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May Day in East Berlin

The Berlin crisis is getting worse and worse. Both power blocks face one another armed to the teeth, fighting for control of the city.

From the standpoint of the general relation of forces between the mighty world powers, the struggle over a single city seems incomprehensible. In the age of rockets and the H-bomb, why should the addition of one city be of such vital importance to any of the Powers?

For Washington, West Germany is an important bastion. The same big businessmen who supported Hitler and raised him to power are in control in West Germany. The economic and military might of Bonn is an important pillar of the Pentagon and Wall Street world empire. Militarily Berlin is a practically useless outpost, being geographically an isolated city in the midst of Eastern Germany. To understand why nevertheless Washington, Bonn, London and Paris insist on the "freedom of West Berlin" one must look at the damaging effect that West Berlin has politically, economically and socially over East Germany in particular and the Kremlin Empire in general.

West Berlin exposes all the social and political bankruptcy of the East German regime. It is the gateway through which some 2½ million East Germans ran away from the Stalinist paradise. They voted, and continue to vote, with their feet against the regime. The overwhelming majority of the refugees are young. They were brought up under the present regime which has been in existence for 16 years. They are not landlords and bankers, but almost entirely workers, students, teachers, doctors, housewives—the common people. All the countries under the control of the Kremlin are tightly closed, so that no one can know for sure what their people really think and feel about the regime. The one exception, the one chink in the armour, is West Berlin. East Germans could up to now quite easily pass through this chink and show clearly what they thought about the rulers and their rule.

The stream of refugees is a blow to the Kremlin not only, or even mainly, because it weakens the East German economy and strengthens that of West Germany. Above all, it exposes the tensions, dissatisfaction and frustrations that rend the Stalinist regime. The ordinary young people educated by this regime show by their flight that they do not prefer the regime of state capitalism to that of monopoly capitalism. Ulbricht is not better loved than Adenauer.

The Communist Parties try to explain the stream of refugees by referring to Western propaganda influencing people to leave their homes. This explanation cannot hold water. As if the beam of Western propaganda is stronger than that of Moscow in East Germany. Again it is argued that Washington and Bonn have made West Berlin a show place to attract East Germans. This is true.

But it is also true that East Berlin is a show place compared with other places in the Kremlin region. The standard of living in East Germany in general and East Berlin in particular is much higher than in Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland or the greater part of the USSR.

All Khrushchev's promises about the achievements of Communism, about the standing of West Berlin, must be seen as mere words, empty talk—by the stream of refugees flowing through Berlin.

Khrushchev faces the alternative of either allowing this exposure to go on or using force to stop it (thus giving the lie to the "withering away of the state", his recent statement talked of so much). He prefers the latter.

Berlin is the Achilles heel of the Kremlin regime. The two K's know this, which is why both are so adamant over the question of the control of Berlin. As militarily West Berlin is such a weak outpost for Washington to defend, she will probably have to retreat in the coming round of struggle, with or without loss of face.

In broad perspective the struggle over Berlin is part of the struggle over Germany, Europe and the world. For socialists there can be only one solution to the question of Berlin and Germany:

Withdrawal of all foreign troops—American, British, French and Russian—from German soil.

Freedom for the German people democratically to decide their own destiny.

A United Socialist Germany as part of a federated Socialist United States of Europe.

SIGNPOST

STAN
BEDWELL

BEARING in mind the weaknesses shown in the Labour Party basic economic work Industry and Society, it is no wonder that the 1961 smaller pre-Conference Signposts For The Sixties is even more uninspiring.

But at least three or four years ago Hugh Gaittie was able to make a great fuss of the proposition to place all landlord property under Councils' control; that, he said, was a major operation of public ownership. It has now fallen off the 'signpost'. A sign of the times.

No document, portending to take Labour to power, has ever been so vague and yet so sure that common ownership must be only whispered. If an industry is monopolistic or failing (presumably by orthodox capitalist economic standards—profits etc.) look out; it may be nationalized (again presumably by the old cont. page 6 col. 4
Nurseries Threat

D WILLIAMS

BEFORE the voters returned the Tories back to power in County Hall this year, they should have remembered the Tory record of previous years. The Trade Unionist majority in Middlesex has resulted in a renewed attack on Day Nurseries. It is a fact that 10 out of every 100 are finishing the job they started 6 years ago—that is, CLOSING EVERY DAY NURSERY IN THE COUNTY.

The Tory campaign against the nurseries dates back to 1952 when they imposed a MEANS TEST and fixed the 'ceiling' charge at 9/- per week. All parents who joined the nursery at this time were told that if they wanted to keep their children in the nursery their weekly contribution would be £11.150 per week with one child were obliged to pay this 'ceiling' charge.

Two deliberately designed to drive working mothers away from the nurseries, payed handsome dividends for the Tories as one after the other the nurseries were closed through lack of funds. When the Tories tried the Tories, 'no-one wants the service, we cannot keep it going, unemployable day nurseries, we must close them to save the ratepayers expense'.

The Tories instituted an MEANS TEST and demands on the nursery fees which the income from the nursery fees, these are seen advertised extensively in the working-class districts.

I believe that there is nothing too good for our class and by the same reasoning I do not believe the Tories will be able to do now what they couldn't achieve nine years ago.

But on this occasion they enjoyed the victory then. Unity and a common will and aim. Now is the time when every working-class representative should join together in demanding an END TO THE MEANS TEST MAKE THE NURSERY SERVICE A FREE SERVICE AND BUILD MORE DAY NURSERIES.

P.O. Overtime Ban

B LYMAN POEU

THE birthright of all workers is, without any doubt, their right to strike. The Post Office Engineers' Union was submitted to the employ of the Post Office and it was finally negotiated. In May an overtime ban was called by the Cable & Wireless branch, whose lead was followed by a number of branches in the London area.

The leadership of the union far from supporting its members pleaded with them to return to overtime work. It must be pointed out that the ban only resulted in voluntary overtime and not a strike. The workers had no choice but to accept.

The leadership of the Union pledged to the abolition of overtime and to urge its members to work overtime. However worse was to come in the form of a proposal by the employers to make a Special Agreement to substitute a one-day token strike for the overtime ban. As it is not clear whether this was a voluntary or a strike action the ban would be more harmful to the Post Office than the token stoppage of one day.

Contrary to expectations the overtime ban was rejected by some 600 votes in a total vote of roughly 70,000 and the one

day token strike accepted. Only after the vote had been taken did the General Secretary Charles John reveal that the ban would only be called if the Post Office would give assurances that the action would be considered a red breaking service. Striking as it was by kind permission of the Post Master General.

The most dishheartening thing about wage claims in the Post Office is the formulation of Royal Commissions. When we demand that wages levels in the Civil Service be based behind those of our inferences of the Ministry of Labour.

What is heartening is that 10,000 Post Office Engineers in London felt that wages struggle is a powerful weapon to protect the City of London.

The Union membership is starting to exercise the executive power of their wages to protect the better conditions and wages. On one hand, are they being to realise how damaging their rejection was of a call for a strike policy some time ago. Although I do not like that strike action except as a last resort I realise that it is in the workers own interest to refuse to be robbed of his right to use this weapon when necessary.

The Lethargic Giant

BIL CROUCH TGWL

NOT the least distressful feature of the so-called "mini-cab war" is the way in which it has split the group of workers in direct conflict with another group, simply for the profit of one rich and callous racketeer. If we suppose for a moment that the Welbeck Mini-cab misadventure achieves a semblance of order, the drivers must be obvious to the most naive. Without question it will mean a depression of wages and conditions for all the workers concerned.

We all despair of the noise behind the mini-cabs, has said that to make his adventure pay, his drivers must do 60 engaged miles per day. The legitimate cab-driver, with his right to pick up in the streets and permission to play in the authorized standings, can do only 40 to 45 engaged miles per day. This means that the mini-cab driver will have to work a third as long again as the ordinary cabman and, at a shilling a mile, will still earn as much money.

The working conditions of the legal cabmen are far from good and they have fought desperately over the years to improve them; yet the cabman whose driver would undermine the whole fight—and for what? To do a difficult job under increasingly difficult circumstances for a smaller return.

The Cab Trade is a peculiar one, and it is not easy to find an analogy to illustrate the position, but perhaps the following will serve.

Imagine a man publicly announcing that he intends to load his loaded and pretty rich goods on his own field at a cheaper rate than the licensed porters. Imagine one morning a large body of men to be employed at the job by an independent person, and that in the meantime the men should carry on as usual and not allow themselves to be provoked. Imagine, if you possibly can, the licensed porters to make the same conditions, and you will have some idea of what is happening in the cab trade.

Here then are these garish little abominations, freely trafficking in the express invention of taking people from point A to point B. We pay the wages, we pay the expenses, we are not to be deceived by any attempt to get rid of us; this cannot be deemed as plying for hire unless the cabmen are not to be heard, and even more if the cabmen are not to be heard.

Is the Union doing the coming out? Well, it has acted responsibly. It has moved carefully, and made overtures to the Ministry of State, and the Commissioner of Police. It has had its case presented in the House of Commons. It has called three mass meetings of angry cabmen and poured out many brave words on the long-suffering air—liberally interspersed with warnings and pleas to the cabmen to do nothing—and it has left the fate of the trade in the hands of the police.

And what have the police done?

On the twenty eighth of June Bro Bob Mellish told a mass meeting of cabmen that the police would bring five prosecutions against Welbeck Motors "in a matter of days". At the time of writing, six weeks later, only one of these cases has come to an outcome which was a far from happy one for cabmen. Wages have been reduced, having pleaded guilty to the charge of plying for hire was fined 10 guineas and 80 shillings. The Chief Motor was given an absolute discharge, the magistrate Mr W Frampton remarking that he was satisfied with the defendents.

So much for police action to date. The wheels of the law may or may not move, but it is certainly obvious they grind exceeding slow.

It would now seem that the time had come for that mighty but rather lethargic giant, the T&GWU, to have to flex its muscles if it doesn't want one of its smaller organs bowled over by the giant if not bitten off completely.

SOCIALIST REVIEW
Teachers Fight Back

C. DALLAS NUT

FOR a number of years profits have been rising considerably. The capitalists own the economy and have a staunch Tory government to help them. Wages too have been rising, but not in some cases by quite large amounts. The organised workers in large numbers of industries have strong union shop floor organisations through which they fight to wrest conditions from the bosses. The white collar workers have neither the one nor the other, with the result that although their salaries have risen somewhat with the general rise in standards, they have not anything like except pace.

The lack of militant organisation ready to take strike sanctions is at last being keenly felt by the teachers. Members of the NUT, which embraces three-quarters of the 300,000 teachers in the country, and the other teachers organisations, feel that they have too long heeded the mitigations of those among them who have taken to heart warnings about the "economic conditions in the country" as always terrible. But new negotiations are being entered into—and who fear the moral effect on their pupils of strike action.

A teacher completing a two-year and from now on a three-year training course, on starting work at about the age of 21, gets a gross weekly income of £60, which, minus 6% superannuation, income tax and National Health charges, leaves him with the magnificent income of less than £5 a week. The cowl from £520 to £1000 maximum takes a full 17 years, bringing him up to about 38 years of age. No wonder that in order to make ends meet during the years of heavy family commitments vast numbers of teachers have to take on evening, weekend holiday jobs, earnestly study the books they require or keep up with new material on their subjects. Nor that schools of all types, but more particularly the secondary modern schools which house 75 per cent of the country's children find it almost impossible to get qualified teachers in certain subjects, more particularly mathematics, science and crafts, as any person qualified in these fields, unless he has the strongest sense of vocation, will opt for higher remuneration in industry. An aggravating factor is that the three-yearly Burburnham negotiations—far too long a period in these days of rising prices—have for a long time increased differentials in the profession, always to the detriment of the majority on the basic scale.

The teachers demanded a scale of £700—1300 with a 10-year incremental period. The authorities offered £600—1200 with a 16-years incremental period, the scale to start next January. This offer was rejected by the NUT which threatened a national one-day strike and prolonged strikes in chosen areas. When the Minister of Education spat in their faces and cynically reduced the small offer of £47 million— which the teachers' panel on Burburnham agreed to accept after the "Little Budget"—by a further £5 million, the teachers were faced with a number of local school strikes took place, actions which are quite unprecedented for teachers in this country. After the holidays are over we may expect greatly increased activity of this sort.

To gain strength for their struggle, the teachers are seeking joint action with the other white-collar workers hit by the Chancellor's "pause"—mainly Civil Servants and Local Government officials. Unfortunately their present militancy may be watered down by the millennial temper of the leaders of the Civil Servants' Unions, one of whose first pronouncements was that they did not contemplate strike action, thus greatly weakening their fighting strength before they even begin. The NUT would do well in addition to seek allies in the industrial unions also fighting for increases and hit by the "pause", notably the railwaymen, Post Office workers, etc.

The NUT has a permanent item on its annual Conference agenda—to affiliate to the TUC. It has never yet been passed. We now have an opportunity to put the principle into practice by allying with the industrial unions who are more experienced in militant struggles over wages than we are, and whom we at the same time can assist with our weight.

C. Dallas NUT.

Sack Selwyn!

TRUE to Tory form Selwyn Lloyd has lashed out in his summer budget and imposed ever more onerous duties which will at least be afforded them. The Chancellor's attempt to stabilize our rotten living economy is the effect on the already inadequate Borough Council building program.

We have never failed to ram home the fact, however, that Labour Councils have always got the kicks for putting up rents it is in fact due to deliberate Government policy—that of imposing high interest charges on money borrowed to build new Council homes.

The following quotation from shows again where the finger of housing shortage should be pointed.

On August 3rd it was announced that the rate of interest on long-term loans from the Public Works Loan Board would go up to 7 percent. This is the highest rate ever; the last time there was a severe credit squeeze in the Autumn of 1957, interest rates on PWLB loans did not go above 6% percent.

This 7 percent of interest means that the ultimate cost of a £2000 council house, paid for over a period of 60 years, is £8537, of which £6357 is interest.

Local authorities are not allowed to borrow from the Public Works Loan Board unless they have tried and failed to borrow on the open market. But in practice local authorities have been finding recently that they have to pay more than 7 percent for short-term loans. The Municipal Journal comments August 4th 1961.

"There have been offers of six-months money at 7% percent and for 10 to 15 years mortgages 7% percent has been asked. These are terms which local authorities, however desperate, must find it very difficult to accept."

The increase in PWLB rates to 7 percent is thus merely bringing public loans into line with the rates prevailing for those local authorities who have to go to the City. Indeed in reply to a question from Mr. Frank Alliott (Lab. Saltford) Mr. Barber, Economic Secretary to the Treasury, said it would be unfair for local authorities borrowing from the Board to borrow more cheaply than those borrowing on the market (August 3rd).

The annual loan charges at 7 percent of 142s a year represent about £245,84d. a week of which about £2 a week is interest. Clearly the rents of new council flats out of which this interest has to be found will tend to be fixed higher than ever.

UP TAILS AND AT 'EM

"THE Government is making a determined diplomatic effort to dissuade General Kassem, the Iraqi Prime Minister, from making a military move against the Middle and Far East on Thursday night. Foreign Ministers and British Ambassadors were called away from dinner parties for urgent consultations."

Daily Telegraph July 1, on the Kuwait-Iraq crisis.
It's Rich

"Lord Home, the Foreign Secretary, told an audience of Harvard University alumni at Cambridge, Massachusetts, today that "the manifest justice of British colonialism" might be the example which would clinch the case against communism in the minds of the neutral and the unaligned."—Times 12 June.

"I am not a believer in the hereditary peerage"—Alfred Robens on receiving a life peerage in the Birthday Honours.—Times 12 June.

"But to classify him with the dictators that have ruled by cruelty because they could not do so by consent or by clemency would be a fantastic distortion of the truth"—Guardian obituary on Trejillo 1 June.

"Unprecedented security precautions marked President de Gaulle's visit to Bonn to-day. Every hospital in and around Bonn was stocked with French blood of the President's group"—Observer 25 May.

"while the Russian grain has been pouring into London their Chinese allies, threatened by famine, have had to turn to Canada and Australia for large shipment of barley on credit"—Observer report entitled 'Soviet dumping hits bumper British crop' 11 June.

"Married couples put their work first and their life together second"—Director of a Shengyuan heavy machine-tools plant to Denis and Ana Mathews—Guardian 29 May.

"It requires a great deal of class consciousness to work through the year"—Janos Kadar quoted in Economist 10 June.

OUT NOW AUTUMN 1961

IS 6

CONTAINING: AMERICAN SOCIALISM, LABOURS SUICIDE, CARRIBBEAN PILGRIM, FOR AND AGAINST A REFORMISM, BRITAIN AND EUROPE.

TU COMMENTARY CONTINUED

Wiltesden

Wilkesden 'done proud'

F. HARWOOD AEU

THE US seamen's strike, which began on June 15th, was over; new contracts for six seamen's unions. One issue was the demand for recognition of the right of US unions to recognise the union of US companies which avoid US taxes and union wages by operating under 'flags of convenience'. Other demands included a 12 percent wage increase over four years and a shorter working week.

Negotiation had reached the final stage and company representatives were reporting back to their boards when US Secretary of Labour, Arthur Goldberg, was called to New York to announce the settlement. Instead of this Goldberg called for a voluntary 90-day suspension of the strike and a fact finding committee. The shipping companies seized this opportunity and withheld final agreement.

The unions rejected this delay tactic and on June 27th Kennedy started up the Taft-Hartley Act machinery, which would force the seamen back on a compulsory 80 days in lieu of a settlement; but had the voluntary 60 days been agreed to by the unions the Taft-Hartley Act could still be forced on the unions after the 60 days if agreement had not been reached during this time.

TEA BREAKS

THE following is a copy of a statement being issued by the NFBO to its members. "The wage increase of 6d per hour from the 1st of October next and the reduction of hours gives building operatives the biggest single improvement in their conditions in the history of the industry."

When these changes were being negotiated the employers made it quite clear to the operatives representatives that it was essential that the shorter number of hours should be fully worked.

The practice of having tea breaks grew up under war-time conditions and its continuation has involved a considerable loss of productive time. The new rule gives employees an opportunity to take steps to minimise these losses.

Builders recognise the importance of breaks to production and they insist that breaks should remain unpaid. To those who say that the new rule does not mention the word 'unpaid', the reply is that the old rule concerning the breaks did not mention it either, and no-one in his right senses contended that the dinner break was a paid one. There is no difference in principle between dinner interval and morning and/or afternoon refreshment breaks and they should be treated in the same way.

Lastly, you should know you are not alone in the matter, as employers all over the country have expressed their determination to see that the refreshment breaks are once again brought under control!"

Our general policy, however, is WHAT WE HAVE TO HOLD. Therefore your efforts must be directed to that end.

No ambiguity about this, is there?

SOCIALIST REVIEW

"the trade unions have become at once the repositories of mighty social power and the beneficiaries of unusual legal privilege; it is not entirely a joke to say the last group of people to enjoy a similar combination of great power and special privilege were the French aristocrats just before 1789"—Economist 27 May.

"They (the Cuban revolutionaries) thus became socialists, some earlier than others; but by the time Fidel announced it, they had all made it"—Saul Landau in New Left Review No 9.

"In March 1921 the Tenth Communist Congress met at Moscow, and Uljanov Lenin is reported to have declared his abandonment of Communism and conversion to the principle of natural economic development under Trade Treaties with Great Britain"—Whithakers Almanack 1922 (page 922).

G. FERRIS

AEU

TGWU

OMAR
The growth of the "human slave" under capitalism, the last two decades is of fundamental importance to any study of the mechanism of modern capitalism. Until 1914, war was epitomized by the "gun boat." Not until the blood bath in the trenches did the means of production reflected in the organization of labour permit the mass destruction to mirror the mass production of Ford cars. The first world war was a significant departure from previous wars in that a majority of the population and a major portion of the economy were organized into a military effort. This total war mobilization did not become permanent until 1939. An economy permanently linked to war was of profound significance for it coincided with the disappearance of the major trade slump from the capitalist economy.

Until then a cyclical cycle of depressions and slumps, of roughly ten yearly intervals had been a central feature of capitalism. Moreover all these slumps, except the final catastrophic slump of 1929-34 had been followed by a greater boom. Yet even in 1939 the USA had not regained the 1929 level of production and mass unemployment was a permanent feature of all democratic capitalist countries—11 million were out of work in the USA, 13 million in Britain. Only in the fascist countries where the working class in excess of 3 million, was reduced, wages reduced to pitances and a war economy got under way was there full employment.

To understand the impact on the capitalist economy of the arms race we must examine the basic cause of capitalist crisis—overproduction resulting from the relatively low purchasing power of the masses. "The last cause of all real crises always remains the poverty and restricted consumption of the masses as compared to the tendency of capitalist production to develop the productive forces in such a way, that only the absolute power of consumption of the masses would be sufficient to them limitation." (K. Marx, Capital, Vol III, p 568)

The fundamental trend in capitalist society is to concentrate a greater and greater percentage of the income of society into the hands of the capitalist class. This means that a greater and greater part of this income is used not for consumption but for the accumulation of more capital. But all means of production are in reality potential means of consumption (even under capitalism). Thus all increases in accumulation must lead to overproduction. Output will increase but because of the mass's restricted purchasing power the increased output will remain unsold.

The 19th Century solution to this problem was imperialist expansion which resulted in the collision of two rival imperialist political societies; the first and second from the front line. Since 1914 many barriers have arisen against imperialism, such as the growth of national movements in the colonies and the expansion of the Stalinist bloc. This has reduced the area available to imperialist expansion.

For capitalism to survive a new solution was needed. The ground was prepared by the bourgeois economist Keynes. An ideological proponent of the great slump. Until Keynes, economists did not regard the slump as part of capitalism. Jevons blamed unemployment on the climate for being too wet.

The basic tenet of Keynesians is that capitalism is not self-regulating. To keep the economy in rough equilibrium a "pump primer" is needed. This is provided by the State directly or indirectly.

If a slump is developing the State must take measures to intensify economic activity, such as increasing cutting interest rates, increasing credit or even spending money on public works projects to increase employment. If the right method is chosen this will increase the community's purchasing power more than proportionately to the initial state expenditure. This is because by employing workers who will spend the majority of their income this extra purchasing power is passing on to the consumer who again spends the majority of this extra income on commodities. The process reverberates throughout the economy and has a "multiplier" effect on production.

The converse method is used to combat inflation. You cut the masses' purchasing power by an austerity policy. Better Robin Hood than public spending, by taking from the poor and giving to the rich, as the Tories have been doing since 1951.

Unfortunately very few capitalists would listen to Keynes. They preferred the big profits they continued to make during the slump and the vast industrial reserve army. Even Roosevelt's moderate proposals were stubbornly resisted and were unable to prevent the renewal of the slump in 1938.

With the advent of the "great experiment" as Keynes called it, WWII the Keynesian economics was assured. When we consider the conditions under which the so-called "public works" program to end unemployment can work we see why:

1) It must compete with private interests in the same field. A state factory producing clothing would not decrease but increase production. But only the State produces H-bombs.

2) It must provide works for the industries most hit by slumps—the capital goods and industries of the industries whose weight in the economy is increasing and whose wages pre-dominate in the ruling class.

3) That they do not add much to—indeed preference should sub- serve from—increasing the productive capacity of capitalism, and should as much as possible, tend to bring down the growth of social capital.

4) That they do not add much, if at all, to the output of mass consumer goods, and thus are not dependent on higher wages for an increasing market.

5) While not adding to the productive capital in the community, the capitalist class must consider them an important factor in the defence of its wealth and even a weapon for enlarging its prospective market.

Thus the ruling class accept them.

The American capitalists that Keynes was instrumental in convincing when he incurred very small pre-war annual budget deficits (1933 $27.6 billion, 1935 3.0, 1936 4.3, 1937 2.7) did not mind a deficit of 59 million in 1941-2.

- Furthermore whatever public works undertakes on one section of the capitalist class with the benefit indirectly (through the multiplier) but be hit directly by tax. The sections of the ruling class—those in heavy industry, the monopolists and the bankers have a direct interest in the "public works" proposals can they be carried out on a wide enough scale to meet these sections of the ruling class.

- The public works program can only succeed on an international scale. That Keynes must participate to an extent corresponding to their national share of the total output. If all or two countries were to do so, they would have less resources than the whole world, they would suffer more than others from inflation and would be defeated in the struggle for world markets. If we keep this in mind, the vital characteristics of prosperity-stabilizing public works as the bourgeois well realize.

"By the spectacular achievement of its planned economy, war production has been a stimulus to the Development of demand and a waste of unemployment. Finally, war experience confirms the possibility of securing full employment by socialization of demand without socialization of production", (Lord Beveridge, Full Employment in a Free Society.)

- "Depression of a severe kind..." (ii) ...simply not in sight. Armament is only a prelude to a more prosperous society of the present and the foreseeable future", (US News and World Report, 1943).

The normal level of consumption of capital by arms production has been in the region of 10 per cent, 40 per cent is an enormous mobilization of an economy's resources when we remember that even in a period of most rapid capital accumulation at least 80 per cent of the national income has been consumed and in most periods it is over 90 percent. This means that the rate of accumulation consumes the bulk of accumulated capital, thus preventing any widespread crisis of overproduction—industrial depression or a change in the social repercussions of war. Hitherto all wars have posed the guns or butter problem after the beginning of the war. Now this question is removed by the expansion of hostilities. This plus the knowledge that war is synonymous with annihilation has made the H-bomb a major political issue.

Due to lack of space we have had to leave over the final part of this article until the October issue.
"A virtuous man will teach himself to recollect the principle of universal benevolence as often as pious men repeat their prayers."

William Godwin

HENRY COLLINS

If men practiced benevolence towards each other society would be sound, happiness widespread and intellectual and moral progress infinite. This could be the text for a rapid sermon. In Godwin's hands it became one of the forming ideas of British and world socialism.

Godwin was born in 1756. His youth coincided with the birth of industrial England. During the 1760s John Wilkes roused the people in defence of parliament and civil liberties against the autocratic tendencies of George III. In the 1770s Thomas Spence demanded the public ownership of land as the only foundation for a just society, freed from oppression and degradation. At the end of the following decade feudal Europe was shaken to the point of collapse by the great French Revolution. And in 1793 Godwin published the first edition of Political Justice. It was to play its part in moulding the ideas of two generations of socialist pioneers.

Godwin's ideas stemmed from philosophy rather than directly from practical conclusion. His philosophical roots were in Locke, Rousseau and the revolutionary spirit of French Encyclopedists. With Locke, Godwin saw the mind of man as a complex receiving mechanism. Sentiments, arriving from the external world were transmuted by reason into ideas, both intellectual and moral. With Rousseau, Godwin perceived the inherent equality of man and the sharp, bitter contrast between this innate equality and the prevailing inequality deriving from social conditions. From the Encyclopedists and, most particularly, from Helvetius, he learned that man's character was formed for him by his social environment. If this environment could be made rational and free, man, in turn, would become rational and free.

Innately, the human mind was neither good nor evil, neither wise nor foolish. It was whole and unmarred. Yet in many cases a ghastly mass. Most men worked too long and too hard for the conditions of crippling poverty. The privileged few, emancipated from the need to work, were also emancipated from the discipline, commonsense and common humanity that went with work. If the poor were vicious from ignorance, greedy because of want, the rich were vicious from idleness and greedy because of greed.

More than a century and a quarter later, a man would write of the "Acquisitive Society," but Godwin, in the first decades of industrial capitalism, described its consequences in eloquent and power. His main weaknesses were those he shared with the French revolutionary materialists from whom he derived. As Pekhanov was later to demonstrate in his essay, "French Materialism of the Eighteenth Century," Helvetius regarded man and his characters and opinions as the effects of their environment. But if he came to explaining how the environment itself to be changed, they looked to a change in men's opinions, to the enlightenment of revolutionary ideas. No thinker of the eighteenth century was able to escape from this contradiction. And in Godwin's case the dilemma was to drive him, more than once, over the edge into absurdity.

Though he called his book an Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, it was with social justice Godwin was, in fact, concerned. Government, like property, originated in violence. It was in Godwin's view that the means of injustice it could not be the means of its eradication. Property, by its very nature, gives power over man, while government gave him the means of political influence. If property led to gross inequality and, hence, to poverty for the great majority, political coercion warped men's character and judgement. Political coercion, therefore, could not be a means of emancipation and all organisation carried with it the seeds of coercion. Reason was the only avenue to freedom and, hence, to a new world and a new type of human society.

With the spread of reason men would learn the futility of superstition, belief in God, and the joy of moderate, creative labour. As the new ideas caught hold, a new pattern of living would be built. The idea of a system of transportation and commerce, and government, men would become fully human.

"The vices which are inseparably joined to the present system of society," wrote Godwin, "would inevitably expire in a state of society where men lived by the bounty of the nature. The narrow principle of selfishness would vanish. Nothing man being obliged to guard his little store, or provide, with anxiety and pain, for his restless wants, each would lose his individual existence in the thought of general good. No man would be an enemy to his neighbour, for they would have no subject of contention, and of consequence philanthropy would reunite the empire which reason assigns her."

Godwin's ideal communities were to be small and individualistic. Co-operation would be ad hoc, voluntary, not institutionalised. The standard of living would be frugal, not luxurious, and poverty would disappear. Intellectually and morally, if not materially, men would reach for the stars.

Politics, by its nature, implies the subordination of the individual. They were therefore rejected. In 1795 Godwin went so far as to publish an anonymous pamphlet (signed, significantly, "Lover of Order") supporting the Government's repressive measures against democratic agitation. Two years earlier, Pitt had refused to bar the French Revolutionary. The masses, he believed, were unlikely to be subverted by an unbridled philosophical treatise costing three guineas.

Yet Godwin became the centre of an intellectual movement with profound repercussions. The poets Wordsworth, Southey and Shelley were, at one time, under his spell, during the period in which they welcomed the French Revolution as the dawn of a new age of human freedom. Godwin's wife, Mary Wollstonecraft, was the first advocate of women's emancipation. Her daughter, Mary, married Shelley, who translated the philosophy of Political Justice into undying poetry. Robert Owen learned from Godwin that private property must be abolished to create an environment worthy of human beings.

France placed Godwin's ideas to the test. The atmosphere of Godwinian libertarianism, applied some of his ideas in political life, late 19th century essay on Avarice and Profusion, which appeared in 1797, Godwin argued that economic progress, under capitalism, would benefit the poor. On the contrary, it would perpetuate poverty and lengthen the working day, an idea which was to provide a central theme for Marx's Capital. The rich would benefit the poor, Godwin showed, not by employing them in factories and mills but by selling off their backs. And in his most famous novel, Caleb Williams, which has become the classic of a new circulation than any of his political writings, Godwin exposed the cruelty of the system of transportation and forced labour, and government, the system to initiate the movement for penal reform.

One celebrated figure, who became a parson, was worked by Godwin's "property," was Thomas Robert Malthus, in 1798, wrote his Essay on the Principle of Population to prove that social progress was impossible and perpetual poverty inevitable unless the poor had fewer children through voluntary, moral self-restraint.

cont. from page 1

STATE METHODS OF STATE BUREAUCRACY, heavy compensation to share-holders, or one to two TU leaders on the boards etc.

The document reflects the incapacity of the Labour leader to grasp the opportunities offered by Tory inefficiency right now. The most recent case is New Zealand, one of the few more selective state controls.

Tory dislike of state intervention is bemoaned, "Those who identify laissez-faire with liberty, democracy, progress, however, they believe, are told, we are told. This is merely a pathetic indication of how Labour is now viewing the political scenery for the next few years.

Either get enough votes to take power in order to poke at capitalism with more and more state intervention, or try to push through a Charter with the promise that the latter are being obliged to do so in any case.

It is folly to anticipate the next Labour election manifesto, that promises to renounce a Party basing itself purely on electorates,

When the Party conference meeting begins in September it if not to denounce the Tories, call for a general election and make its own proposals for government.

In the foreword we are told that the Tories have bought time and are "doing deals." There is no much time to buy, it says.

Labour's recent reform of the Labour leadership is mostly responsible for the market conditions in which time has been bought so cheaply! The Tories may take a lot more time if all they have to confront is Signposts going all over the place.

It doesn't say, but we assume the thing is just a "home" treatment for a deadly indicator without some reference to the H-Bomb would be the most significant of all Labour policies. Mankind cries aloud for a lead out of the nightmarish atomic arms race. So we must stick to the economic considerations. This Wilsonsensate Keyston doctrine is the same nasty medicine.

Keynes' proposition was mostly that by sufficient state management of capitalism its worst excesses could be so mitigated as to prod it out of all recognition and have a "Czechoslovak" capitalist managerial reason would prevail. By that thesis it is surprising Wilsonsensate Keyston doctrine and Labour Movement at all.

Apart from the denationalisation of steel and the partial demilitaryisation of road haulage, the Tories have been mostly content to make use of Labour gains. The limited distance placed under state control by the Labour Government.

Tory self-styled "free enterprise" was not set up until 1951, so it was pretty easy to dismantle as soon as the Tories took control that year. The limit distance placed under state control and to renationalisation and so it is stated in this document. The

cont. on next page
Charity is not enough

RAY CHALLINOR

WHEN considering the evils of 19th century industrialism, such as women and young children working in coal-mines, we like to slide into complacency. We say, "Of course, this sort of outrageous thing couldn't occur in our enlightened age."

But we would do well to remember that what to-day is unanimously thought to be wrong was then considered perfectly proper. The argument, for example, in North Staffordshire, where I live, workers opposed the ending of child-labour because it would lessen family incomes. To them, child-labour in the pits was regarded as quite natural and inevitable.

Now I contend that many of the things, unquestionably accepted by this age of unrivalled affluence, will be considered scandalous and barbaric a 100 years hence—that is if Mankind is still alive. Our successors will, I think, cite examples like these to show that a society which could spend millions on armaments and advertising could not meet the most elementary human needs—:

Cancer patient 8517. Poor widow (67) with three motherless grandchildren to care for. Nourishing foods particularly needed. Can you help please? (Health, etc., gladly utilised).

Cancer patient 0657. Spinster (27), cancer of the womb, needs warmth and extra nourishing foods...

Cancer patient 60953. Poor man (68) with wife also suffering from cancer. Very fortunate OAPs are bravely facing their tragic circumstances, but find it very difficult to provide the nourishing diet they so badly need...

These appeals, and many others, have appeared in the British Press recently, issued by the National Society for Cancer Relief. But such voluntary societies, however well-meaning, is their efforts can only help a few among the misfortunate many; they find it very difficult to satisfy the need, which can only be fully met by a re-allocation of the community's resources.

To make adequate provision for the sick, to attend to their needs for food and shelter, are basic duties of any state, and not beyond the powers of Britain to-day. Other countries, such as Sweden and Denmark, have achieved the same.

The fundamental reason for Britain's failure, as Professor Titmuss has pointed out, is because the crucial decisions on the nature of resources should be apportioned are taken by small groups of businessmen. They are influenced by financial considerations and thoughts of personal prestige; the welfare of the people is not within their frame of reference.

And, far from trying to counteract this tendency, the Government accentuates it. No one can accuse the Exchequer of being prompted by thoughts of the greatest good for the greatest number when it allocates a mere £56,000 a year to research into cancer, one of the two great killers of mankind. The death of 250 people each day in England alone. This compares with £240 million—300 times as much—spent by the Government on military research.

In the House of Commons recently, Mr. David Freeth, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Science, defending the meagre sum spent on cancer research, claimed that the Department was not lacking funds or scientists, but lack of new ideas and promising leads that was hindering progress.

This appears a lame excuse: lack of new ideas and promising leads has never curtailed expenditure on military research. Just as the Government has not the desperate, concerted efforts that went into tackling the development of the atom and nuclear weapons. If the same effort could be put into the discovery of new means of preserving life that is put into devising new methods of destroying it, then dreaded illnesses like cancer would quickly lose their sting.

The Exchequer of being prompted by thoughts of the greatest good for the greatest number when it allocates a mere £56,000 a year to research into cancer, one of the two great killers of mankind. The death of 250 people each day in England alone. This compares with £240 million—300 times as much—spent by the Government on military research.

And, far from trying to counteract this tendency, the Government accentuates it. No one can accuse the Exchequer of being prompted by thoughts of the greatest good for the greatest number when it allocates a mere £56,000 a year to research into cancer, one of the two great killers of mankind. The death of 250 people each day in England alone. This compares with £240 million—300 times as much—spent by the Government on military research.

In the House of Commons recently, Mr. David Freeth, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Science, defending the meagre sum spent on cancer research, claimed that the Department was not lacking funds or scientists, but lack of new ideas and promising leads that was hindering progress.

This appears a lame excuse: lack of new ideas and promising leads has never curtailed expenditure on military research. Just as the Government has not the desperate, concerted efforts that went into tackling the development of the atom and nuclear weapons. If the same effort could be put into the discovery of new means of preserving life that is put into devising new methods of destroying it, then dreaded illnesses like cancer would quickly lose their sting.

But, in any case, Mr. Freeth overlooks the important point that, where cures for some types of cancers have been found, the treatment is often administered under conditions that are not conducive to success. For full benefit from medical attention it cannot be derived if the patient is inadequately fed or, like a friend of mine, recovering from cancer of the bladder, cannot have the proper diet. There is no cure for the community—the sick, aged and infirm—it will be judged and found wanting.

with the shapeless Labour Left complaining is in our counter-proposals. Our answers are clear and firm in the program which bands us together.

Tribune has no such anchorages. The inability to out Gaiskirk when he made his major anti-Socialist proposal on Clause 4 two years ago demonstrated the emptiness of the Labour Left. It is also the essence of our inability to link the campaign against the H-Bomb with the more positive struggle of the working class against exploitation and capitalism.

It doesn't need the publication of the document under review for a large number of the Labour Left to respond to the inadequacy of the Parlia- ments.
A step nearer Socialism?

FOR British socialists to approach the Common Market with suspicion is one thing. For them to oppose outright any connection with it on the grounds that it 'would be', in the words of Tribune, 'to turn our backs on a small economic island...we have an independent role in world affairs, to join the most virulent cold-war crusaders and to offer the introduction of further measures of Socialism until the Christian Democrats of Germany and Italy are prepared to accept them' is another.

British capitalism is inevitably its back on the Commonwealth there are good reasons for it do not so the old, imperial basis of the economy—industrial exports to backward countries in exchange for food and raw materials—is being undermined as the industrial countries themselves become the largest suppliers of these materials and food. At the same time there is a need to find a new basis to carry the industrial diversification that this implies, and to introduce the more intense division of labour which it requires. Such a basis might be found in Europe in the near future and within the present scheme of things. It cannot be found in the backward and agrarian countries of the Commonwealth without far-reaching, revolutionary changes here and there. So long as more is taken out in private profits than is put back in grants and loans rapid industrialization of India, Ghana and the rest is unthink- able; industrialization at all is barely conceivable so long as these prevailing economic flows prop up regimes that perpetuate agricultural and social stagnation; and the flow of funds itself can be no more than a trickle so long as Britain is wedded to the monstrous waste of a permanent arms economy and the Cold War and so long as her ana- cronistic structure for economic independence. Economically independent world lays her open to an exchange crisis every second summer. Were British assets overseas handed over to the people of the host countries without compensation: were Britain the outgrowth of the military stance essential to modern capitalism: were such a Britain the result of domestic revolutionary movements for land reform and workers' control in the backward Commonwealth countries—ine a word, were socialist revolution in Britain and the Commonwealth immediately possible there might be hope for eventual economic complementarity between the two. As it is, who conceives of such a denouement? Certainly not Tribune, the New Statesman and those that follow them. And even if it were conceivable one need only begin to imagine the difficulties of an isolated British socialism to realise that without Europe—without international socialism—these tasks would strain us far beyond our capacity.

The second argument need not detain us. After the snuffing out at Suez anyone who can talk of 'Britain's independent role in world affairs' is in enduring thrall to a Tory public relations gimmick.

But there is substance in the third argument. A sacrifice of sovereignty will enhance De Gaulle and Adenauer's power to intervene in British politics. To take one example—an im- portant one—the anti-nuclear campaign will face a different, complex and incredibly more difficult situation. That European reaction will stiffen the backs of both ruling classes is certain. The only questions relate to the importance of their intervention and to its unilateralism.

It is clear that the role of the state as the major agent for social reform within capitalism is of cardinal premise of all reformist pieties—narrowing. On the one hand, large-scale private capital is easily connected on its traditional welfare functions (pensions, housing, health) on the other, growing economic interdependence internationally is setting stricter limits to what a government can do with- out the concurrence of foreign capital. Without doubt Euro- peanization will contract these limits further, but to oppose it on these grounds is tantamount to protesting that a cobra has stung Tribune's case against the Common Market remains un- proven. The more one looks at it the more unrealistic seem the alternatives and the more it ap- pears to be a defense of reformism. 'Let us have a rich and sovereign Britain', is what they are saying, 'because only in such a Britain can we hope to use the State to better workers' conditions'. That riches cannot flow from the Commonwealth to the modern capitalist condition is ignored: that the state is declining as the locus of reform is ignored; that social democracy is losing its importance as the motor of such state reformism is ignored—witness the greater specific gravity of welfare pay- ments in workers' standards in Adenauer's Germany—is ignor- ed. Everything is forgotten in a blind, unenlightened struggle to shore up an expiring tradition. This is not to say that we must be transformed by inexorable economic trends, or that we must accept entry on the bosses' terms. God knows the tragic is not. Rationalization of European capital might mean deep unemployment in some industries—shipbuilding, textiles, coal, agriculture, and more; it might mean a new form of state intervention to pass the costs on to the workers as a whole; it might mean concentrated European capital bearing down on a de- united, nationally-separate and disfigured working class. It might mean these but it can mean more: in the same way as take- overs and the concentration of capital—by a pressure he encouraged combine, large-scale organization of workers in joint shop-strike committees one can expect to see—hesitantly at first —the internationalization of similar rudimentary working class politics. Even more important in the long run might be the effect on working-class political thinking: there's definite importance as a centre for welfare and other political decisions. If the European division of labour between workers' and their (middle- class) representatives in Parlia- ment, law courts and such like—has weakened the division of labour that nurtured reformism, it has in the struggle towards the factories, workers become their own reformists, become more jealous of their own power to extract concessions, more chary of delegating to it the politicians. This diffusion of militant reformism amongst the working class might mean in the end a militant European political reformism as it was, in the United States. But at the moment it is in danger of being a none-too-classic revolutionism—where the parliamentary reformists have given way to a militant movement striking beyond the confines of capitalism, the militant worker-reformist is himself the potential revolutionary; where politics had to be subtracted from free working class militancy, it is added to it. The constant background of milit- any towards power. If, in the end, the middle-class rationalizes this process, as it surely will, cartels will have laid, as surely, the basis for the United States of Socialist Europe. For revolutionary socialists in Britain there is no greater aim. We should be the first to clasp hands across La Manche.

It is not, however, the long- run effects that will occupy our movement in the coming days. How the small national traditions and organizations and forms of struggle, the threat to full employment and the fragmentation in the labour movement and the decanting of power out of it, the threat to its weaker sections—the Old Age Pensioners, for example—be based over in the scramble and, most important of all, the threat to world peace implied in strengthening the economic base of the cold war, are part of cartel-Europe; how big a part must depend upon decisions of the European Conference and its im- lying class. In our small way, revolu- tionary socialists can further this action by linking its aims and clarifying its aims, specifically by showing—in contrast to the—the threat to backward to an independent cartel—there is illusion, and—in contrast to the Crosland-Gaitskell variety of labour leaders—that the road to elytrum in the new state setup is as illusionary. The political strategy of the small, tends the scope of class strug- gle in which we are directly in- volved and clarifying our aims for the present. But it makes ultimate victory more secure.
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