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**HOW TO DIG OUT THE TORIES**

By Owen Roberts

WITH HAROLD MACMILLAN firmly installed in Downing Street at the head of a Tory Government apparently determined to remain in office as long as possible, the big question before Britain is: How will the Labour Party react? Will it be content to conduct a limited campaign of sniping at the Tories in Parliament; or will it strike out on a bold course designed to turn the Tories out and capture power for Labour on the basis of firm Socialist measures?

These questions are on the lips of Labour Party members and supporters throughout the country. The answers are not clear. They depend on a variety of factors—and not least upon the way in which the Labour Movement reacts to the economic consequences of Toryism.

Employment is a big factor. Last month the Ministry of Labour announced that when it took a count in the middle of December there were 297,000 workers out of a job. This was 32,000 more than in November and 65,000 more than a year previously. In addition, the number of workers on short-time had increased and the number on overtime had decreased.

But, even more important is the number of people out of work relative to the number of jobs waiting to be filled. At mid-December there were 279,000 unclassified workers notified to labour exchanges. This was 103,000 less than a year earlier and meant that there were 18,000 more out of work than there were jobs available.

This situation marks, in the words of The Economist, the end of “brim-full employment,” and will have very important consequences for workers and trade unions.

The Forum is open to all Socialists of whatever shade of opinion—to even those with the faintest shadow of one.

This month Sid Bidwell, NCLC (North London) Organizer and prospective Parliamentary candidate for East Herts will launch the Forum by speaking on the Tory Rents Bill.

Roll up and hear all sorts of opinion on all sorts of subjects on the first Sunday of every month.

**This Issue includes:**

Two tactics of Tory Colonialism  
Forum on workers’ control and nationalised industries  
on European unity  
on Yugoslavia  
Cassia's Column etc.

Mr. Tuke was really saying that employers “and they are so often outbid one another for workers, and that wage increases would be a way to contain the end of “brimful employment,” spells a tougher time ahead on the industrial front in coming months. In particular, workers at the bottom end of the wages scale, such as municipal employees, bus workers, railwaymen, will find it extremely difficult to wring any extra wages out of their employers, because it will be possible for gaps in their ranks—to low wages—to be filled from among men who are out of work.

No slump, but . . .

There is no reason for believing, at this juncture, that a major industrial crisis and large-scale unemployment is on the way. But the aggravation will be sufficient to set the scene for major (continued on next page)

**The Tory Rent Bill**

By Tom Herbert

Tory unemployment has questioned our right to work. The Tory Rents Bill is one proposed cure for the wrongs to LSE, and then more clearly the demands of a socialist programme through their party increase profits was slightly lower than in the previous year.

Mr. Anthony Tuke, chairman of Barclays Bank, recently put the matter quite clearly, when he said: “A reduction in profit margins had already begun to manifest itself in industry before this crisis arose, and this was already tending to reduce the inflationary pressure and the excessive competition for labour in certain areas.”

As the number of married women going out to work falls, the need for their husbands to seek wage increases will grow, and this will add to the desire for wage increases due to higher prices.

Standards fall

Since the new index of retail prices was introduced just over 12 months ago it has gone up by 3 per cent. This, as most working-class housewives will realise, is a very low estimate. For, as Jim Campbell—general secretary of the National Union of Railwaymen, said recently: “To say it reflects the cost of living is utter nonsense.”

But, however slow the index is to follow the real movement of prices, it will certainly move upwards in coming months when price increases due to the war in Egypt appear in the shops. It will receive a further boost when the new Rents Bill pushes up rents of some five million tenants of private landlords.

Faced with this situation the workers will respond by demanding trade union action for higher wages—and it is at this point that they will come face to face with the employment position.

Since the war the advantage in wage negotiations has been with the workers because employers were faced with the position where there were not enough men to fill vacant jobs. If employers did not pay at least a substantial part of the increase demanded, there was always the danger that the men concerned would move to another job.

Now, however, there is labour to go round—and everyone to spare. Employers are, therefore, in a stronger position to resist wage claims and to dispense with the "hedge" which, such as a little over the minimum rates and extra bonuses, at one time necessary in order to hire workers.

Basses Tougher

Employers will also tend to stick out firmer against wage claims because of the effects which the credit squeeze is having upon profits. This does not mean that capitalists are starving, it means that last year the increase in profits was slightly lower than in the previous year.

Mr. Anthony Tuke, chairman of Barclays Bank, recently put the matter quite clearly, when he said: “A reduction in profit margins had already begun to manifest itself in industry before this crisis arose, and this was already tending to reduce the inflationary pressure and the excessive competition for labour in certain areas.”

The following article from a correspondent shows the importance of the fourth plank in this platform. We hope that readers will deal with the others—of equal importance—in future contributions—Excerpt.

The Tory Government’s new Rents Bill was introduced to help the landlords—well known for their adherence to Toryism. But in trying to help the landlords the Tories have stirred up trouble for themselves amongst another section of their supporters—middle-class tenants of private landlords.

Sticking like a bone in the gullet of many middle-class tenants is the clause in the Rents Bill which removes rent control from all those privately rented houses and flats with a rental value of £100 in London and £30 elsewhere. This means that, as soon as the Bill becomes law, landlords of these properties can put rents at sky-high limits; and it also means that they cannot turn the tenants out when they feel like it.

Most of the houses and flats falling in to this category are occupied by members of the middle class—small businessmen, professional workers and the like—and they are beginning to understand, to their horror, that the Tory Government which so successfully wooed them during the general election is now going to test them to the wolves—the landlords. To make matters worse, most of the landlords concerned are wealthy estate companies—so the Government has not even got the excuse that its measures are designed to help the hard pressed small landlord keep his property in good repair.

The middle-class tenants, particularly in London, are now busy organizing themselves against this latest Tory attack on their living standards. Their
OUT WITH THE TORIES—continued

Socialism was crippling the middle class and that a Conservative Government would put things right. Now the middle class realise that it was sold up.

Of the total personal income in this country in 1951, professionals earned 40 per cent, farmers and self-employed persons 7.4 per cent, and salary earners 22.3 per cent. In 1955, professional income fell to 38 per cent, farmers 2.5 per cent, self-employed persons 7.6 per cent, and salary earners 21.8 per cent. In every case their share had dropped.

On the other hand, however, the income of the interests or estates grew from 5.6 per cent in 1951 to 10.2 in 1955. It is this that the middle classes have to stand for a large portion of the gain by industrial and financial capital, which has given rise to middle class discontent. The credit squeeze merely added fuel to the flames.

This feeling was shown at the Tory rally in Bermondsey and at the general meeting of the TUC on August 2—the Tory vote slumped drastically because middle class voters do not vote for the Tory candidates. The Government, which had deceived them and worsened their living conditions.

As the full effects of Tory economic policy are being experienced, discontent grew. The newspapers are full of complaints from the People’s League and the Middle Class Alliance—these would be the major parties in a new electoral system.

DANGEROUS COURTPRATEGY

The right-wing of the Labour Party will be tempted to take advantage of this situation by pulling into the Party—or behind it at election times—as many of these middle class voters as possible. And in order to do this it will revert to the slogan of “Woo the Middle Class” which was so unpopular in the 1950-51 period, when he was urging that Labour should change its name to the Welfare State. They will then seek to voice their discontent through existing political parties—the Liberal Party and the Labour Party.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP

Public ownership has been out of fashion for a long time. The right wing of the Tory Party has taken advantage of this and the idea of public ownership in the Party will be toned down still further. Contrary to what the right-wing of the Party would like to argue, the left-wing of the Party will put a strong case for public ownership and for the socialisation of the industries already nationalised.

This great debate will crystallise the opposing currents which are now gathering strength within the Party. Some Members of Parliament will set the pattern of the Party’s role and programme for some time ahead.

With the middle class alienation, with the continually increasing influence upon the Tory Party, what should be done to ensure that the Tory Party strike out towards Socialism? There are several ways in which they must act.

TASKS OF THE LEFT

First, the left wing must give a political content to the movement which is now brewing within the trade union movement and within the Party. In other words, if they are to realise that industrial owners alone will not provide a permanent solution for their problems. In order to make a serious attack on the policy which has brought about their present situation, they must isolate the Government and its policies.

Secondly, the left wing must prepare the ground for the big debate which is now on the agenda for the Party conference. Public ownership, its extent and role in the economy, is one of the most important questions of our time. The left wing of the Party will seek to voice their discontent through existing political parties—the Liberal Party and the Labour Party.

GENERAL ELECTION NOW

By voicing the demand for a General Election in the next few months, the left wing could put right-wingers, who hold such views, on the spot. They will be forced to justify their parochial, narrow view. They will not want to push forward with a programme of drastic social change and they will feel that they must not isolate the Labour Party, and that these reforms—the efficient management of a capitalist economy—is insufficient to solve the economic problems confronting Britain.

An indication of the possibilities of success in such tactics was written in The Economist, when Hugh Gaitskell was elected leader of the Parliament of the Labour Party. The decision to make Gaitskell leader, said The Economist was a risky one, because it would not want to push forward with a programme of drastic social change, and that they must not isolate the Labour Party. The Economist foresaw that Gaitskell could “rule only by persuasion, and persuasion means coalition”, and this was the case in the 1955 General Election.

The Tory Housing Record

By B. Donaldson

How did the Tory Government’s policy of housing succeed? In the last years, the rate of new houses affected by government policies has been very low. In fact, there are signs that private house building is coming back down to the old levels. It is estimated that private builders in England and Wales started work on a million dwellings, as compared with 124,000 in 1955. The full effect of this drop will be noticed during the next few years, when these houses are completed.

The total effect of this slowing down of house building is achieved in conjunction with the proposals contained in the Government’s new Rents Bill, which are designed to improve the housing situation in urban areas. It is estimated that private builders in England and Wales started work on a million dwellings, as compared with 124,000 in 1955. The full effect of this drop will be noticed during the next few years, when these houses are completed.

The total effect of this slowing down of house building is achieved in conjunction with the proposals contained in the Government’s new Rents Bill, which are designed to improve the housing situation in urban areas. It is estimated that private builders in England and Wales started work on a million dwellings, as compared with 124,000 in 1955. The full effect of this drop will be noticed during the next few years, when these houses are completed.
Discussion of the Socialist Program:

SOCIALISM IS NATIONALISATION PLUS WORKERS’ CONTROL

By Stan Newens

Is workers’ control of industry possible? That is the crucial question raised by Peter Reed in his article “Nationalised Coal and Steel” in last month’s “Socialist Review.” According to Comrade Reed, workers’ control is inherent in the very nature of the system and is not a disputed point. “The control of industry is not a question of whether it can be achieved, but of whether it should be achieved.”

Workers’ position unchanged

The basic explanation of this fact, whatever the truth of Comrade Reed’s ambiguous statement that the miners obtained the form of public ownership that they desired, is that they (along with workers in other nationalised industries) did not gain what they expected from nationalisation.

Major Lloyd George prophesied in Parliament, when the Coal Bill was under discussion that after nationalisation and miner the miners would go to the same pit and get the same lamp from the same man and when he gets to the bottom of the pit, to see that certain parts of the country, the same expression on his face of the pin. He will see the same manager, the same deputy, the old roadway, and the same coalface that was probably been paid by the same man.” (Hansard 30th Jan, 1946 Col. 880.)

University, from the workers’ point of view, Lloyd George was correct and after a short period of reserved judgments, the miners was to his traditional attitude of suspicion and scepticism towards his employer. The change for them was largely a paper one.

If he did not return to his former hostility, or if he was a newcomer, he were the many displaced persons who entered the pits after the war, bitter experiences with the managers. A shift spent in dangerous and cramped working conditions for which the overman must be made an allowance in his pay sheet, several hours spent waiting to see an inofficile official over a grievance, quickly taught him the elementary facts of his life. Realising he was still at the back of the pyramid, he adapted himself. The traditional attitude was his reply—militant suspicion.

The dissatisfaction was rubbing in facts—often called from the Tory press about the new officials of nine Nationalised Coal Board members, only two (Eddy Edwards and Sir Wat Tyler) were from the mining background. The rest were much nearer the old coalowners and included Lord Hunter of Duddingston and T. E. B. Young, all of whom had been directors of leading private enterprise concerns.

The same thing occurred at local level. Men with reputations as local tyrants held their positions and were even promoted. The conclusions to those who knew the industry were obvious.

True enough, wages rose in the mines much more rapidly than in other industries but the fact was lost on the miners that they did not get wages the coal shortage was transferred to nationalisation. Railwaymen under nationalisation, as Peter Reed pointed out, were by no means hostile, student of the mines considered. “Wholesale, at all, that wages would have been less under private ownership; they might have been greater.” (William Warren Haynes, Nationalisation in Practice, 1953, p. 154.) In any case the miners sought that their new employer hold the old yield to pressure; there were few bounties.

The pyramid of authority

On the aspiring side: each official in the new hierarchy from NCB members downwards put the screw on the official below him to squeeze out better results. The latter passed the pressure on to his immediate inferior until the miner was reached—with no one to squeeze but his own muscle. As early as 1947, this method or procedure produced the Grimethorpe Strike which cost 600,000 tons of coal.

The miners show in this struggle that their antagonism to increased exploitation of their work was based on the name of the NCB was no less than it was in the days of the private coalowners. This antagonism has since been demonstrated many times over by an unparalleled record of unofficial strikes.

To speak of NCB senitivity to the men’s demands by instances the removal of a manager by strike action is like speaking of the sensitivity of a horse to whip. For this one case which Peter Reed gives is, it is possible to cite many in which the men did not get rid of a hatted official or manager—because their demand was not backed by such determined pressure.

A state of affairs in which more days are lost by miners than is justified by the single industry, is surely not characteristic of development away from capitalism. Peter Reed shows that the intensity of class struggle has in some respects increased under nationalisation.

The power of bureaucracy

Truly, the miner’s attitude to his job in a nationalised concern is basically no different from that of the average worker in a private concern. But experience under both private owners and nationalised boards have bred a suspicion of management that could rarely be produced by a socialist system. The average working miner in fact feels the identification between his own personal position and the ownership of the concern in which he works better than he did in the 1930s.

This outlook epitomised in the fact that the mass of miners are still a part of the ruled and not the ruling class. There is nothing in common with socialism if the workers are not to participate in deciding their own destinies except in so far as they help elect Members of Parliament. The more so, as the Nationalised Coal Board is not only capable of being exploited by the state, but also simply of being exploited by the state. This could lead to the evolution of a state capitalist bourgeoisie, the NCB being the state’s representative on the board.

Socialism is not so many socialists have miserably supposed a question purely and simply of the form of property. Much more important is the question of control and effective power, which many have gleefully assumed is inevitably inseparable from the form of ownership. Despite nationalisation, effective power in the mining industry resides with the hands of the community as a whole but in the mining bureaucracy. The crucial stage in the struggle for the miners’ control will be the transfer of effective power to the workers from this oligarchy. Workers’ control is surely the only means whereby this can be done and not merely in word be genuinely achieved.

Control distinct from management

Comrade Reed dismisses workers’ control as utopian primarily by arguing that control could not be exercised without a level of technical knowledge outside the range of a committee of unskilled workers. But his argument confuses the functions of management and control. The task of management is to organise and co-ordinate means of achieving a general policy requires technical information, while the decision in what is to be done is the formulation of general policy, which is the role of control can be effectively carried out by laymen.

Even the existing administration often lacks the technical knowledge required for formulating general policy. Many of the problems of “botticlers” and “sycophants” of the officials can be faced by another group of officials. The solution to the problem of absenteeism, steel losses, safety, stagnant or falling selling prices, the problems of the miners, and so on, is the formulation of general policy, which is the role of control can be effectively carried out by laymen.

Examples

Peter Reed’s arguments that technical knowledge is needed before control can be exercised are inaccurate. The more forcefully applied are the case of a company which is a much larger and more complicated concern to control than an individual mine. Yet, who would deny (outside the drawing rooms of some reactionary town clerks) that ordinary workers when elected to a local government or to a local committee are capable of understanding and running all affairs within the limits laid down by the central government?

This is done with the aid of information obtained from local government officials. It is in no way different from the fact that control is vested in elected councillors and not officials.

Even at central government level policy is often decided by laymen without specialist knowledge of the departments they control. Permanent Civil Servants, etc., may advise but the ultimate power of decision is not in their hands.

Some experts more expert than others

The chief reason why control by elected representatives has been accepted under capitalism in local and central government spheres is that local and central government is the direct source of profit as it is industry. Logically there is no reason whatsoever for arguing that working men would be any less capable of controlling the concerns in which they work than of wielding power on local councils or sitting in Parliament.

Experiences on the Joint Consultative Committees have shown that where men are not too threatened and sceptical to participate—with the result that representation has not been left to “botticlers” and “sycophants”—their contributions are being equal or if not superior to those of the technicians in many cases. In fact, it is by no means easy to argue that the experts are in any way superior to officials.”

Nationalisation—a social issue

Such a system is neither socialist nor neutral as Peter Reed suggests. It is essentially capitalist with many similarities to capitalist plants like Unilever or General Motors. In a socialist society, every pit or productive unit would be required to fit into a national plan, but the whole body of workers would not be designated in fixing the target; similarly they and not the bureaucratic oligarchy which wields power at present would determine the means employed to reach it—after receiving such technical advice as they required.

Some such system of Industrial democracy is a vital feature of socialist society. Without it, whether property is nationalised or not, the workers will remain an exploited class.

This is one reason why genuine socialists should struggle against the ideas of the future of industry put forward by the Right Wing Labour Leaders and others as well. It is no accident that neither—despite mutual antagonism—advocate a genuine programme of workers’ control.
The Tories are talking loudly about European Unity, European integration, common markets, free trade zones and so on. Why? What do they want out of it? What should the Socialist attitude be? This article starts the ball rolling by showing the contradiction between capitalism and European integration.

By Seymour Papert

It is not simply because of natural resources that America has outstripped Europe in the development of industry. Nor is it simply that fate decrees that every dog has his day. The very conditions which nurtured the infancy of industrialisation in Europe now hang like a millstone about its neck. Among these is the division of our continent into a dozen and more separate national states.

Each capitalist state nursed its early industries behind the sheltered walls of import duties, tariffs and special taxation. But these same walls were later to hamper growth. A crucial feature of the 20th century has been a series of attempts, sometimes warlike sometimes peaceful, to integrate Europe, to break up the national barriers to trade and industrialisation.

There is no doubting the economic inefficiency of Europe's subdivision. Where American industry produces for a market of 164 million, the four largest Western European countries each count only about 200 million souls. The greater degree of concentration and specialisation of the US is partly the consequence of this. To a far greater extent than in Europe American production is located in the nation's most suitable for the product concerned.

Vested interests in the State

Is it then more sentimentally foolish for national pride which holds back the pace of development? By no means. The forces behind national patriotism are neither foolish nor sentimental.

The existence of national states in Europe not only impedes the expansion of the infant industrial capitalism: it puts its stamp on the adult. The very monopolies which have now grown to large for their national states acquired a vested interest in them. British capital might bank for the German market; but it is not at all willing to dissolve the British State which, after all, it controls. Nor to see it weakened. From time to time (1914, 1939) attempts have been made to organise Europe at least as open as the American tangle. The EPU (European Payments Union) which acts as an all-European clearing bank, the OEEC (Organisation for European Economic Co-operation) are examples of institutions which bridge the divide between European countries without breaking the barriers in any real sense. At the other extreme are the Dark Age alliances, for Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg. This is an association of three countries which is tight enough for the three to be regarded as one unit. But while it has elements of significance, it is on a very small scale: in fact its formation was dictated by the very smallness of the economies involved. Luxembourg has 309,000 people and the other two about ten million each.

The Coal and Steel Community

The most serious and important part is played by the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). In 1952 six countries—Western Germany, France, Italy and the three Benelux countries—signed the Schuman Treaty which claimed to integrate the trade in coal and steel. In theory there would be no discrimination in any of the countries against the coal and steel products of the others; movements of these commodities were to be as freely made as between Lancashire and Yorkshire. No curtail or restrictive practices were to be allowed. In fact a model was being set—or so it was said—for the complete latte-faire integration of Europe. To put the working of the plan, a body was set up which made up for any other defects in the grand title: The High Authority.

The ease with which the Coal and Steel Community was accepted and also the shallowness of the arrangement came out when we trace the condition of the Steel and Coal market. Conditions of over-production made protection necessary and conditions of rapid expansion made demand do the opposite when there were markets for more than can be produced no protectionist arguments. For instance, by the time the ECSC began coal and steel were in full boom. In France, Germany and Italy, 1952 production hit a level 20% above the previous year and every pound was sold. The ECSC made the needs of protection—protection was not wanted, organisation could go ahead.

The slumps the problem

But 1953-4 marked a recession: output went down by 10-25% in the ECSC countries. At the same time manufacturers began to unload their coal at privately fixed prices well below the market controlled by the High Authority and 55 Ruhr coal producers openly broke the rules by forming a selling alliance as GEORG. The High Authority fumed and raved: but it was impotent. It dared not act for fear that the whole carl would come tumbling down! As long as boom conditions weakened competition the ECSC could be allowed; but even then only because it was without teeth and could be defied when the economic weight was changed.

For three years the High Authority complained about the existence of GEORG and other sellers. They were told to dissolve. It threatened to impose penalties. In the end it made no difference: it would have been the same: "as if it had a choice"? provided they were not too big. GEORG obligingly split into three at the end of last year. Even the Economist had to admit that the High Authority had produced "a small mouse for three years’ labour."

But even this gives too much credit to the High Authority! GEORG had already lost its main purpose: between 1954-55 brought a complete recovery from the recession. Once more steel and coal were booming, and in short supply and when fortune smiles on the capitalists they can afford to flirt with integration.

So is the boom?

Yet the ECSC has new troubles which show its impotence just as clearly. The boom has created a demand for coal in Europe that 25 million tons of expensive US coal was imported last year. Who bought the cheap coal and who the dear? In Britain the NCB shares amongst all the coal, iron and steel. In theory there would be no discrimination in any of the countries against the coal and steel products of the others; movements of these commodities were to be as freely made as between Lancashire and Yorkshire. No curtail or restrictive practices were to be allowed. In fact a model was being set—or so it was said—for the complete latte-faire integration of Europe. To put the working of the plan, a body was set up which made up for any other defects in the grand title: The High Authority.

The ease with which the Coal and Steel Community was accepted and also the shallowness of the arrangement came out when we trace the condition of the Steel and Coal market. Conditions of over-production made protection necessary and conditions of rapid expansion made demand do the opposite when there were markets for more than can be produced no protectionist arguments. For instance, by the time the ECSC began coal and steel were in full boom. In France, Germany and Italy, 1952 production hit a level 20% above the previous year and every pound was sold. The ECSC made the needs of protection—protection was not wanted, organisation could go ahead.

The slumps the problem

But 1953-4 marked a recession: output went down by 10-25% in the ECSC countries. At the same time manufacturers began to unload their coal at privately fixed prices well below the market controlled by the High Authority and 55 Ruhr coal producers openly broke the rules by forming a selling alliance as GEORG. The High Authority fumed and raved: but it was impotent. It dared not act for fear that the whole carl would come tumbling down! As long as boom conditions weakened competition the ECSC could be allowed; but even then only because it was without teeth and could be defied when the economic weight was changed.

For three years the High Authority complained about the existence of GEORG and other sellers. They were told to dissolve. It threatened to impose penalties. In the end it made no difference: it would have been the same: "as if it had a choice"? provided they were not too big. GEORG obligingly split into three at the end of last year. Even the Economist had to admit that the High Authority had produced "a small mouse for three years’ labour."

But even this gives too much credit to the High Authority! GEORG had already lost its main purpose: between 1954-55 brought a complete recovery from the recession. Once more steel and coal were booming, and in short supply and when fortune smiles on the capitalists they can afford to flirt with integration.

The strings attached to President Eisenhower’s plan to spend 200 million dollars a year on economic assistance to the Middle East, are now quite apparent. Mr. Dulles put the issue clearly when he said that the countries of the Middle East would “have to be dedicated to fighting against any form of communism before we give them help.”

This is no new doctrine for the United States; at present American aid “to the rest of the world is running at around 3,600 million dollars a year—and two-thirds of this goes in military assistance. Compared with 402 million dollars of technica aid, military assistance accounts for 2,017 million dollars of foreign aid, and defense support another 1,162 million dollars.”
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Europeean integration—continued

(i) A free trade zone consisting of countries who accept one half of the rules, namely to drop all tariffs between them in the common market. They will be free to make independent arrangements with outside countries. The countries that will be in it are: Britain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland and Austria. These arrangements are not complete, and will be discussed later after signing the treaty. The restrictions and tariffs will be reduced gradually over 12 to 15 years.

Conflicting interests

The motor of capitalism is the need to expand. The law of competition dictates: grow faster than your competitors or go under. But to say only this is to oversimplify. There is an unequal development amongst firms and amongst countries so that when one sector cries against every obstacle to expansion, another wants to shelter behind them, and so we find that there are conflicting interests even within the same country, for example Germany and Benelux push for free integration, while France is torn by hesitation and irresolution. The explanation of the differences lie in the economic conditions peculiar to each country.

Germany—confident

Germany is the economic wonder of Europe. Compared with Britain and France her economic development has been tremendous between 1950 and 1954. She pushed industrial production up by 50%, exports and imports by 60% while they barely managed 20% on each. There is no miracle behind it. Britain and France were spending millions on armaments that they were putting into production. Germany had only the military budget and could put her surplus into building industry.

Moreover she was not dragged down by backward industrial methods which are our inheritance from the past. The result is that Germany is effectively eating into the export markets of the other European countries, especially Britain and French car sales whose has met them on equal terms. No wonder then that the Germans are closing down behind breaking down protective walls which keep her out of home markets in the European Community.

Germany’s economic interest in European integration is supported by the political position of her government. Adenauer sees the Unification in the West of European as a slogan which can answer and replace the demand for the Reunification of Germany.

Belgium enthusiastic

Belgium—the most ardent of all supporter of “Europe”—has had different reasons. They too, have been prospering above the European average and, like Germany, have even been able to give credit in their European trade while France, Britain and Benelux have always conserved some of it. But the chief economic factor pushing Belgium to integration is that the Benelux countries depend heavily on their trade, Luxemburg and Belgium have a concentration of heavy industry out of proportion to their population and export as much as 70% of their steel output. Holland gets 35% of her national income from foreign trade, so it is only to be expected that these countries will throw themselves wholeheartedly into the attempt to open up Europe’s markets to free trade.

Military factors also push Benelux in the same direction. They are small countries surrounded by countries that could make them a plun to Russia whose army in Eastern Germany is only 150 miles away from Holland. Admittedly the immediate danger of such an attack is slight: but the fear of it felt from time to time in Dutch breasts and that is what counts.

Britain faces both ways

All capitalist countries are tied to one another by the laws of competition. The market. This is well illustrated by Britain’s position in the relation to Germany and Benelux. She (and other countries) have only a very restricted choice. Once Germany and Belux start the current going, Britain is under heavy pressure to go forward. This is reflected in all discussions—whether in Parliament, the Times or the TUC. Everyone knows that Britain is in an economic pincher. If she stays out she loses a large part of her present export trade to Europe because tariffs will be put up against her by low tariff Benelux and a wave of German and other goods will flood in because tariffs will be lowered for them. Britain cannot afford to stay out. But she can happen to the conditions of entry—and dilute the impact further by altering its form to suit her special needs.

The chief concession demanded by Britain is that the abolition of import duties should not apply to food. The reason for this is plain. The Common market with Britain under special terms would have the Imperial Preference. Britain is not eager to spare these special terms with her future allies. In fact the abandonment of Imperial Preference was, at first raised as a conclusive argument against a free trade pact at all. It was pointed out that Commonwealth trade amounts to 12,000 million dollars, Britain’s share of trade with the six Schuman countries is only 1,000 million dollars. But the idea of a deal made with France and Belgium (90%) of imports from the Commonwealth food, so that this could be excluded from the European plan all would be well—for Britain. But not for everyone else.

Italy gets the boot

The chief sufferer would be Italy who looked forward to increasing her agricultural exports to Europe. In fact according to the General Conclusions of the Italian-Institutions the British proposal removes one of the chief advantages for Italy in the whole scheme. In October, Britain wanted to boot Italy. But who after all is Italy? The crucial matter is that her boot does not fit Germany or Benelux. The discussions on unity are not a fresh approach, free from the struggles between factions on the theme of unity they are simply a phase of this very same struggle.

The big incident we have the original contradiction in any capitalist approach to integration: each capitalist has a plan of unity for his own image of his own interest. Their very concepts of European unity become contradictory, hindering the achievement of national interests.

France—Europe’s invalid

The British proposal throws a spotlight on the ability of capitalist Europe to carry out effective integration. It is left to the European governments the proposal of European unity has nothing to do with the grand conception which has inspired socialists from the time of Marx and Engels. It is now a case of a Europe no longer divided against itself and at last able to put to the service of the world the industrial power which spings from its bases.

This dream will be realized: but only after both the giant and Europe have been removed from the hands of capitalist owners, and put into the hands of those men who work the machines. We shall see a united Europe when we see a Social Europe.

Yugoslavia

End

Readers, we have set aside these centre pages for serious discussion about the problems of Capitalist, Socialism theory. We believe that we are unique in this country in being able to offer a forum for serious discussion with the dwindling number of people who are committed to neither Washington nor Moscow but to international Socialism. We believe that such people will not be swayed by the "heaviness" of the matter in this section—our forum.
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We are happy to print the following letter from an Italian comrade, Lucio Liberti. Comrade Liberti is the editor of the weekly Review of Socialist Organisation (USI—Union Socialista Italiana), a newspaper published in Rome weekly in Italian, and is a break-away from the Italian CFIs. The USI-Unioni Socialisti Italiani demand that a number of its members refused to accept the “line” that Tito had taken, and that he was trying to strengthen Socialism in Italy, a party based on the International Socialist Review—Editions of the Yugoslav system.

(3) The attitude towards Yugoslavia. I do not believe that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is a number of defects, even in Yugoslavia. It’s is true that the laws of the workers’ councils are the result of the administration; it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion. But a judgment on Yugoslav people and the action of the government, the Yugoslav system, is not made on Yugoslav officialdom but, according to those who have worked in Yugoslavia, I have no objection to this judgment on Yugoslav people. I should point out that the Yugoslav system is good for my country; moreover, it is the nationalizing of the bureaucratic apparatus of facts, but the rigid one-party system is not acceptable as it prevents the necessary flow of ideas, even within the party in power, and because it leads to the prosecution of “crimes” of opinion.
TWO TACTICS OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM

One: Independence for the Two: Terror for Trade Unionists

Gold Coast

By Selwyn Pepper

At first sight the Tory policy in West Africa might seem inconsistent with their general colonial policy. At the same time as their armies and police forces smashed viciously against colonial independence in Kenya, Cyprus, and the Middle East, preparations were going forward to give self government to the Gold Coast. Yet it is clear that this is an independent policy for West African people, a "full member of the British Commonwealth of Nations." It must be admitted that Britain really is giving something away in the Gold Coast. It is true that Ghana (as it is now called after independence) will be in the Commonwealth. But it will be free to leave. It will be free to give all its business to Britain's rivals in Western Europe in the same way as India has given some very juicy contracts to the West. If Germany invites it, it will even be free to break with the West altogether. On the other hand, we shall see that the Tories have good reason to be sure that none of these things will happen in the near future and things have been moving much too fast for them to worry too far ahead.

NOT MUCH TO LOSE

They can be sure that Ghana will "stay British" for quite a long time because of the close connection between British interests and the plans for economic development in West Africa. The biggest scheme in Ghana is the Volta River plan. This project will set up a new hydro-electric system, which will be used to manufacture aluminium in large quantities. It is dependent on support from the Ghana government, the British Government, and a group of British and American aluminium companies. It is obviously as safe as can be.

So the immediate risks of letting the Gold Coast loose from the apron string are so small that the other side of the story stands some solid advantages which can come to capitalat Britain.

PLENTY TO GAIN

In the first place there is the propaganda value of this piece of "liberalism." By showing how good British intentions are, it goes towards neutralising the efforts of the other side of the story and stands some solid advantages.

Secondly—and more important—is the fact that Ghana can develop the Gold Coast as a field for British capital and as a dollar earner much better than the British continent ever could. (At the moment the Gold Coast is an important source of dollars for British gold and silver and cotton, chief producer of cocoa and a large part of her output goes to America. The Volta aluminium scheme is also good for Britain's dollar position.)

THE PEASANT FEET THE BILL

The money which Ghana will get into the Volta project (like the finance for her ten million pound harbour construction) will have to come from large cocoa. But in order to use the cocoa proceeds for capital development the Gold Coast government will have to exploit the peasants who produce the precious beans. This is done by forcing the producers to sell their entire crop to a government board, which then sells it at an enormous profit in London and New York. This exploitation is on a tremendous scale; while cocoa prices have been as high as £500 (and never fall below £200) the peasant gets only £134 a ton. The result is that approximately two hundred million pounds have come into the hands of the government.

INDIRECT CONTROL BEST

There is no doubt that the peasants would not approve this policy of using their money for schemes which—as a result of the cocoa board— incomes have been as high as £500 (and never fall below £200) the peasant gets only £134 a ton. The result is that approximately two hundred million pounds have come into the hands of the government.

RHODESIA

At the end of November, last year, the Northern Rhodesia Government began the extraordinary procedure of asking the King to make an extraordinary name: The Emergency (Temporary) Provisional Ordinance, which will enable the government to banish and control the movements of anyone in trade union it deems a "troublemaker." By this means it will be able to prevent the Africans now working in holding further office in their union.

The employers previously tried to blackmail the African Mineworkers' Union by ruling that any African who accepted "any measure of advancement, promotion, bonus, etc., will be excluded from the union in the future." This was enforced by any industrial dispute during which the leaders were arrested. Now there is another attempt to break this union, one of the best-organised in Africa.

In Southern Rhodesia no African trade unions (except a railway union) are recognised officially and no Africans have the right to strike (white workers have).

CYPRUS

Trade union suppression is only one part of the ending of all free movement of the emergency regulations here, which include now an automatic prison sentence for anyone caught carrying arms.

The position is that all the top officials of the Cyprus Workers Confederation and the Pan-Cypriot Federation of Labour have been arrested and are detained.

MRA + ICTU

I SEE THAT the executive board of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions has recently taken another swipe at Dr. Frank Buchanan and his followers in Moral Rearmament. This time the ICTU accuses MRA of pokimg its nose into the affairs of trade unions in Tunisia, Northern Rhodesia and Nambia.

The ICTU had a previous crack at the Buchamites just over three years ago, when it asked all affiliated trade unions to impress upon their members that they should not join any social union if they were thinking of propagandising for MRA. Many trade unions in Britain, fed up with going on like this hand, took the view that thought then that the ICTU should have gone further—they will now be pleased to learn that the ICTU's latest statement calls upon all its affiliated organisations to advise trade unionists to sever all connections with MRA.

WHO KNOWS?

Chance readers might even become regulars:

Regulars might even take extra copies of the Socialist Review to give to friends.

Friends might even send a donation.

WHO KNOWS?
CASSIA'S CALUMNY

COLUMBUS

IN SOME CIRCLES the realisation is dawning that a fair part of the responsibility for the rape of Hungary by the Soviet Union lies directly upon the shoulders of the British ruling class, and in particular upon the shoulders of the ex-Prime Minister—Sir Winston Churchill.

It was at Yalta, in 1944, that Stalin and Churchill made their agreement, which allowed Europe up into "spheres of influence" and so laid the foundation for Russia's recent international imperialism.

Churchill records the event in the sixth volume of his history of the war. He tells how, at the Yalta meeting, he wrote down all the names of the countries of Eastern Europe and indicated how he thought they should be divided between Russia and Britain; this he then pushed across the table to Stalin. "It is for you, Grand Duke," wrote Churchill, "then be Stalin took his blue pencil and made a large tick upon it, and said, 'It is not a question of divided, but of settled in no more time than it takes to set down...'."

Thus, with Churchill's piece of paper, the fate of half of Europe was settled. It was an act which led to Russia's recent assault on Hungary, and equally a similar assault by Britain on the people of Greece.

MANY READERS of this column have commented how amused they were with the report of the split in the East German Socialists at Berlin soon after the Soviet invasion. But Stalin and the Kremlin have built out of the Hungarian revolution. They told their readers recently that: "The frightening events in Hungary have joined us in recognizing that we did not correct in time the signs, did not take issue with false and anti-Socialist ideas, and failed to caution our Hungarian friends of the dangers of intervention."

Was that accidental? Or is it a sign of the confusion which also prevails here about the destructive consequences of discussions which coincide with attacks upon Stalinism on the international level?"

It may be, of course, that the editor of Sonntag wrote this because they saw the shadow of a secret policeman peering through their window. In which case, their action is understandable—but still regrettable that in their ignorance they can stick to the road on which they set out.

On the other hand, it may well be that they are readers, vain and producers of a "cultural review," value too highly the privileges which flow from the access away by supporting a revolution of workers and students in Hungary.

Tory Rent continued from front page

The Socialist Review stands for international socialist democracy. It opposes the exploitive system of both Washington and Moscow—the two rival imperialist forces which now dominate the world—and seeks to advance the cause of the Worker Camp which conducts a relentless struggle against both class societies.

It believes that—in the struggle against the reactionary policies of the Tories—it is a matter of standing up for the realisation of the aims of socialism and not to be content with mere propaganda, which would achieve only the perpetual postponement of the struggle.

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and post, and of all other pay- ments based on a means test. Re- nationisation of all denationalised industries without compensation. The nationalised industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.

- Workers' control in all nationalised industries i.e., a majority of workers' representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and to receive proper wage ruling in the industry.

- The inclusion of workers' representatives on the boards of all private firms employing more than 20 people, and not to be denied the right to have free access to all documents.

- The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions.

- The establishment of the principle of work or full maintenance.

- The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, linked to a realistic cost-of-living index, the abolition of all payments for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.

- The expansion of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities and the right to requisition privately held land.

- Free State education up to 18, abolition of fee paying schools. For comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants—without a means test—for all with student membership.

- Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection to all workers whatever their country of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.

- Freedom to all colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to the peoples of the under-developed countries.

- The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas.

- A Socialist foreign policy independent of both Washington and Moscow.