarist court's cult of the Tsar's personality. But he does this in a context of social analysis which reveals clearly that such a cult is always a symptom of something deeply wrong with a social order. Kruschew in his speech at the 20th Congress quoted Bulganin as saying, "It has happened sometimes that a man goes to Stalin on his invitation as a friend. And, when he sits with Stalin, he does not know where he will be sent next—home or to jail." Trotsky wrote of Tsar Nicholas II: "Flatterers called him a charmer, bewitcher, because of his gentle way with the courtiers. But the tsar reserved his special caresses for just those officials whom he had decided to dismiss. Charmed beyond measure at a reception, the minister would go home and find a letter requesting his resignation." Arbitrary power in class society has its own characteristic methods.

IN 1961 how many children do you think have had to go into LCC children's homes not because they were orphans, or delinquents, or the children of the ill, but just because their parents had no home? The answer is 1,000. What proportion of the country's houses were built before 1880? One quarter. How many houses do we need to build every year to house our growing population? Answers to this one vary, but a recent Fabian pamphlet, *The Housing Problem*, suggests

very convincingly that it is between 325,000 and 425,000 each year. How many each year do we build? 260,000. There are no prizes for knowing the answers to this question, but we will give a very large prize indeed to anyone who suggests how private enterprise building could solve our difficulties. And do you remember a long ago General Election when an obscure Tory politician promised to build 300,000 houses a year, and managed it for just one year, only to forget all about it afterwards. 1951 wasn't it? Mac-something-or-other was his name. I wonder what became of him.

● UNITED LABOUR—from page 1
solid on this. The confusion could hardly be worse.

The Left is now called upon to prove its mettle. The responsibility of Marxists at this moment is to come forward with a policy which can unite the wider Left and then, for a time, the whole Labour movement, excepting only a small and incorrigible minority who must be helped as quickly as possible to find their real home in the Liberal Party. Isolation of the extreme Right is job number one: when that is done, the debate can proceed at a new and higher level.

Given agreement on priorities and a degree of serious organization, the task can be done. Exposure of all nuclear "defence" programmes as a farce, even on the lines of the very weak LCC

WHAT WE STAND FOR

War is the inevitable outcome of the division of society into classes. Only the working class, controlling and owning the means of production, distribution and exchange in a planned economy, can guarantee the world against war and the annihilation of large sections of humanity. Planning under workers' control demands the nationalisation without compensation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land. International collaboration between socialist states must replace aggressive competition between capitalist states.

The working class will reach the consciousness necessary to change society only by building upon the experience in struggle of the existing mass organizations and organizing around a revolutionary socialist program, independent of Washington and Moscow, based on:

The unilateral renunciation of the H-Bomb and all weapons of mass destruction

The withdrawal of all British troops from overseas

The establishment of workers' control.

SOCIALIST REVIEW is published by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd. Subscriptions, post paid. 12 issues: 8s. Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of *Socialist Review* which are given in editorial statement.

All communications to be addressed to the editor Alasdair MacIntyre 47 Fitzroy Road, NW1.

Printed by St. Martin's Printers (T.U.), 86d, Lillie Road London, S.W.6.

resolution; the restoration of the demand for municipalization of rented property as a first step to solving the housing problem; nationalization of selected key industries (such as ship-building and car production); the right of free discussion in the Party and an end to victimization and purges—this is a platform which can put the extreme Right against the wall, uniting the largest possible number against them. It is not a revolutionary programme, but the fight for it can open the way for such a programme and lead logically towards it.

There are certain conditions for the success of this fight. The first is conscious preparation, beginning with the London Labour Party conference and continued at every level, and the will to win. The second is the abandonment of the martyr complex, as expressed in any tendency for CND to hive off with candidates of its own, thus conceding the fight in advance and giving the Right a golden opportunity to break its isolation and jump in waving the hatchet. The third is that Marxists, while seeking to build unity against the far Right on agreed aims, never cease from putting their full line in all discussions (for example, popularizing workers' control where the wider Left speaks in terms only of extending nationalization).

That is the way to stave off a fifty-fifty split, from which only the class enemy could prosper. It is the way to politicize the struggle, and to ensure that polarization takes place on a political basis. It is the way to assemble, build and test a new leadership. It is therefore ultimately the road to power.