WHOSE UNITED EUROPE?

THERE approach to the thorny question of Britain and the European Common Market by Michael Foot and the Tribunals underlines the complete theoretical muddle which constitutes the remnants of Bevanism in the British Labour Party.

From frightening stories of the possibilities of the British Labour market being flooded by Italian unemployment: sharp increases in the prices of food for every single man, woman and child; the dismemberment of the link between British Commonwealth and Empire; right over to the acceptance of De Gaulle and Adenauer—we have been warned.

No wonder in such a string of clouded thoughts (all in the fair name of Socialism) it is confessed that lines on the Common Market do not run alongside the usual divisions ever for example unilateralism or the Choice Four controversy.

For the Marxist the question is simple. We are concerned with no less than the abolition of the nation capitalist-state; we are out to establish no less than a Federation of United Socialist States of Europe (East and West) and eventually a United Socialist States of the World.

They are indeed lofty aims but nevertheless the only beacon for humanity to follow.

We do not raise this as does the Socialist Party of Great Britain which disdains to address itself to the practical problems of the EEC.

When you ask a worker if he is glad or sorry about the Common Market he wants to know what there is in it for him. And that instinct is perfectly sound.

Whether you get a co-ordinated Western European Economy with Britain outside or in, the worker will gain or lose according to his ability to struggle through his own economic strength in combination with his fellows.

For Foot and Co. to really discuss the capitalist problems arising from the Common Market, they must be prepared to say what they have to say to the workers of all countries. If your arguments cannot stand up in front of an audience of Western European Trade Unionists, whatever gives birth to your thoughts it is not International Socialism.

LITTLE ENGLANDISM

What we have had from Clive Jenkins of ASSET is an outburst of Little Englandism. He was reported as saying at his conference that Britain is 'in danger of becoming a European off-shore island'.

So what? That is precisely what we are.

The system of imperial preferences and heavy subsidy support for British agriculture, which provides less than half home needs, is a capitalist system and for capitalist needs. The sterling bloc is a currency empire for finance capitalist purposes.

If there is division in the British capital camp over the Common Market it is a division about how to make the most of British capitalism in the future. The big combines see it as a chance to tool-up for a considerably extended market; while the heavily tariff-protected inefficient industries see the writing on the wall.

Macmillan is well aware of all the problems involved. The other day in the House of Commons he accused Shinwell of growing jingoistic in his (Shinwell's) old age. The Prime Minister can afford to turn his back on while Labour Party spokesmen confine their attention to the problems of a 'commonwealth' scattered all over the earth.

The problem of the Common Market is another milestone in the haudown of British imperialism.
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It is nonsense for workers' representatives to get involved in the abstract arguments of British capitalism; whether to sweat for a "protected" or "free" trade. It is as foolish as arguing for the return of mid-Victorian capitalism with its larger elements of "freedom". Workers will address their minds to the scare of the Common Market in exactly the same way as they have to confront other forms of capitalist integration at home in the form of mergers, takeovers and combines.

Mergers and large-scale capitalist enterprise for private profit are the order of the day; mergers and the solidarity of trade union organisation should be the order of the day for the workers.

If therefore we regard it as a Tory headache what should the attitude of a real Socialist-Workers Government be?

First of all it cannot be separated from the Cold War. Just as the capitalists and their Government do not separate it here. There is no doubt that the OEEC originally was seen by Western European capitalist countries as the means of consolidating a 'third' economic and consequently political power bloc. But those whom the Gods wish to destroy, they first make mad.

continued on page eight

THE NET TIGHTENS

BY JOHN PALMER

THE dramatic fall in the value of industrial shares and government equities on the Stock Exchange last week has spotlighted what may prove to be the start of a major economic crisis.

The first warnings of stormy weather ahead in the capitalist economy were clearly given when Mr Selwyn Lloyd presented his now famous 'rob the poor to feed the rich' budget last April. Then he clearly stated that he had taken wide powers to deal with any economic crisis that might arise... leaving us with little doubt that HE at any rate had confidence in the future.

The two most important powers he then took were directly aimed at slushing working class living standards: firstly by using the payroll tax to create a pool of unemployment and secondly by exercising the other powers to increase taxes and retail prices, designed to drastically cut consumption.

Since then we have seen prices start to rise, interest loans on house mortgages rise and a further increase in rents. Added to these must also be included the national health charges, increased insurance contributions and the other measures taken in and before the budget. All these steps have been taken to reduce costs in industry, which are at present allowing Britain out of the world capitalist markets. Indeed realisation of the far-reaching deterioration of the British balance of payments situation, because of the industrial stagnation of the last two years, has led to a run on sterling, leaving the Tories less cash in hand to pay for the deficits in their foreign trade.

The Tories' predication, then, is the classical capitalist contradiction. They cannot stimulate demand for fear of raising costs even further, while to take deflationary action would lead to a further loss of confidence in the
SON OF FRED

THE increasing tendency of officialdom to coin words, the con-
stituent letters being first letters of other words (PLUTO or
pipe line under the ocean being an early example) is a blight on the
language and is more than usually manifest here. Nobody is
more pronounced than the British Post Office, as is in-
stanced by this article reproduced from the “Live Wire” organ of
the Mt. Branch of the Post Office Engineering Union. The FRED of the title refers we understand to
a machine known as the Functional Routine Enumerating Device.

TO help our readers who do not have the time to keep abreast
of the latest developments, here is a survey of what they may expect
by the new development of the ENQ service. Customers will dial “ENQ” plus a “customer recognition
code”. This selects the customer’s fault card and punches date/time/total.

A scanner notes any previous faults. If these are less than
three in 24 hours a recorded apology is switched on, promising
swift action. This service is called Basic Apology Handout or BAH, and has yet to be implemented. Nor is there the number of faults of more than three days duration reaching
200. This operates a low-power radio transmitter which breaks in on TV and Radio with a recorded promise that everything
short of having engineers actually working on the fault is being
done. This is called Group Announcement Wireless Distribution or GAWD.

We now come to the part of the building of most interest; the
small cylindrical base housing the apparatus. To obtain the re-
quired strength to support the top structure and keep the ap-
paratus free from dirt, it is made without doors or windows and is
hermetically sealed. Access is obtained via an air-lock and steps from the rear of the apparatus. The apparatus is strung an
aqua-long strap to his back. This is the Pneumatic Harness Engineering Workmen or PHEW.

It has been realised that the complete absence of daylight would
affect health and cause sickness. This has been overcome by
providing all supervisory lamps with double filaments to generate
Ultra Violet light. This is Daylight Imitation Double Duty Equipment or DIDDEL.

The possibility of an engineer working alone and sealed off,
having an accident has also been taken into consideration. Metal
strip are set up on the floor and these metal strips, the variation in capacity will operate an alarm in the
switchroom. This is Survey Absent Disabled Indolent Staff Technique or SADIST.

With an apparatus so complex it is essential that only qualified
men should work on it. In future staff obtaining City and Guilds
Certificates will, in addition, be injected with a radio-active
isotope. An unqualified engineer approaching a rack of equipment
will fail to ‘trigger-off’ the built-in Geiger counter. This failure
will operate buzzers tuned to give a slightly derisive note and
to cause a visual obstruction behind the glass chest. This is Barrier Unqualified Routine Personnel or BURP.

This wholesale automation will result in a surplus of engi-
neering staff. To make the best use of these redundancies Obser-
vations will be fed into a computer. At the end of the day staff
will be told where to report the following month. This scheme is
Concentration Redundant Auto Personnel. How it will work out
only time will tell. I am told it will continue the North West Area is likely to have he biggest load of Concentrated Redundant Auto Personnel in the London
Telecommunications Region.

THE COMMITTEE

ONCE again the motor in-
dustry is faced with a crisis,
this time promoted by an acces-
sory manufacturers’ stock,
half of which has been held hitherto.
Many folk will be asking at this
stage, “What have Smiths got to
do with this?” the general im-
pression being that this company is
associated with domestic clocks.

Let me hasten to add that
Smiths are an empire within an empire, manufacturing, among other things, empolying 20,000 workers and
producing almost all instrumentation
for motoring and motor transport, the
industry and the professions, for
shipping and home appliances. Thus, at the moment, a fourth
of these plants are out in dispute—
namely Cricklewood (MAI)—
Watford, Whitney Road, Ham, I propose only to deal
with the set-up at Cricklewood (Motor Accessory).

For many years MAI enjoyed
—by virtue of militancy—good
industrial relations with manage-
ment, which, however, is said to have toppled the poll in the
NW London Area. Now, according to my information, they are
at 14th July 1954 took care of the “trouble-makers” and for some time it was feared that the contract
Cricklewood (Motor Accessory) would fail. However, whilst
management, by the management, our
members came to months in
settlement, and as these tactics
which, however, is said to have toppled the poll in the
NW London Area. Now, according to my information, they are
at 14th July 1954 took care of the “trouble-makers” and for some time it was feared
that the contract the nature the which
management, by the management, our
members came to months in
settlement, and as these tactics
were adopted in many cases of
departmental and works com-
mittee negotiations, frustration
was felt to a degree and it was
decided to make a stand.

As to the present issue, be-
cause of loss of bonus earnings,
due to the wage recession in the
industry (£120 per annum in my
own case) and the cut back in
piece-work earnings, in a period of
rising costs, 11 departmental
claims were present-
ed to the management. The
works committee attempted to
aggregate these claims into an
overall factory claim and con-
sultation was sought with the
management with a view to
formulating a formula that was accep-
able—bearing in mind that all
other factories in the company
have parity agreements with the
parent company—namely MAI

This the management refused,
and informed the convenor that
if he so desired he must institute
a specific claim of his own.
Having no alternative, a claim based on An Werk differentials
was presented and rejected out of
hand.

In consequence a works meet-
ing was convened and a decision
taken to stop work—we are well aware of constitutional pro-
cedure, and of how much the management desire for this course to be
taken—past experience having
made us won to the thing the course with Smith’s manage-
ment.

The works have signified
willingness, at all stages of the
strike, to return to work
upon the management’s guarantee
that they will discuss the claims by a certain date; have received
this information, formally, on
two occasions. At these meetings,
and on the second occasion, the
information was given by the works committee in the presence of
Bros Berridge, Bird and McLaughlin of Smiths
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BY SID HOVELL

AUS and Bro O’Brien of the
NUGMW—the management cat-
categorically refused.

Bearin in mind that ap-
proximately three-quarters of the
20,000 workers in the dispute are
women, that many are young
women earning approximately
£5 per week and in many cases
paying £3 or £4 per week in
rent, it is not surprising that
their solidarity is taking the
strain so strongly. It does ap-
pear that the conditions under
which they face the cases where
direct hardship prevails and I would ask all organ-
isations and factory committees
who can help us face these
troubles to do so generously.

REINSTATE

BRO GILBERT

AT the National Conference of
Guards and Shunters, held in
Margate on May 26th and
27th the following resolution
standing in the name of the
London District Council was
considered at the Joint Session.

RESOLVED that in the face of
denning the despicable action of
the B.T.C. in victimising Bro.
T. Gilbert, Secretary L.D.C.
No. 3 Camden Town Depot.
“We demand that our N.E.C.,
if they have not already done
so, declare this to be a case of
victimisation and to act accord-
ingly.”

After an extremely lively de-
bate this resolution was put to
the vote. Result: 269 For. 1
cont. next page
Against. 1 Recorded Atention. Bro Gilbert's case will be discussed at the AGM. There the number of branches and District Councils have appealed against the NEC decision - "that no further action be taken in this case." The National Conference of Guards and Shunters condemned his dismissal as an act of virulence and called upon the NEC to act. All this with good cause for the case was one of blatant victimisation.

The reasons outlined in Bro Greenie's circular for reversing the NEC decision of "We are adamant Bro Gilbert must be reinstated in his former position" puts the management in a still more villainous light. They said - "We have ample evidence that Gilbert refused the order first and then got the men to back him by striking." Where and what is that evidence? For it never was produced at any stage of the disciplinary hearing. Every shunter concerned gave evidence that Gilbert acted on their instructions. Since the issuing of the circular they have declared "We stand by that evidence'.

The management have brought in one fresh piece of evidence. They said to our Head Office in Brook Greenie's circular -"On the night of December 8, 1960 a train of 45 wagons was taken into the yard at 4.15AM. and fouled the engine that should have shunted it. Gilbert refused to take the rear portion off the train."

The management never used this evidence at the disciplinary hearings for the simple reason it is untrue and would have been proved untrue by the witnesses. The management knew they could give no valid reasons for their determination to keep an engineer idle all night and were forced to invent one. It made our management and instead of accepting it as gospel, the NEC should have been even more determined to secure his reinstatement.

To our members at Camden, the management's desire was plain - the engine was kept idle in order to dispense with its use. The union's action of the shunters upset this plan.

To charge in and dismiss the LDC Secretary on such an issue strikes at the heart of militant action on the job against local attempts to bring about redundancies.

George London District Council has, from the beginning, fought for Bro Gilbert's reinstatement, and we should do everything possible to see that Chalk Farm's appeal to the AGM is successfully carried. *This report has been reprinted from Unility, organ of the London District Council NUR, June 1961.*

### REVIEWS

#### BOOK

**DESPITE the limitations both, of his vision and his ability to draw the relevant lessons, Mr Desmond Greaves has produced a book which is worth reading in The Life and Times of James Connolly (Lawrence and Wishart). All Socialists, and particularly British and Irish ones will benefit from a reconsideration of Connolly as a labour leader, and a reconsideration of his ideas. A hatred of capitalism with all its works and pompies, a complete rejection of blinkered democracy, and a clear and in-sight into the necessary connection between theory and action; these are the great Connolly qualities. We can say that they are not needed in the Labour movement of today more than ever before.**

Despite his hidebound Stalinist philosophy, Mr Greaves has the authentic historian's touch. (Just as well, perhaps, that Connolly was shot by British forces in 1916 and not later, when he might have caused concern in other quarters.)

One of the most interesting passages in the book is that dealing with Connolly's long but rather fruitless flirtation with the romantic International Workers of the World in America. The lessons for American labour abounded in these pages which contain, in microcosm, all the failings and inadequacies of the American labour movement. A good book to be read for background. Do not, however, expect any guiding morals for the future from Mr Greaves. He and his 'Connolly Association' in Britain are far too concerned with capturing political power for the CP for that.

#### FILM

**THE importance of the film A RAISIN in the SUN for socialists lies in its symbolic nature. On the surface the plot seems a fairly bourgeois one: the coloured man living in a rattrap of a flat, where his son has to sleep on the living-room sofa, where his mother's word and his mother's God are law, is becoming more and more obsessed with money, and estranged from humanity. His ambition is to make more and more money, until he will be as rich as the white man he envies and, so he believes, able to look the world as his."**

**especially his son, in the face.**

He invests his dead father's insurance money (entrusted to him by his mother to do what he likes with it) in a liquor store which does not materialise and it seems that the family will be completely shattered by this. But, as the career-girl sister's Nigerian boy friend points out, there is something wrong when all the dreams in a family are placed in "the bank which might never have happened", in the insurance money. Money, and, having put the down-payment on a house in an all-white area, the coloured man finally manages to overcome his desire for money and refuses to be bought out for a higher price by the "welcoming committee". Thus he attains manhood.

The importance of the film does not, however, lie in his reaching manhood, but in his recognition that if he wants to rise above his position of slavery and humiliation he must act for himself and try to make the money to do everything for him.

### Po Engineers  

**THE Post Office Engineering Union has met in conference this month at Scarborough and considered our situation in SR last month the Overtime ban has been rejected by 600 votes in a one-day ballot. In its place an Executive propos- al for a one day stoppage was overwhelmingly successful.**

This BUD - the extra express enough in all conscience for as the Times so rightly said, a pro-longed action would be far more harmful to the Post Office than a token stoppage of one day.**

The General Secretary Charles Smith a bureaucrat who has learned well the art of making militant noises without actually committing anyone to anything) in supporting the proposal for a one day strike on the point that the strike would only be called if the Post Office would give the Union assurances that our action would not be con- sidered breaking service. Strik- ing as it were by kind permission of the Post Master General. The Union is now paying for years of sterile anti-communist worship has meant that the Executive Committee has been composed of a set of intellectual spectres that are to the Right Catholic Activist caucus any nitwit is preferable to a Com- munist. (Under this general head- ing anyone who has had a thought to the Left of Rarum Novarum can qualify for the dusty word. God a clicking that the Communist Party as an organised faction in the POU has been practically non-existent since 1956 is apparently beside the point.**

The Union Establishment has been able, through the series of joint committees which proliferate throughout the structure of the Post Office, to disregard the members as a force in negotiations. The formulations of Royal Commissions which the departmental wages and conditions in "comparable" outside indus- try effectively ensure that wage levels in the Civil Service lag behind those of our industrial colleagues. That the whole set-up of Civil Service formalism is now being questioned is all to the good. What is heartening is that 10,000 Post Office Engineers in London felt that wages struggles were something which could be most usefully expressed in rank and file action against the boss. The contact between Branches and the liaison commis- sioner which helped to steer the overtime ban should be broad- ened and should consider ways and means of bringing the mem- bers in to a fuller awareness of their power in the fight for better conditions and wages.

**By J. Higgins**

### HELLISH BUDGET

**The American "Heller Budget" estimates that the wage which a US worker needs weekly to maintain a modest standard of living ("necessary to health and reasonably comfortable living") is $120 to $180. In the period, the former figure applying to those who rent their homes and the latter to those with homes of their own. This is $42 16s to $44 10s. The average weekly earnings of US factory workers in 1959 were $89.47 ($32). The only industries and trades in which production worker averaged the weekly wage "necessary to health and reasonably com- fortable living" were rubber, steel, synthetic rubber, plumbing, flat glass working and electricians. In contrast—"about $25,000, of potent- ial revenue is lost in the US through tax loopholes, and $5,000,000, by illegal evasion," according to Professor Gray of the University of Illinois. "Most of this loss occurs in corporations and high income brackets."
A number of recent happenings have served to underline the need for a reappraisal of society's attitude to punishment. There have been the savage jail sentences of 25 and 42 years imposed on two men who were found guilty of espionage (although one might have thought that the lenient sentence of 12 months was commendable, in creating the equal "balance of terror" so eagerly praised by official strategists). There has been the sentence on Victor Terry, hustled out of the court-room before he could hear the result of his appeal to the Lords. There has been the extension of the death penalty in the Soviet Union to such crimes as embezzlement and forgery, thus creating a criminal code reminiscent of the grimy days of pre-Victorian England. And, praised be for something positive for a change, there have been the results of the National Campaign for the Abolition of Capital Punishment, on a scale which comes nearest well for its ultimate success.

Behind the current prejudices against punishment, in whatever country, there stands a whole mass of irrational, ill-informed, sadistic and hysterical attitudes, stemming from a long and cultural level of the rated and the maniac obsessions of their rulers.

This seemingly sweeping generalisation is true especially of what may be called the physical punishment (in the form of judicial killing or beating). A few examples must suffice here. As far as flooring is concerned, a pre-war Departmental Committee of the Home Office established that violent criminals who had had the "cat" tend to, if anything, to commit more violent crimes afterwards than those who had not been so brutalized. Concerning capital punishment there is an abundance of statistics comparing the murder-rate in different countries with and without the death penalty. Statistics of the same kind are not in evidence in the degree to which hanging was or was not in abeyance.

The lack of accurate statistics have been widely publicised in such papers as the Observer and the Times, where the statistics, on the effects of capital punishment on military desertion, are less well known, and deserve some quoting (if only because certain Left-wingers still apparently feel that the Ealing Squad is a more efficient, moral, Socialist, or just romantic form of judicial killing than the gallows in the First World War over three thousand death sentences were passed on mem-

bers of the Red Army for desertion and "cowardice", and 36 of the condemned were actu-

ally executed. The death penalty was abolished for these offences in 1930 and, despite strong pressure to the contrary in 1942 from General Aushin-

leck and all his Army Com-

manders (and a similar, though less enthusiastic, recommendation from General Alexander in the same year), it was not re-in-

duced during World War Two. The average yearly in-

cidence of desertion in World War One was in fact considerably lower (10,266 cases or 1,000 troops) than in the last war (6,89 per 1,000) although the strictness of the battle in the First World War was incomparably greater, in the long run, than that experienced during the First World War" (R H Ahrenfeldt, Psychi-

atry in the British Army in the Second World War, p. 273, from which the above figures are taken).

It may be noted that shooting, for desertion, was a fairly common practice both in Trotsky's Red Army and in certain of the Inter-

national Brigades during the Spanish Civil War (although it was successfully resisted by the British Battalion).

Given these facts, the onus is on the worldwide proponents of capital punishment to prove that their methods are any more ef-

fective against forgery, embezz-

lement, treason, sabotage or re-

bellion than they are against murder desertion or (one may add) sheep-stealing and the other capital crimes of the pre-

Victorian calendar.

Why, in the teeth of so much evidence, do working-class, mid-

dle-class and ruling-class people persist in regarding these barbaric penalties as necessary? Part of the answer lies, as has been mentioned, in the impulses to destruction and torture that lie beneath the surface in all of us, and which are fully realised within large numbers of indi-

viduals in conditions of colonial war and totalitarian oppres-

sion. The belief in "an eye for an eye" evident in all moral theology, which one must to the Old Testament (Christianity, Islam) is also partly to blame. There operates a persistent anti-scientific habit, in-

culated over centuries, of re-

garding human beings as freely volitional actors who decide on their ac-

tions in the light of all the likely consequences. Hence there is a demand for "deterrence". This view of human behaviour simply does not do justice to the actual work-

ings of the minds of men, parti-

cularly criminal types (like poisons or politicians). In fact such people choose what to do on the basis of what kinds of ir-

rational, socially distorted motiv-

es, Which is why murder still takes place and nuclear war is at present more likely to hap-

pen than not.

The above argument is very sketchy, and especially does not pay enough detailed attention to the special reasons that ruling classes have for being cruel. It should be emphasized that no case for abolishing Capital is now has been put. People are not killed in wars as a form of deterrent punishment, but as a trial of naked force.

Two more quotations. First, Rosa Luxemburg, who was certainly no pacifist: "The

proletarian revolution needs no terrorism to attain its ends, and its supporters abhorrent murder. It needs none of these weapons because it fights against in-

stitutions, not against individ-

uals. Because it does not enter the struggle with naive illusions, it needs no bloody terror to re-

venge its disappointments."

Finally, our Abolitionists of the last century: "Is there not a necessity for reflecting deeply on the question of the support of the system that breeds these crimes, instead of glorifying the hangman who executes a lot of criminals to prevent a few only for a supply of new ones?" (Note: the quotations in italic are taken from an article in the New York Daily Tribune of May 18, 1853, by Karl Marx.)

October. On the contrary, they must profit by the example of the Camps and the Socialism and continue to organize a consistent campaign in every union and throughout the constituencies.

The Left should be grouped on the basis of a clear confirmation of the Scarborough decision, opposition to all bases and a break from nuclear arms. We should be in the NATO. Those who stand on this program should systematically visit all who can be won to the and convince them of the need to attend all Party and trade union meetings and vote for it.

The summer must be used to try, intensively to the Party, on the basis of the Scarborough policy. The branches of Victory, Socialism and Socialism should send speakers to every trade union branch which will accept them. We must ensure adequate ex-

clusive and widespread support for the program of the Left.

The unity-shouters must be told plainly that unity is possible only on the basis of (Scar-

borough) Party policy. Unionists immediately available to all those prepared to accept the Scarborough decisions and oth-

ers who are willing to do so must bear the full responsibility for any disun-

n

A flood of resolutions demand-

ing adherence to Scarborough, a break with NATO and oppos-

ition to bases: the removal of Callaghan, Crossman and Wilson from the NEC; a great summer campaign, in the tradition of the pro-

borgh policy and the people, and to extend and revive the movement. These are the tasks of the moment.

We are the Left must show that we, too, are prepared to fight for the cause. We Movement we love from the agents and fellow-travellers of Toryism who would destroy it.
Why the strike failed

BY DEV MUMARKA

DR Verwoerd's mouthpieces have gleefully concentrated on the comparative failure of the strike call by the Africans against the inauguration of the white South African Republic. But the failure does not imply any African support for the antics of Verwoerd's government.

The causes are simple enough and can be listed under three headings. First and foremost is the disunity between the different groups. On the question of the strike this manifested itself by a section of the Africans quietly ignoring the call. The strike undermined the tactical and political inadequacies of African leadership. This drawback is blocking African progress and radicalisation of African politics. The African masses are ready but not prepared to distinguish between subtle political differences of their leadership, which is hesitant and timid. Secondly, the occasion was ill-timed. To African masses it made very little difference whether the country was called a republic or a dominion. The issue was sufficiently academic for them not to risk too much for it. Even so, had the call been for a one day strike the response might have been better. By spreading it over three days the leadership ignored the economic realities. The Africans are not in a position to stretch their resources for such long periods unless the issue is a burning one in terms of bread and butter. Clearly the issue was not important enough.

In the third place the extent of Verwoerd's preparedness is not realised. Weeks before Republic day, Africans were under pressure. Their leaders were taken into custody, their houses were turned upside down and all the resources of a tyrannical state were stretched to the utmost to coerce the people away from strike. Then on the eve of the strike came the massive display of armed strength. True enough, there was a hard core of leadership which went underground but it was too scattered and too circumscribed to be of any effective use. This points to a serious shortcoming. By the very nature of the struggle in South Africa, a powerful organisation is required. Such an organisation will have to be partly underground and partly in the open. It should be capable of waging struggle effectively whenever the occasion demands it. This is nowhere in sight at the moment. Due to the peculiar geographic position of South Africa it is not possible to conduct any movement from outside the country. Unless the Africans pay some attention to this problem, again and again, they will be frustrated in their struggle. This is the most salutary conclusion which the Africans can draw from their own failure.

SPACE VOLUNTEER

WHERE Russia leads, let it not be said that English womanhood is far behind. Mrs. Doris McGarvie Munn, widow of Colonel Hugh McGarvie Munn of the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders, tells me that, when the Russians put their first sputnik into orbit, she went to the embassy in London offering to become the first women in space.

"I thought it would be wonderful if an English woman went up first," she said, as we sat chatting in the lounge of a small hotel in North Kensington.

"They didn't want me because I was an Englishwoman and not a Russian. That, I think, was the whole reason behind it."

Mrs. McGarvie Munn, who is in her late sixties, looked wistful.

"I did so want to be in Gagarin's shoes. Look what it would have meant for England."

"I don't think it would have troubled me. I have a good head for heights. I don't know such a thing as fear. I was the first woman in India to play polo. Side-saddle."

"I wouldn't even have minded Kruschev hugging and kissing me in public as long as I had done something for my country."

from the Evening Standard April 17 1961.
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WUNDERKINDER

continued from page seven

and seven. There's no doubt who will win—Big Business is mobilising its lobby to get us into the Common Market. But Macmillan has to be a shrewd operator if he can console small business, ditch it and preserve his crown intact. The drift is part of the act. He has sent his bright young men off to the colonies (and tied Powell down to health), packing the key posts at home with centrist mediocrities. He knows, as the Party does, that the change from a stagnant Commonwealth to brash and booming Europe is the decisive transition to the Organisation of African Unity: a dangerous change before he plunges, another chapter in Tory history to be closed as cleanly as possible.

"PEOPLE'S inspectors" are using cameras in Hungarian factories to check the efficiency of labour. According to the Communist weekly Hardi, work time was wasted—The Times, October 13 1960.
Letter

LAWRENCE

DEAR Comrade,

Lawrence Cadogan was a most interesting and exciting thinker, and I think I said as much in my review of Lady Chatterley's Lover (January 1961 Socialist Review). But I don't think I was all that wrong in misrepresenting him, either in saying that some of his judgement was a little hasty and simply, or in accusing him of laying 'fascism' at Lawrence's door.

Cadogan himself confirms what I said about this, in the very act of dissenting from it. If one reads the section of the essay concerned, from pages 55-61, it is clear that although Caudwell sees that Lawrence is a great artist, he measures him against a naive standard (nai ve from the point of view of literary criticism rather more than of politics) of 'going forward or back', or of being necessarily fascist or communist, (by which Caudwell meant 'stalinist'). Lawrence's 'ultimate' fascism is grounded on this assumption, as far as Caudwell is concerned, and that's that.

But how can one talk about Lawrence's 'ultimate' solution as being either fascist or communist? Caudwell himself sees well the inaccuracy of Lawrence's thought: on what grounds does he claim that the 'ultimate' resolution of the contradiction is fascist? For that matter, how could such a resolution be 'ultimate'? How ultimate is 'ultimate' in this case? Surely, if one wants to describe Lawrence's politics, there is a wide vocabulary of better epithets to use than this. Marx, in the section on Feudal Socialism in the Communist Manifesto, might provide a few. In any case, what is it that allows us to assume that Lawrence's solution is the thing that matters in talking about his work? Surely it is almost the least significant thing about his work, which is far too rich and full to be held in the confines of a pamphlet, still less a prescription.

The same essay also contains other interesting examples of generalisations which have come unstuck, or which were never even stuck together in the first place. One of these is a little homely about the novel as the last surviving bourgeois literary art form. If Peter Caudwell wanted to gather the rich best of Cadogan to themselves, he could have done it between the generation of Beckett, Osborne, and Arden will meet statements like this by brandishing them as inconsequential. It is no use raving at them for not prostrating themselves before the very things they were far to learn from a man whose thought is alive with dim truths and lively errors, than to lean on a god whose truths have mortified along with his sacred nonsense.

Nottingham
Franzally Ken Coates

PS: This reminds me that the article which has sparked off this argument was rather badly roasted by Socialist Review's correspondent: 'Under Chatterley's devil.' The last paragraph was gobbledy-gooed out of all recognition. Perhaps, this is an opportunity to put that right. It reads:

'But that's the trouble. Life is all one. You can't love in one small part of it, and regard the rest of it, of your fellows, to feed your love. They will feed your life with the power of your relation to them, and it will fester. Either you use others or you don't. Until we don't. Lawrence has not come into his own, however many read his books and dream the loves he dreams. When we have abdicated the slavery of the wages system, and tamed the factories with brotherhood, that will be Lawrence's day. Yet I think his book will help to bring it nearer.'

DIRECT ACTION

DEAR Comrade,

As one who has been I suppose a reasonably hard-core direct actionist may I comment on Peter Sedgwick's article?

Since only a minority of Industrial Workers believe in Unilateral Disarmament, it is obviously absurd to call now for a General Strike, or even to passively back a policy of blacking the bases for the immediate future. Both of these policies are obviously the objective. Now although there is certainly a very small minority of direct actionists which thinks in terms of personal witness, and of the protest that we can do now, the majority of us are concerned with the most effective way of getting Industrial Action (this does not necessarily mean that all of us who take part in direct action on the best way).

Socialist Review believes that by working within the corpse of the Labour Party it is getting to the masses, others not merely doubt this, but believe that being tainted by the prettification of that party is not going to endear you to any workers' nostrils.

There are three basic forms of illegal action, lacking violence, that commands us. The first is a purely symbolic demonstration aimed at getting press publicity in order to carry one's message to workers that way. (Soper and Meryn Jones have shown in Tribune and the New Statesman that they regarded the 1958 actions in this light, as a way of influencing the Labour Party; this might be useful while there remains in terms of workers on the shop floor, not their representatives in Parliament, threat in similar terms.)

The second, which would be applicable if most of the unions were already blacking the bases and if these were being run by predominantly "blackleg" labour, would be to maintain in conjunction with the various groups obstruction at any and every opportunity—provided that it did not endanger life and limb. It would be opportune to use such methods as sabotage, which at this stage would merely alienate people.

The third method, non-violent resistance proper, is designed to challenge the conscience of the people operating nuclear bases (or other evils) by one's readiness to take their violence on oneself; it is applicable at all times both now when we are in a minority and tomorrow—when, if we survive, we shall be in the majority; there is abundant evidence to show that people who have been subjected to Government propaganda and to conventional ethics are challenged and later converted by this method, where they have not merely by argument or by the number of pamphlets that we are likely to be able to afford to publish.

I would readily agree that Gandhi was no Pacifist, and that Indian Independence was not won by non-violence; but to any one who thinks this disproves the case for non-violence, I would say have you looked at India recently? I would also agree that Bhave and the post-Gandi Gandhian movement is also only part- pially pacifist, becoming incidentally less and less so; which is why Bhave works with Nehru on so much, and why Naga hillmen persisted, with incredible poverty, and with all the other evils of India, the only thing that Bhave considers worthy of Satyagraha campaign is "invisible film advertisements".

Dawson
Laurence Oter

FREE RAPTIS and SANTEN

ON the tenth of June, 1960, Michael Raptis (who writes under the name of Pablo), and Sal Santen were arrested in Amsterdam. Both of these men are leading members of the Tristkraft Fourth International, Raptis being the secretary of that body, and Santen a member of its secretariat. They were accused of forging papers, counterfeiting money and running guns to assist the Algerian FLN. At the same time, German police arrested four people in Osnabruck, accusing them of counterfeiting. Some four weeks later, a Mr J Zwart, who seems to be an associated several European police forces, went to the Dutch police to tell them that he had been producing counterfeit money.

Of the four people arrested in Germany, one was immediately released, denied all knowledge of any ring of counterfeiters, while the fourth, a Dutchman, "confessed" to having been involved in the printing of counterfeit money, alleging that Pablo had organized a circle of counterfeiters, and that Santen was an intermediary. Subsequent to Zwart's release, his "confession" was released, after which he stated that he had "nothing to do with this affair". Pablo and Santen have denied any participation in the counterfeiting of money. They have accepted the responsibility for helping to produce false papers, and industrial equipment, for the future Algerian state. They have cont. on next page
The "economic miracle" of Erhard and Federal Germany has only verbal analogies with British economic policy, but Britain has its Mr Macmillan, a slightly flinty Edwardian spinster of doubtful antiquity (or, as someone else would have it, a look like a rat), Mr Macmillan, the mirage, is wholly created by Colonel Macmillan himself.

But this is not to detract from his talent at keeping alive. Leaders of the Tories are notorious for their inability to grasp the situation when the sun shines, and quietly murdered when it rains. The corpses of the Chamberlain, Neville Chamberlain and even little Eden are kept in the basement whether they are baptised as King, just to remind the newcomers of the "horrid fate that follows failure." (You cannot become leader is a slippery game—the hard core of the Party must always be kept alive to keep it alive. There are landlords wanting rents up, the prevailing climate of inflation wanting the Bank rate changed, the exporters wanting subsidies, the farmers wanting a tariff upon imports, the industrialists wanting the tariffs taken off: little business wants protection from trade unions and competition, big business wants 'competition' and expansion, fixed incomes, the government wants heavy capital grants—the scramble for the public purse is as violent as a racecourse and one finds the doors of clubs and committee rooms.)

The only decisive force holding the long-haired is the common threat might deprive them all of everything—the working class. The shadow of this threat in the Commons is Her Majesty's Opposition: they keep the political party in existence. A class teacher on those rare occasions when differences become more important than fears—and it also means a question of how far they can go without upsetting the ballot box. More importantly, at the present time, the split in the Tories is fairly clear—big business is out to capture the Party. The Party historically belongs (look at the names) to the great banks, the industrialists, the professional and retired service officers, ex-Indian Civil servants, wealthy businessmen, the tattered remnants of the landed gentry. Their day is done; they were a war party and now their contribution to history is that they are still powerful—more powerful than anything else they seek to destroy. Always being out of the ruling class: they want stability, security, and destruction to all opposition from below. Crucially, they need the State to protect them, not just from challenges from the working class, but more importantly, the steady erosion of their domination by Big Business.

Big Business has no vested property interest—the managers don't care, there are enough capitalist entrepreneurs. They don't care about stability—their stake only increases as the economic situation worsens. They're so big that 'security' means merely restriction for them. These are the planners who compare the rates of growth of growth, see German business booming and expanding: but who are checking the German governm ents stricture cuts back investment to keep the price index stable (and so helps the first group). And importantly, Big Business does not need the State except as a vehicle of increasing monopoly capital in declining industries needs Government grants for prestige investment (cf. the Canadair ship, which the Canadair company could have financed, but preferred to by-pass to invest in more profitable air travel) but in the main, left to themselves, the organisation man will manage. The fact is that the State has been in the changing industries—and they can be set up as public corporations. So far as access to resources the big firms are already replacing the Welfare state as private welfare empires, the new corporate state.

And now the Opposition is weak, the Tories have difficulty in keeping together—or rather in restraining their wild men. The Lancet of England (the Times) to the peers as a separate organisation, and the rather violent Anti-Violent League doesn't seem to want a revolution. Uninhibited but scared. More importantly, in the Commons and in the State, imperialism and war-stages of the State (cf. his earlier resignation on this issue). Marples briskly juggling to in crease the taxes. In the interim, Amery's neutral budget last year is compensated by a gesture at the little men by Lloyd (so far as the big firms are concerned, the increase from the Chancellor's right hand in surtax concessions is taken away on the left by increased profits tax). But the general emphasis on present events and generalist economics. It has earned its critics—the Bow Group demanded that old-age pensioners should share the financial burden. So up they went, enough to answer the critics, not enough to satisfy the Tories or help the pensioners.

On Africa, the doubts are more serious. as events over the Common Market, Big Business might be prepared to slide off the whites onto the black bourgeoisie. The balance of white collar workers—young and new professional, business executives, journalists, journalists—looked—and the appeal when one Young Conservative declaimed that "the country is hounded into giving up its share of the burden". They accepted without protest Ministerial pronouncements on Africa (which would have explored the Party a few years ago), hints at the Common Market (what happened to the Empire and British Sovereignty?), misdirected suspicion of some empires—empires' attitudes toward white aggression is, in any and any successful was the magic (even 'em, mammy' was staged after the TV cameras were supposed to have left for the day), that Butler complained of the lack of opposition, and the Economist (22 Oct. 1960) commented: "the passing of anomaly motions by overwhelming majorities at times brought the proceedings perilously close to the risible.

In Parliament, conflicts cannot be so easily rigid. Even in the Cabinet, strains are growing up over the Lloyd-Home orthodoxy and the new men, MacLeod, Powell and a few others. But according to a recent leak, the State (cf. his earlier resignation on this issue). Marples briskly juggling to increase the taxes. In the interim, Amery's neutral budget last year is compensated by a gesture at the little men by Lloyd (so far as the big firms are concerned, the increase from the Chancellor's right hand in surtax concessions is taken away on the left by increased profits tax). But the general emphasis on present events and generalist economics. It has earned its critics—the Bow Group demanded that old-age pensioners should share the financial burden. So up they went, enough to answer the critics, not enough to satisfy the Tories or help the pensioners.

On Africa, the doubts are more serious as events over the Common Market, Big Business might be prepared to slide off the whites onto the black bourgeoisie. The balance of white collar workers—young and new professional, business executives, journalists, journalists—looked—and the appeal when one Young Conservative declaimed that "the country is hounded into giving up its share of the burden". They accepted without protest Ministerial pronouncements on Africa (which would have explored the Party a few years ago), hints at the Common Market (what happened to the Empire and British Sovereignty?), misdirected suspicion of some empires—empires' attitudes toward white aggression is, in any and any successful was the magic (even 'em, mammy' was staged after the TV cameras were supposed to have left for the day), that Butler complained of the lack of opposition, and the Economist (22 Oct. 1960) commented: "the passing of anomaly motions by overwhelming majorities at times brought the proceedings perilously close to the risible.

In Parliament, conflicts cannot be so easily rigid. Even in the Cabinet, strains are growing up over the Lloyd-Home orthodoxy and the new men, MacLeod, Powell and a few others. But according to a recent leak, the State (cf. his earlier resignation on this issue). Marples briskly juggling to increase the taxes. In the interim, Amery's neutral budget last year is compensated by a gesture at the little men by Lloyd (so far as the big firms are concerned, the increase from the Chancellor's right hand in surtax concessions is taken away on the left by increased profits tax). But the general emphasis on present events and generalist economics. It has earned its critics—the Bow Group demanded that old-age pensioners should share the financial burden. So up they went, enough to answer the critics, not enough to satisfy the Tories or help the pensioners.

On Africa, the doubts are more serious as events over the Common Market, Big Business might be prepared to slide off the whites onto the black bourgeoisie. The balance of white collar workers—young and new professional, business executives, journalists, journalists—looked—and the appeal when one Young Conservative declaimed that "the country is hounded into giving up its share of the burden". They accepted without protest Ministerial pronouncements on Africa (which would have explored the Party a few years ago), hints at the Common Market (what happened to the Empire and British Sovereignty?), misdirected suspicion of some empires—empires' attitudes toward white aggression is, in any and any successful was the magic (even 'em, mammy' was staged after the TV cameras were supposed to have left for the day), that Butler complained of the lack of opposition, and the Economist (22 Oct. 1960) commented: "the passing of anomaly motions by overwhelming majorities at times brought the proceedings perilously close to the risible.
A RIGHT FLING
BY PAUL HIGSON

THE Young Socialists held their first annual rally at Skegnes at the beginning of last month. It was the first Young Socialist rally that has been held, and was attended by Labour Party candidates, etc. as being extremely dangerous saboteurs bent upon smashing the Derbyshire Miner’s Welfare Holiday Centre. It was an old holiday—constantly crowding into the camp theatre, being told we were the ‘vanguard of social revolution’, ‘the shock troops of change’, the democraticbrigade of something or other, appealing, and leaving for the bar (there were at least four) feeling thoroughly elated.

There was a succession of speakers. Harold Wilson was in favour of more councils and recruited a racketeer Bert Wynn to agree with him that workers’ control was possible, a form of ‘positive socialism’. In eighty minutes of speeches from George Brown and Barbara Castle the word ‘defence’ was not mentioned once. Brown demeaned the left no end by telling them he was once like them—a tactic often employed by right-wingers. During the week members attended one of the Young Socialists, which was the most popular, international affairs and socialism in theory and practice.

But of course the highlight of the week was the event marked in the programme as ‘Put your questions, Rt. Hon. Hugh Gaitskell’.

We walked into the hall to find that the agents were marshalling the Gaitskellites into a solid block behind the speak unhurried, crossed the platform with his neck muscles working nine to the dozen.

At the end, Mr Gaitskell looked quite modest when some body started singing ‘For he’s a jolly good fellow’, but did not turn to the microphone to chastise us when we started chanting ‘Ban the Bomb’. The leader left to the RAF March Past.

NO SKYLARKS

Out of an estimated YS membership of 20,000 (the YS Highflyers estimate there were people present at the Rally. No doubt those who have youthful dreams of Westminster consider attended at the Rally imperative—while those in the YS who have an utter contempt for anything arranged by the Party were absent. The affair was as right wing as any gathering of Young Socialists will ever be.

Added to this, the comrades who were responsible for the skylarks at the Conference had become extremely conscious of their importance, leaving those heckling and dissection to the undramatic left, many of whom were too peaceful for this kind of thing.

EDITORIAL from page one

The boom of the Six has led to considerable improvements in wages, standards and holidays for all workers involved through their organized trade union effort. In many respects they are leaving the British worker behind.

A British Socialist Government seeing itself as a leader of developing European Socialism would welcome all steps to absolute freedom of trade and association with all peoples. At the same time it would expose the machinations of the British and European capitalist classes.

Because of the past there would have to be step-by-step economic arrangements, and workers most heavily affected must be retrained or fully maintained in the transition. But the British workers are the workers of the world unite!”. Foot and Co. have raised them as first issues.

The post-war economic problems of Western Europe thrust into the forefront. The 1960’s are seen as a socialist working class in the West, which is modernized with a socialist policy on banks. It will be much easier for us to end capitalism here and raise the banner of common ownership when we can cut ‘Britishers’ down to size.

THE NET TIGHTENS
cont. from page 1

pound. All the signs indicate that the Tories have resolved on some generous dose of an unpleasant medicine to remedy their condition. The medicine will, however, be administered to the working class. While no action will be taken to prejudice the still abnormal high profit margins of the capitalist firms, while the relief for the superstock exchange financier will go ahead and already there will be no direction of the nation’s resources which might interfere with the policy of reducing the present high rate of expenditure, tention will be paid to the workers.

TOTAL profits for the British Motor Corporation during the year ending July 1960 were £3.5m, made up of a profit on sales of £11.1m and a return of 1s 11d in the £. With an output of 669,000 units this is a profit per unit of £50. Capital employed was £93.3m. This means that the bosses can pay their shareholders and make them a profit return of 36%.

WHAT WE STAND FOR

War is the inevitable outcome of the division of society into classes.

The abolition of all charges for personal and small public transport.

War

The unilateral renunciation of the H-Bomb and all weapons of mass destruction, withdrawal from NATO and all other aggressive alliances and preliminary steps to international disarmament.

The withdrawal of all British forces from overseas and the transfer of all British capital in colonies and other underdeveloped territories to their peoples.

A Socialist foreign policy subordinated to neither Washington nor Moscow. Material and moral support for all workers in all countries in their fight against reaction and oppression and their struggle for socialism.

The establishment of workers’ committees in all concerns to combat hiring, bad plant and working conditions, together with the implementation of the principle of work or full maintenance.

The extension of the social services by the payment of the full industry in their contributions to retirement, together with the establishment of a free Health

and Industrial Health service.

The abolition of all charges for personal and small public transport.

War

The unilateral renunciation of the H-Bomb and all weapons of mass destruction, withdrawal from NATO and all other aggressive alliances and preliminary steps to international disarmament.

The withdrawal of all British forces from overseas and the transfer of all British capital in colonies and other underdeveloped territories to their peoples.

A Socialist foreign policy subordinated to neither Washington nor Moscow. Material and moral support for all workers in all countries in their fight against reaction and oppression and their struggle for socialism.

The establishment of workers’ committees in all concerns to combat hiring, bad plant and working conditions, together with the implementation of the principle of work or full maintenance.

The extension of the social services by the payment of the full industry in their contributions to retirement, together with the establishment of a free Health
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