

# Socialist Review

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW,  
BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

APRIL 1962

4 d.

## BY-ELECTION MESSAGE

JOHN FAIRHEAD

Commentators on the Orpington by-election agree at one point: that the Tories received a blow from whose effects they are still staggering. But observe Macmillan's reaction. Far from trimming his sail to the wind, he steers to course by offering university teachers and civil servants a derisory salary increase to come into operation only at the end of the pay pause.

What a contrast to the snivelling soul-searching of Gaitskell and company after the electoral larruping the Labour Party received in 1959. Then the Labour leadership, without even attempting to give substance to the pale image it was projecting at that time initiated a move to abandon even the last vestigial trace of socialism. This is the difference between leadership and carpetbagging, between a party committed firmly to its class and a bureaucracy intent on manoeuvring to

safeguard its sectional interest.

There is no doubt that the Orpington result means a shift in political allegiance by many managers, technocrats and small professional people. This layer could be won by a Labour Movement boldly led and presenting an aggressive socialist policy, radical in the best sense. Yet this social group, at the moment, clearly does not identify itself with the working class.

The most the Liberals can do is to pressurise the Tory hierarchy into broadening its social base: something that the Butlerite wing of the Conservative Party has been trying to do, not without some success, since 1945. A party basing itself on neither of the two main contending classes in capitalist society can have no long-term future. For years British capitalism has been living off its fat, and reformism has battered on the leavings

in the ruling-class fleshpots. This feast is nearly ended, and after it must come the fireworks. But, in the interval, there is a corridor in time down which Liberalism may momentarily flitter, a Florence Nightingale figure, yet one which bears neither cure nor comfort for its patients.

The results at Lincoln and Middlesbrough show the solidity of Labour's working-class base. They are, indeed, the only thing solid in the present very fluid situation. Once more, for those prepared to learn, events have shattered the Gaitskell—Brown—Gunter image of a multi-class Labour Party. Only the immensely patient and tolerant British working class would have tolerated a smell like Gaitskell under its nose for so long.

But if this working-class base is to be not merely rested on, but built upon; if the energy, ability and imagination of the frustrated sections of the middle class is to be enlisted for socially useful action; then the Labour Party must advance a bold socialist programme. In the era of Chambers, Clore and Cotton, the case for socialising the economic heights acquires a new attractiveness as well as a growing urgency. In the age of the nuclear bomb, the continuation of human life demands that the working class take power and construct the socialist order.

Marxists, accurately diagnosing the difficulties through which capitalism is passing and conscious of the crisis of confidence which has induced policy differences within the ruling class, will try to make use of this situation for a new drive through. The situation now favours those who push for militant and aggressive policies in industry. Within the Party also a new offensive must be mounted, in which the clear political lesson of Orpington must be driven home.

## WHAT'S LEFT FOR LABOUR ?

ALASDAIR MACINTYRE

For some time now writers in *Socialist Review* and in *International Socialism* have been offering an analysis of British political life which has involved them in predicting a radically new shape for the next decade. It is worth asking how far the results in the latest crop of bye-elections bear out these predictions. What has been predicted is the end of traditional social democratic politics and an Americanisation of the political scene. The basis of these predictions is the belief that the character of British industry and with it the character of the British working-class has changed. In the past British workers were able to envisage

a bettering of their lot by political action which would use the state as a lever against the private employer to secure welfare measures and full employment. In the new expanding capitalism the important gains are those which can be won on the industrial front, both in wages and in welfare. (Many socialists do not realise the size and importance to workers of the welfare schemes operated by industry nowadays.) State action is relatively irrelevant; indeed the boundaries between state corporations, private corporations and government committees would be difficult to chart. Equally employers now find it easier to deal

with the union bureaucracy direct (remember the trips of union leaders to Downing Street and Admiralty House). Parliament is now on the outside edge of the real political scene and decision-making goes on outside parliament, being at best endorsed there by the hacks of the Party machines. In this situation one would expect the following to happen. Labour would retain its vote unscathed only in areas where the older type of industrial set-up persists along with traditional patterns of union organisation. In areas where either the new class of technicians or white-collar workers are dominant the

contd page 8

# PIT CRISIS IN SCOTLAND

PAUL FOOT

We have seen rather a lot of Lord Robens in Scotland lately. Most of all, this has pleased the pressmen. For the noble Lord with his smart, dark suit, his open, honest face, and above all with his way of taking you aside and "talking frankly" about things is the embodiment of all that is beautiful in the world of public relations.

His Press Conference on February 16th was no exception. How worried he was about the position in Scotland: "After all," he remarked, with that accent taking on a little more of the "common man" touch, "I cannot disassociate myself from the human side of the problem. I used to be Minister of Labour."

Lord Robens said that he now accepted that the Scottish division of the NCE would make a loss, but that this could be borne by the profitable coal-fields of Yorkshire and Derbyshire. He said that he would have to make a decision in the next few weeks as to whether to spend another £6 million on the pit at Rothes, or to close it. And to the delight of all the pressmen he ended off with an attack on unofficial strikes. He said that in 1961 more than 250,000 tons of coal had been lost in Scotland through unofficial stoppages—meaning a loss to the division of over a million pounds. Unfortunately he said later in reply to a question that the Scottish division was producing at present over a million tons more than could be sold. The surplus, he said, was "saved for emergencies." Of course if it hadn't been for all those unofficial strikes, there would have been much more coal to "save," and, if you take into account the considerable cost of this "saving," the National Coal Board would have lost even more. But, this sort of subtlety does not occur to the scribbling industrial reporter who already foresees the juicy headline . . . "ROBENS SLAMS UNOFFICIAL STRIKES," and the editor's approving smile.

★

Alf was up the other day again. But this time it wasn't quite so smooth. This time he was closeted—not with a few admiring pressmen—but with a couple of angry union leaders, Alec Moffatt and John Macarthur who were asking him why he was doing precisely

nothing to help some of the most neglected people through the history of British industry—the Scottish miners. So insistent were they that Alf missed a couple of trains. And that was not the end of it. Three days later the miners were on the march—through the streets of London and the halls of Westminster—about 800 of them carrying their vigorous protest into the sterile slagheap of Parliament itself. Robens can have got little pleasure from the vicious complaints of the NUM leaders who cottoned on to an obsolete clause in the union's constitution (which holds that no miners can take a delegation to anyone without permission from the Almighty Executive) in order to disassociate their pure conscience from the "bloody Reds" up North.

The Scottish miners are worried and angry. The latest Coal Board proposition is to close down 16 pits. Among these is the pit at Glenochil, opened recently with great flourish, around which a whole new community had been built up. The fate of the enormous "show-piece" at Rothes hangs in the balance, and no one holds out much hope for it. Expenditure on this pit has totalled something like £20,000,000.

Scotland is divided into eight different coal areas. Unlike other regions in England and Wales, these areas differ hugely in types and prices of coal. The old field in Lanarkshire, which has been worked since the industrial revolution, is almost exhausted. Well before it was fully exhausted, however, the Coal Board gambled on shutting a lot of its pits, and opening new ones in Fife and the Lothians. Most of these—like Rothes, Glenochil, Bowhill—have proved vastly expensive failures (we are told for "unavoidable geological reasons")—with the result that in 1960-61 the majority of the £10½ million loss was made in East and West Fife, Alloa, and East Ayr, where most of the new schemes had been attempted. Matters have not been made any better by a blatant failure in planning which resulted in cutting the target for Scottish coal production by almost half. In 1955 the Coal Board's target for 1965 was still 30 million tons. In the 1959 Revised Plan for Coal it was slashed to 17 million tons. The reason for this—not of course stated in the plan—is simply the

inability of the NCB bureaucrats to cooperate with their competitors—the oil bosses.

The recent history of the NCB's management of the Scottish region is a sordid one of bungling and mismanagement. Now the miners are faced with the pay-off. They are faced too with the despicable taunts of the establishment that "it is simply stupid and reactionary to oppose the closing of exhausted pits." However often this charge is answered by the extremely able union leaders, it appears incessantly in every organ of the capitalist machine.

The answer is a very simple one. There are still about 100,000 men in Scotland employed in some way or other in coal mining. The NUM is the second biggest union in Scotland. These men are not impressed with arguments about profitability. Nor, and this is something to which Lord Robens might apply his mind, do they enjoy working down a mine. They are simply concerned with employment and a living wage. And when pits are closed down, there is nowhere for them to turn. There are 85,000 unemployed in Scotland, and the figure rises daily. 4 per cent. of men are without work—TWICE the national average. Robens is worried about this, of course. Remember, he was Minister of Labour. He is, as he says, "in touch with the Secretary of State (J. S. Maclay—probably the most reactionary, inefficient and arrogant of all the Tory Ministers) to see what can be done about new jobs for the miners." Unfortunately Mr. Maclay can do nothing. For Scotland does not feature in the capitalist conception of what is best for the ruling class. Why bring all the work up here, when freight charges are much cheaper elsewhere? Robens knows that, but he can only make a name for himself if the Coal Board makes a good profit. And therefore the Scottish pits must go. The Scottish miners know that, and, with or without Mr. Sid Ford, they will be fighting Uncle Alfred and his minions all along the line.

OUT NOW!

see page 5

# WHITE COLLAR WAGES

F. LIPSON

Anyone watching the Labour Party Political Broadcast on Wednesday, 28th March, could see just how seriously the leadership was taking the Orpington by-election result and how much importance was likely to be put on an all-out effort to capture the "white collar" vote.

As is usual in programmes of this sort, the general impression was of blatant opportunism presented with shining insincerity but the fact remains that the three political parties now appreciate the possible electoral value of the increasing section of the population made up of clerical, supervisory and administrative workers.

The most distinctive quality of the clerical trade union has long been an anxiety to emphasise its negative characteristics. Unions of clerks are generally described as "non-manual," "non-party political" and industrially "non-militant." The basic dilemma of the clerical worker has been to find a way of keeping pace with the other participants in the wage race without

resorting to actions which would lay him open to undesirable comparisons with other workers who earn their living in a much less dignified way than by the careful manipulation of a fountain pen. (When you come to think of it, there are few more completely "manual" jobs than that of the clerk.)

Despite the continual and often very effective propaganda from the well organised clerical unions, it is not strictly true that non-manual workers generally have been steadily falling behind the industrial worker in actual earnings since the end of the war. It is a fact that the clerical worker, largely due to a lack of organisation, did not nearly keep pace with the increases obtained by the industrial worker during and immediately after the war. For the past ten years, how-

ever, many sections of "white collar" workers have equalled or exceeded the 60 per cent. wage increase in industry.

As the years go by the number of older clerks dreaming of recovery of lost differentials is decreasing and more and more young clerical workers are becoming more concerned simply in maintaining their present position and not falling behind the organised manual worker.

In recent months the non-manual unions have joined in the general battle against the "Pay Pause" and this has led them to take a more militant stand publically and has resulted in considerable increases in some unions which have remained dormant for a considerable time. Although one normally assumes that militancy always starts from the bottom rather than the top of a trade union the reverse has usually been the case in the majority of non-manual unions.

Recently there has been a change and the old pattern has been disturbed. In the Union of Post Office Workers, the National Union of Teachers and the Civil Service Clerical Association there has been seen far more militancy on the floor than on the platform. The Government already is showing signs of regretting the day it decided to alienate its erstwhile supporters by destroying the sacred cow of arbitration.

But while there are welcome signs of a general movement away from the traditional attitude of disgruntled inertia towards a more positive trade unionism, it would be over optimistic to imagine that clerical workers will now proceed to shepherd themselves gently into the socialist fold.

Just as at Orpington the white collars found the Liberal Party a more acceptable form of protest than Labour so the non-manual unions show signs of balking at the prospect of a closer association with their fellow workers in the T.U.C. and are tinkering with the new collective organisations of their own. A week ago the formation of the Conference of Professional and Public Service Organisations was announced. This body consists of NALGO, the Institute of Professional Civil Servants, the National Union of Teachers, the BBC Staff Association, the Gas Staff Association and the Water Board Staff Association. Its

## LONDON LABOUR CONFERENCE

By A DELEGATE

At its conference on March 24-25 the London Labour Party's customary Dead Sea calm was rippled by several significant undercurrents. To avert criticism and even a number of defeats the platform was obliged to resort to tactics unthinkable, and indeed unnecessary, even a year ago.

The warning signal flashed for the Executive when delegates voted by a majority of two to discuss an emergency motion pledging support to the sit-down in Parliament Square that afternoon. During the lunch hour the tops converged and came up with a sly amendment, deleting all reference to the current demonstration but expressing sympathy with the six members of the Committee of 100 sentenced at the Old Bailey. The amendment was carried by the fairly slender majority of 840 votes against 600, and it is possible that the majority figure included the votes of a number of confused Lefts.

The hypocrisy of the platform was exposed by a delegate who pointed out that it was George Brown who had called in the House of Commons for use of the Official Secrets Act against militants. When, after the vote had been taken, another delegate asked that even this message should be conveyed at once to the demonstrators in Whitehall, the chairman snapped out a

sharp negative to the accompaniment of cynical laughter.

Tied in advance by the resolution on civil defence carried by the LCC, the platform was obliged to accept a resolution declaring the futility of all proposed "defence" against nuclear attack. On housing, Blackpool policy was defied by a resolution calling for socialisation of housing as a "long-term" aim. Conference, and platform, were again placed in opposition to Transport House when the Cities of London and Westminster's request to be allowed to contest the parliamentary seat against the Speaker was carried unanimously, on the recommendation of the Executive.

In the elections to the Executive, Hugh Jenkins replaces Irene Chaplin, a Right-winger. Jenkins, on the other hand, received a derisory vote for the chairmanship against Bob Mellish.

Certainly this year's Conference leaves no room for complacency or illusions on the part of the Left. Yet it would be as wrong, and harmfully sectarian, to fail to recognise the first faint rustle of the Leftward stir. Careful preparation should begin immediately to ensure that real political issues are discussed next year, and that the slowly growing strength of the Left finds adequate organisational reflection.

contd page 5

# ALGERIANS BETRAYED

The Editor,  
Socialist Review.  
Dear Comrade,

Would you please publish information on the record of the Communist and Socialist Parties of France in the Algerian struggle. Thank you.

Yours fraternally,  
I. S. TAYLOR.

This article is written in response to this request.

★

The role of both parties is absolutely reprehensible. The record of betrayal is long, but for reasons of space only some items can be pinpointed.

On V.E. May, May 8th, 1945, a Moslem demonstration of several thousand marched through Setif carrying French, British, Russian and American flags, and banners reading "Down with Colonialism," "We want to be your equals," and "Long live a Free Algeria." This detonated an uprising all over the country that was brutally suppressed. Ex-Premier George Bidault estimated the number of Moslems killed at 20,000, and Algerian nationalists claim that between 40,000 and 50,000 lost their lives.

At the time both Communists and Socialists were participating in the French government. Accordingly at the tenth congress of the French Communist Party (June 1945), Caballero, General Secretary of the Algerian Communist Party "concluded by emphasising that the Algerian people had the same enemies as the French people, and do not want to be separated from France. Those who claim independence for Algeria, are the conscious or unconscious agents of another imperialism." (*L'Humanite*, 30th June 1945.)

The local Communists in Algeria drew the obvious conclusion, and "European Communists were among the organisers of the repressive militia" fighting the Algerians. (Edward Behr, *The Algerian Problem*, Penguin, 1961, p. 54.) Thus the Communist Party helped to turn "Red" Bab el Oued, the citadel of the Communist Party, largely inhabited by Spanish Republicans after the Civil War and overwhelmingly proletarian (*Ibid.*, pp. 226-7) into the citadel of the future OAS!

This was the time that the French Communist Party was most enthusiastic for the "civilising mission of France" in her empire. Thus, for instance, on 4th April, 1946, the Stalinist Deputies in the French parliament voted for the following message of congratulations to the French troops fighting in Indo-China against Vietminh: "The National Constituent Assembly sends to the troops of the Expeditionary Force in the Far East and to their leaders the expression of the country's gratitude and confidence on the morrow of the day in which their entry into Hanoi sets the seal on the success of the government of the Republic's policy of peaceful liberation of all the peoples of the Union of Indo-China." Again, "On the occasion of Christmas, the Commission of National Defence sends to the French soldiers in Indo-China the expression of its affectionate sympathy and salutes their efforts to maintain in the Far East the civilising and peaceful presence of France." (10th December 1946.)

It is hardly necessary to say that during all this the leaders of the Socialist Party of France behaved in exactly the same way as the leaders of the Communist Party. But the days of glory for the Socialist Party leaders were yet to come, 1956 and after.

In January 1956 the leader of the Socialist Party, Guy Mollet, came to power after an election campaign the main promise of which was to put an end to the war in Algeria which had been going on since November 1954. The rest of the story is fairly well known. On February 6th Mollet arrived in Algeria. While laying a wreath at the War Memorial in the town centre, tens of thousands of Europeans packed the square and pelted Mollet with cabbages and tomatoes. The effect on him was profound. On February 9th, he made a broadcast, specially directed to the Europeans of Algeria:

"You have been depicted as colonialists. I do not share this view. . . . There is . . . the immense mass of the European population: farmers, workers, tradespeople, teachers, doctors, who have been established in Algeria for several generations and have their homes, their families and their dead in Algeria. Since my arrival, I have heard the voice of all of

them and have been greatly moved by it. In their eyes, Algeria is the best country in the world: it is their small homeland, it is what they are most attached to.

★

I understand their despair. . . . That is why I say to you in all sincerity that, even though for me the experience was painful, the unfortunate demonstration on Monday had a wholesome aspect. It provided many with an opportunity to express their attachment to France and their fear of being abandoned. If that is what the immense majority of the men and women at the War Memorial wanted to make known, I assure them that they have been heard. France will remain present in Algeria. The bonds linking metropolitan France to Algeria are indissoluble. . . ." (Behr, *op. cit.*, pp. 91-2).

As Resident-General of Algeria Mollet appointed the extreme Right-wing "Socialist" Robert Lacoste. The latter on January 7, 1957, turned over the responsibility of all police and security measures to General Jacques Massu and his Tenth Parachutists Division. Torture and murder in Algeria went on at a galloping pace.

What about the record of the Communist Party in recent years? On March 2, 1956, the Political Bureau of the French CP issued a statement which was to be the basis of the French CP policy: "We are in favour of the existence and the permanence of special political, economic and cultural bonds between France and Algeria."

Accordingly the Communist Party worked in Parliament for extra-constitutional powers for the Government in Algeria. "The vote of the emergency powers is the capital that we must make bear fruit," declared the CP leader Léon Feix. The fruit was bitter for the Algerians.

In 1956, in the "Cahiers du Communisme," Léon Feix specified the theoretical basis of the French CP's attitude.

"Some nationalist leaders advocate the fusion of the three countries in an  
*contd next page*

# EDITORIAL

Arab or Moslem Maghreb, tied up with all the Moslem or Arab countries, from Morocco to Pakistan. That is an old idea of the Arab League, taken up and stimulated by the leading bourgeois circles of Cairo and Karachi. A long time ago Lenin and Stalin showed the inevitable reactionary character of currents based on race or on religion. It is quite natural that the Algerians, the Tunisians, and the Moroccans entertain fraternal feelings for one another. It is equally natural that they feel strongly drawn to the peoples of the Near and Middle East, owing both to the community of religion and the similarity of language, and to the support which they have received from these peoples during these last years.

“But that does not justify a political community against which so many historical, geographical, and economic elements work. Another way is available, or better, still available, for the peoples of North Africa: the way of the French Union.

And for added “theoretical” justification of the French “bond” with Algeria:

In his speech to the Assembly on March 20th, 1957, the CP spokesman, Laurent Casanova, clearly summed up this policy:

“Our party takes the following complementary factual data into account. First, the existence of historical bonds between France and Algeria. Next, the presence on African soil for several generations of an Algerian population of French and European origin whose interests have nothing to do with colonialism. Lastly, the aid that newly emancipated peoples require to make up the backwardness imposed on them by the colonial regime.”

★

CP policies regarding the Algerian war could not be summed up better than the statement of the French Federation of the FLN issued in the spring of 1958:

Solidarity with the Algerian workers in emigration in France has been almost nil. No demonstration or action found support other than words among the workers' organisations. Against the repression that is every day striking at our compatriots, no struggle has been organised.

True, here and there the solidarity of the French workers manifests itself. It remains, however, individual and up

It is extremely dangerous in Britain to comment upon the activities of Courts of Law. We have therefore all the more a duty to speak out on the imprisonment of leading members of the Committee of 100 for advocating, planning and carrying out acts of civil disobedience. The charges against them were to the effect that they were endangering the security of the state. The accused were not allowed by the judge to produce arguments or to call witnesses to show that what they were doing was not in fact prejudicial to the safety of the state. The prosecution were allowed to bring evidence on this point, which the defence had no adequate opportunity to rebut. The paid servant of the state, Air Commodore Magill, who gave evidence on this point, said that he would, if asked, press the button which would bring about mass extinction.

The doctrines which were endorsed by the activity of the court therefore included approval of mass extermination by nuclear weapons, of the appeal to the orders of a superior officer to justify such an action, and of a law which does not permit a political defence to a political accusation. It is important to stress that prosecuting counsel, the judge and everyone else who participated in the trial acted in accordance with the law and with what are often called “the highest standards of British justice”. It is not this particular judge nor this particular prosecution nor this jury who stand condemned by the case. It is the justice of a system which has refused the right of organised passive resistance protesters to perform symbolic actions to protest against doctrines which were condemned in the Nuremberg trials. The law of this country is the servant of the permanent war economy.

till now, has never taken on the aspect of organised action. Recent instances are a proof of this. Algerian trade-unionists are put under arrest and transferred to Algeria. The event rates only a few discreet lines in *l'Humanité*.

In 1955-1956, workers' demonstrations against the call-up of reservists ran up against underhand opposition by the French CP. *L'Humanité* denounced the “leftists,” the “provocateurs,” of Grenoble; and did not call for extending the action, offered no slogan at all to the soldiers who were going off to preserve the colonialists' privileges, and long kept silent about the gesture of those who, like, Liéchi, refused to bear arms against our people.

(Reprinted in *Fourth International*, No. 2, 1958).

The activities of the French Communist Party were simply dictated by the foreign policies of Russia. This aimed at attracting France away from Germany and an open flirtation with de Gaulle. As late as March 1960, Khrushchev, in Paris for the Summit Meeting, spoke of the “historic ties” between France and Algeria. He waited until March 1962 to recognise *de jure* the Algerian Provisional Government, while Mao recognised it from its foundation in 1959).

*contd from page 3*

object is said to be simply to support groups with little industrial power and to represent the interests of its 600,000 white collar members on the National Economic Development Council. It is possible that this new body will form the nucleus of a white collar alternative to the TUC and that some of those non-manual unions who have for long considered that the interests of clerical workers were insufficiently represented at Congress will be persuaded to chance their arm with the new, and eminently respectable COPPSO.

If the increased militancy of the non-manual worker is not to be dissipated and the division of the working-class increased, socialists and trade unionists must attempt to recognise the particular problems of the clerical worker. A good start towards this would be made if it was made clear that we do not all believe that the shovel is necessarily mightier than the pen.

INTERNATIONAL  
SOCIALISM

No 8

with . . . . . see page 6

# Can We Afford Disarmament ?

JOHN PALMER

The United Nations report on the "likely" economic consequences of disarmament, issued last week, will be of special interest to those Socialists who have taken special interests in studying the relationships between the economic and the military policies of the world's ruling classes.

The very fact of the report (Economic and Social Consequences of disarmament, U.N. Economy and Social Council) is itself unusual. Not only is it the first of its kind to be produced by the UN but it has received the official "imprimatur" of both the Kennedy and the Khrushchev regimes.

The report blandly points out that the world is spending over £40,000,000,000 on armaments—or a little less than the entire income of the under-developed countries. This figure does not take into account all the "hidden" forms of expenditure, especially capital expenditure, on "secondary" defence projects; factories to produce the guns, new roads to the new military installations and a thousand and one other projects which usually get put into separate estimates when the Governments announce future defence expenditure.

The sum of money spent on armaments is of course quite stunning. It almost defies contemplation when one remembers that we are living in a world in which about two-thirds of its population are living at starvation level, where untold millions want for clothing, shelter, medical attention and other basic human needs.

What is almost as startling, however, is to learn to what extent the economies of the advanced capitalist countries, especially the United States, rely upon the arms industry. It is not only that missile and military aircraft production alone account for 30 per cent. of all factory jobs in the Los Angeles area, 53 per cent. in Seattle and 82 per cent. in San Diego, but the dependency which secondary industries have, in entire states, on defence contracts and on Department of Defence pay-rolls.

As a succession of American Treasury spokesmen have made clear during periods of recession, the defence industry plays a vital role in "state counter cyclical investment." This helps to counteract the effects of the recession and to induce some life into

what would otherwise be a chronically stagnating economy.

Not that things are plain sailing as they are. Only this month has seen the climax of a Pentagon controversy which is more than an eye-opener into the workings of a modern capitalist economy—the row over the B70 bomber. Said by the scientists to be outdated and strategically irrelevant, nevertheless a huge contract for mass production was eventually handed to North American Aviation, who have proceeded to joyfully claim it as the fruits of a long and costly "ante chamber" pressure group campaign, within the portals of the Pentagon itself.

These matters are not, of course, discussed by the UN report which blithely claims that disarmament even on a total scale is simple a matter of "re-adjustment of production to a more socially acceptable scale of priorities."

★

While the capitalist class remains in possession of the factories and even more important in command of the sources of capital it is utopian in the least to believe that the change over to "peaceful production" could take place without mass unemployment and the precipitation of a severe international economic crisis.

The role in the United Nations commission on all this of the representatives of the Russian government is interesting to say the least. As some Tory newspapers have been quick, and delighted, to point out after the appearance of this paper, the Russians have dropped all pretence of a Marxist analysis of the problems of arms within a capitalist economy.

Nor is the State controlled Russian economy free from the distortions and problems which an arms orientated programme has left them. It will be my object in a later article to show how an important section of the Russian ruling class has a vested interest in the Cold War pattern of the Russian economy and therefore in an economic programme devoted to massive expenditure of armaments. What is clear is that while the major industrial countries of the world remain under the rule of the capitalist classes

who depend increasingly on an arms programme, they will be utterly unable to assist in any meaningful way the struggle of the untold masses of this planet for the basic requirements for survival.

The report ignores two things. Firstly that attempts have been made from time to time in America and elsewhere for armament firms to attempt a switch to peaceful production. As the experience of General Electric, Lockheed and General Dynamics has shown this has not been a success largely because of the much lower profit margins which peaceful contracts bring and the immense cost of re-tooling and other adjustments to capital equipment.

Secondly the report has not taken into account at all the fact that although roads, hospitals and aid to the under-developed lands are excellent social targets, there is nothing within a free enterprise capitalist economy which will persuade the entrepreneur to invest his money in commodities which have a much smaller replacement value than armaments. After all the great value of investment in armaments is that it is a field where one need have, in modern conditions, little fear of the market contracting. (Whenever the international chat about peace grows ominously the stock exchanges of New York and London soon register the alarm felt by holders of defence bond and company equity.)

It would seem then that the classical Keynesian remedy for all economic evils, the deficit budget, will hardly work in conditions where the desirable social projects are not those to which the factory owners are prepared to devote production.

Decline of  
German Socialism  
Opposition  
To W.F.T.U.  
Decline of  
Chinese Communes  
in  
International Socialism

2/6

47 Fitzroy Rd., N.W.1.

# BIG AND LITTLE NATIONS

T. LINNELL

Although it is too early to make very precise predictions on the world economic situation, the prospects for the capitalist economy are not the most encouraging. Rees Mogg of the Sunday Times recently went so far as to detect "a world surplus of capacity in basic industries, and even in industries like oil and chemical, with a rapid growth in normal demand." He went on to maintain that a violent upheaval is unlikely because of high arms and state spending, nevertheless "unless it is corrected in time this situation could lead to a contraction in world trade."

Apart from the effects of contraction on the so called advanced countries, a reduction or upheaval in world trade can have particularly serious consequences for the underdeveloped nations. Capitalist spokesmen are not unaware of the problem of capital accumulation for these nations, but are incapable of finding a serious long term solution. Capitalism remains essentially national even in its decay and can hardly begin to solve international trading and investment problems. Thus the report of the American Senate sub-committee on foreign aid in Latin-America has stressed the need for "self help" and openly approved of close association with the various military cliques there. This is actually self-contradictory because the military cliques are incapable of self help—only a wholesale social revolution entailing considerable discipline in consumption could achieve effective accumulation of capital. More important than this cynical report, has been Gaitskell's recently expressed concern that Common Market Atlantic Community tariff barriers might seriously affect the prices of the primary commodities, thus dislocating the economies of the undeveloped nations.

Industrial countries over the last twenty years have more than doubled the volume of their exports. But commodity producers have increased the volume of sales by little more than half. Prices can fluctuate a great deal also in these primary products—thus Ghana cocoa, Malaya rubber and Pakistan Jute which play a vital role in their respective economies could prove very vulnerable in a downturn in the world economy. In 1957-58, Chile suffered a loss of £25 million through a fall in copper prices—aid given to her was on average £4 million a year.

According to Sachs (Polish Perspectives May 1961), in 1959 exports from

Indonesia calculated per head of the population were actually 44 per cent. lower than in 1937, in Argentine 60 per cent lower, in Egypt 34 per cent lower, in Malaya 27 per cent and in Mexico 9 per cent lower. In 1938, those countries producing primary commodities accounted for 37.5 per cent. of capitalist world exports, yet in 1959 despite the vast expansion of world trade, these countries still accounted for only 34.1 per cent. In the UN Economic Survey of 1958, it was estimated that the primary producing areas lost more as a result of deterioration in the terms of trade than the whole of the foreign aid they received.

Great Britain is one of those nations which has indirectly benefited a great deal from favourable terms of trade. According to Balogh (New Statesman 12th Dec. 1959), "In Britain, for instance, home costs since 1955 have risen at a steady rate of 5 per cent. Price stability since 1957 could be maintained only because import costs declined by eight per cent. . . . The improvement in the standard of life since 1957, some two or three per cent., is entirely due to the violent improvement in the terms at which we are able to purchase food and raw materials—to the discomfiture of poor areas. Not less than half of the total gain since 1951 is due to this same cause." In toto between 1953-1961 the terms of trade have improved as much as 10 per cent. (Labour Research)—import prices have fallen and export prices have risen. Ultimately, of course, this leads to a reduction of trade and stagnation of exports for the advanced nations. To crown it all the latest figures would seem to make it clear (Lloyds Bank Review, Feb. 1962) that the recovery of output in the UK in 1959 and that in the US have made no impact on falling commodity prices.

The facts of the world economy are that a small group of advanced nations, primarily the USA and Western Europe, are exploiting in a variety of ways the rest of the non-communist underdeveloped nations—and isolating nations such as China in desperate need of capital and massive aid. These advanced nations are geared to the fantastic waste of the permanent war economy—the proletariats of these nations indirectly benefit from alterations in the terms of trade, are in fact aristocrats in relation to the rest of the world. It is to be hoped that disturbances within the Western econo-

mies will awaken these proletariats and lead them further to consider their responsibilities towards the hundreds of millions of exploited workers and peasant all over the world who require tremendous economic aid to relieve their hellish existence, their endless poverty.

## IN THE RED

"Class makes a gulf across which all the best human flow is lost. It is not exactly the triumph of the middle classes that has made the deadness, but the triumph of the middle-class thing. . . ." So D. H. Lawrence. Penguin Books have now reprinted "A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover," the pamphlet which Lawrence wrote in defence of his book, and have included with it various essays and documents. I was reminded of the way in which the political element in "Lady Chatterley's Lover" was diminished in each successive version of it that Lawrence wrote. In the third version, the published one, there is no hint of a solution to the problems of our society except in personal terms. In the first version the gamekeeper ended up as a steelworker in Sheffield and the secretary of a Communist Party branch. It is significant that in this version there is least hope of success for the marriage of Constance Chatterley and the gamekeeper turned steelworker. The barriers which society has set are just too high. And the barriers are set by society and not just by the individuals.

George Orwell's early writings have also been reprinted by Pilgrim Books. Of these *Homage to Catalonia* and *Keep the Aspidistra Flying* should be in every socialist's library. *Keep the Aspidistra Flying* says in the form of a novel what Marx said of the power of money, that in capitalist society money takes the place of essential human qualities. "And now abideth faith, hope and money, these three; but the greatest of these is money" is Orwell's gloss on St. Paul. *Homage to Catalonia* is the best single book on the Spanish War. Borkenau's *The Spanish Cockpit* and Hugh Thomas's history of the war are indispensable guides, but for the sheer, living sense of the Spanish revolution nothing can beat Orwell. The use of lies by the Communist Party to discredit POUM (the Left Marxist party) and the Trotskyists can be documented here again. It will be interesting to know if Lawrence & Wishart are likely to republish this as a companion to *Ten Days that Shook the World*.

contd from page 1

Labour vote will crumble away. If members of these groups do vote they will vote against the whole present set-up and not for anything that makes sense in terms of that set-up. Militant strike action will be led by people who often have no Left-wing political commitments. And so on. The last of these predictions was borne out in several recent unofficial strikes. The others are now being confirmed by the bye-elections. In the older industrial areas Labour retains its share of the vote without increasing it. In Orpington the Labour Party disappears. The vote for the Liberals appears to be a vote against the system rather than for the smiling nonentities who are enjoying the limelight for which they have waited so long. The reason for thinking this is quite simply the vote for the eccentric Mr. Eckley at Pontefract. Mr. Eckley's nomination paper was signed by a friendly lavatory attendant; he stood for a series of causes which appear to have only a random connection with one another; and he claimed to have God specially on his side. He polled over 1,000 votes; what a Liberal would have done even in that solid mining town, one can only guess.

So far then we have that most dangerous of all satisfactions, the satisfaction of being proved right. But this is

going to be very cold comfort unless we can produce a programme of action for the future. What we ought to say about action is this. First, the Left must recognise that we have to mobilise all our resources not for short-term victories, but for the long run. Unilateralism, rank-and-file action in industry, the proclamation of the objectives of workers' control, the attack on the permanent war economy; all these must be points at which we draw together industrial workers, members of YS and YCND, and Labour members, so that they can learn in action the unity of the fight for socialism. Secondly, nobody in the Labour Party will benefit from a split in the Party; only the Tories will benefit. We of the Left cannot reduce or minimise our differences with the Labour Right; but we can fight in the same party for such radical proposals as Anthony Crossland's reforms for the educational system and proposals for really punishing redistributive taxation, which would lead on towards income equality. The real indictment of the Labour Right is not that they support only this kind of measure; but that they have shown great reluctance to campaign in the country and among the working class for anything at all radical. Left-wingers who are inclined to treat Crossland's proposals as milk-and-water should remember that he is proposing to take away from the rich both a lot

of their money and a lot of their educational privileges. Any Labour Party which really tried to do this would have to learn some simple truths about class-war which even the Right wing of the Party would find it difficult to ignore. Moreover, I do not doubt that an unknown proportion of the new Liberal voters are genuine middle-class and working-class radicals, who are disgusted by the Labour Party's record on radical issues. When the proposals for resumption of nuclear testing came up in parliament it was Grimond who spoke up sharply. Gaitskell's response was that of an obedient spokesman for the Kennedy administration. On colonial issues Labour's record is marred by the utterances of men like Mr. Roy Mason who support Sir Roy Welensky. (What is one to make of an NEC of the Labour Party which tries to suppress Mr. Woodrow Wyatt's democratic rights in the party—and the Left should be strongly against this absurd attempt to muzzle Mr. Wyatt, who will provide a convenient precedent for the next Left-winger the NEC wishes to discipline—but allows Mr. Roy Mason to support Welensky without any sort of censure.) So the Left must insist that the party has nothing to gain electorally by watering down its radicalism; all that will happen if it does is that still more CND supporters will vote Liberal or put up independent candidates.

## 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.

Finally, we could not notice the bye-elections and fail to notice the force of Mr. George Brown's performance. Mr. Brown sometime ago did a good deal to publicise the concept of the "wasted vote" which at Orpington boomeranged against the Labour Party with a vengeance. Did Mr. Brown retire reticently into the wings? No, there he was to celebrate Labour's defeat by leading the singing of the "Red Flag." So long as we are weighed down by the bureaucratic forces in the Party of which Mr. Brown is so adequate a symbol, so long the Labour Party cannot hope to resist even temporarily the forces which are making for its decline.

Read the—

INDUSTRIAL

WORKER price 4d

from:—K. Dunbar

134 Carlton Vale, NW6.