

Socialist Review

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW,
BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

FEBRUARY 1962

4 d.

TRIAL BY FIRE

JOHN PALMER

WHAT with the Common Market, the Pay Pause crisis and the Tories attempt to introduce some kind of planning into the ever more chaotic British economy, facts and figures pour out from official sources at a record level.

For a socialist the present situation is of special interest because of the coincidence of a short term crisis with what looks like being an attempt at a long term readjustment of British capitalism.

There can be few on the left who expect the present deepening stagnation to lead to a sudden catastrophic slump, but similarly there can be few now who do not realise that when we do come out of this present 'impasse' it will be with a higher level of unemployment and a considerable

toughening of industrial 'discipline'.

The present 'trial by fire' whereby British capitalism is trying to cleanse itself before entering the Common Market is so far a trial which has only burned the working class. It has been the weakest sections of the working class who are carrying the burden of the cut in real wages, while, despite a certain amount of talk, profits, dividends and interest continue to do very nicely.

The purpose of the present pay pause is to reduce costs, and to stimulate revision labour-capital ratios. This has been described by a director of a large paper group as "seeing where jobs at present done by ten men can be done by five."

In this context Mr Selwyn Lloyd's promise to replace the Pay Pause

proper with a longterm scheme to hold incomes in check is of interest. It is clear that we have only seen the beginning of the present season of screw tightening which looks like getting under way after what should be Lloyd's toughest yet budget next April.

In his attempt to get the blessing of the TUC for measures to keep wages and salary rises inside about 2% (against what background of rising prices?) Lloyd has been dangling the juicy carrot of a seat on his planning board. While the outcome is still in the balance it is obvious that there are several members of the TUC who would gladly lend their support to a long term freeze on wages while "keeping an eye on dividends."

The only planning we can expect from Lloyd's NED is the planned assassination of those industries with a high cost basis, and the planned imposition of 'industrial discipline' designed to make 'us' competitive when 'we' enter the Common Market. In the realm of economic decisions it is difficult to see NED planning anything which cuts across the interests of the monopolies who daily grow more important as the real decision making bodies in British, and indeed European capitalism.

Our job should be to see that the Labour movement lends not a tittle of support for the Tories squeeze on living standards. Instead we should be showing how it is a preparation for the Common Market. If entry into the "Six" is not going to mean a decisive drop in the living standards of the working class then resistance should be being planned and executed now.

ANOTHER SIGNPOST - TO NOWHERE

KEVIN BARRY

THE most interesting feature of Labour's Right wing at the moment is their search for scape-goats for their own failure. Mr. Douglas Jay's new book, *Socialism in the New Society* (Longmans, 35s.) is no exception. Labour has never lost elections in his view because it failed to offer the electors the correct policy; before the war the Tory press were the villains, after the post-war Labour government the villains were those Left-wingers who made the party appear "doctrinaire, Marxist or divided." There is a middling size grain of truth in the first accusation

and a very tiny one in the second. But what Mr. Jay uses his accusations to avoid seeing and saying is that there is no evidence at all that Right wing Labour policies have ever appealed to the electorate. This of course does not mean that these policies are incorrect; but it does mean that to command them as the policies which will win the Labour Party the next or any other election is to make an utterly unfounded claim. Indeed the Parliamentary Labour Party realise this. How else can we account for the slow but now regular trickle of Labour MP's away

from Parliament into jobs in nationalised or private industry?

Mr Jay's central policies for Labour are unexceptionable so far as they go: sharply rising income tax and capital gains tax, to be used along with heavy death duties to finance a much improved welfare state. All this is to be done while the present ownership of industry is maintained. But the present structure of private industry depends on sharp differences of income, on glittering money rewards for those at the top

• cont. on page 7

WHY MERGERS ?

STEPHEN HERO

WHAT is the difference between a merger and a take-over bid? A take-over bid occurs when a financier realises that the value of the shares of a particular firm is a good deal less than the value of the assets of the firm. By acquiring control of the shares he acquires control of the assets and in some cases disposes of them. A take-over bid is thus merely a quick way of making money. A merger consists in bringing together under one ownership and one management two industrial enterprises. The aim here is to become more profitable in either the short or long run in a number of different ways. First one can rationalise one's marketing and selling arrangements. Secondly one hopes to cut costs of production by larger-scale production. Thirdly one wants to unify research projects and planning for future development. And

lastly and least noticed one hopes by becoming bigger and bigger to avoid either a take-over bid or a merger with some yet larger enterprise.

Why does ICI want a merger with Courtaulds? ICI has not been doing well. Its profits are down. So consequently are its share prices. At the same time the Common Market means that it confronts important German and French competition, especially German. The turnover of the French chemical industry in 1959 was just over £1000 million; that of Britain and Germany both reached towards £2000 million, with Britain a little in the lead. So ICI wants cut production costs and to rationalise its marketing. It needs profitable new fibres such as Courtele which Courtaulds have so far produced only in small quantities.

Who decides whether the merger will come off? The banks and insur-

ance companies who make the financial arrangements for the deal. If they advance enough money the deal is on; and whether they advance the money or not, depends on the profitability of ICI. What does *enough* mean here? It means enough to tempt Courtauld's shareholders. In fact what happens in a merger like this is that capitalism redeploys part of its investment programme. The key question for socialists is: who makes the decisions, decisions which will determine the life and work of a great many ordinary people? The answer is not the shareholders: they are merely offered alternative financial inducements by Courtaulds and ICI until they give in to one side or the other. So that the shareholders have no control. The workers even less so of course. And it makes no difference to those ICI workers who own ICI shares, about whom Tory propaganda so often boasts. Share-owning workers are as powerless as any others. The lesson for socialists to learn from mergers is where power lies.

IRELAND WHOSE OWN ?

ALASDAIR MACINTYRE

IRELAND HER OWN the old slogan says. But Ireland was owned first by English landlords and now by her own small capitalist class. The poverty of the Dublin slum or of the poor peasant in the West is a sharp reminder of pre-welfare capitalism. What have socialists to say about Ireland's problems? There was an heroic period of Irish Socialism, beginning with William Thompson who invented the Labour Theory of Value before Marx did, and culminating in James Connolly's part in the Easter Rising of 1916. But more recently socialists in Ireland have spoken with isolated voices. Not that these voices have been unimportant. Dr. Owen Sheehy Skeffington, for instance, who represented Trinity College, Dublin, in the Irish State until last year has time and again challenged the powers that be on such crucial issues as freedom from censorship and the Catholic Church's stronghold over education. Yet perhaps now the voices will not

be so isolated. Perhaps Ireland is on the verge of the revival of a socialist movement. Why? The answer is contained in the stories of two different political parties.

The first is the National Progressive Democrats. The founder of the NPD, Dr. Noel Browne, was in 1949 Minister of Health in a coalition government when he was still a member of the smallest of the bourgeois parties, Clann na Poblachta. Because he brought in a bill to give elementary welfare services to mothers and children the Catholic bishops condemned him. (Dr. Browne is himself a Catholic). His party at once expelled him and he lost his place in the government. Rejected in the end by all the parties, Dr. Browne stood as an Independent for his own Dublin constituency and was elected on a larger majority than ever before. His vote on that occasion was largely Protestant, middle-class and anti-clerical. But as Dr. Browne moved into a distinctly socialist position he

lost his middle-class support and acquired the solid vote of Dublin workers. In the election in Ireland Dr. Browne held his seat in spite of attempts at gerrymandering and enormous press hostility. In Roscommon the other NPD member, Jack Macquillan, again came in head of the poll. In the Dail the NPD deputies have continually found themselves able to use parliamentary institutions as a platform for attacking NATO, criticising the failures of the UN and above all arguing for socialism in Ireland, for public ownership and for welfare.

In this fight they were at first separated from the Labour Party. But recently the Labour Party has been gathering strength. It has only just acquired the support of the Irish TUC and it has justified this by fighting anti-strike legislation in the Dail. The latest papal encyclical on politics asserts that there is no incompatibility between Catholicism

● *contd next page*

Forward by the Right

NIGEL HARRIS

ON June 24, 1872, Disraeli spoke at the Crystal Palace, laying down what is traditionally considered to be the essence of Conservatism. It consisted in 'the maintenance of the institutions of the country' (the Lords, Monarchy, Commons, and Church of England), of the Empire, and 'the elevation of the condition of the people' (reform of housing, water, light, the regulation of industry and improvement in the people's diet). The third plank was a startling innovation for official Con-

• *cont. from previous page*

servatism and it has no doubt it is this that led Mr. Brendan Corish, the leader of the Labour Party, to assert for the first time in the Dail that the Labour Party was a socialist party. The Labour Party has become increasingly class-conscious and is making efforts, even though small ones as yet, to make itself the voice of workers and peasants. Mr. Corish in the Dail has condemned Labour's case as the alternative to the existing government in the Dail and he has not been afraid of Noel Browne's support in doing this. When one adds to this that Labour won votes and seats in the last election, you can see why it seems that numbers of people in Ireland at last envisage a socialist alternative.

Ireland faces crucial problems: at home those of growing industrialisation, abroad those of the Common Market. Ireland has not been a welcome applicant to the Common Market. Her anti-colonialism makes her unwelcome in Belgium and France. Her cheap agricultural produce is likely to hold its own in British markets against continental producers. The danger is that the price demanded for Irish entry into the Common Market will be on the one hand Ireland's entry into NATO and on the other hand an even more extensive exploitation of cheap Irish labour. German and Japanese firms in Ireland for instance have already exhibited strong anti-trade union attitudes. The need is urgent therefore for the Labour Party to be converted to the kind of socialist platform on which the NPD is already fighting. This is the most important task for all Irish socialists.

servatism—the justification of 'Tory Democracy', the contention that Toryism is essentially a popular creed that represents the interests of the working-class as much as anyone. Explicitly the point recognises that if the Conservatives were to survive, like the Liberals, they had to bid for the working-class vote. Disraeli was one of the cleverest Conservatives ever produced—a man who recognised that to be a ruling-class party and successful in a society where the majority are industrial working-class, one should evaluate quite clearly what is essential for class-survival and what is mere ideological furniture—absolute pragmatism if the right men retain all the important strings.

Others in the Party were terrified. Historically, the Conservatives have always been a party more or less balanced between the pragmatists and the ideologists. As a Party, their historical success has been allowing change, in allowing new elites to rise and recruiting them into the Party before a fight developed—to do so, means a permanent shifting in ideology, and, furthermore, that the people who really believe in the ideological furniture (the principled) must never have overall dominance in the Party. Thus, in the nineteenth century, industrialists entered on the pragmatic side, shoving the old landed aristocracy out onto the ideological wing—with them, they brought imperialism and militant nationalism. Over time, of course, other elites enter the pragmatic door, shoving the existing occupants out into ideology—unless the old vanguard merges its interests with the new. On the other hand, unless the old shows at least some flexibility, it may even be shoved right out the other side, branded as a lunatic diehard. Thus there are still in Britain authentic survivals of the old landed aristocrats—now unknown, because they could not change; but, for example, the Duke of Devonshire's family (or Home, Salisbury etc) transformed themselves and kept pace, merging each successive generation with the current elite.

In the twenties and thirties, decisive shifts took place in the Party—the representatives of old basic in-

dustry (cotton, coal, railways, ship-building, iron and steel) were shoved rightwards into the ideological wing, while new growth industry (electrical equipment and engineering, chemicals, radio, cars), entered on the pragmatic side. The change in outlook was decisive—from free enterprise, anti-State, competitive and aggressive private property (the characteristics of nineteenth-century capitalism) to managerialism, corporatism, welfare and state planning, to a cluster of notions associated loosely under the term Keynesianism. The prime exponent of these last views was a certain Harold Macmillan, an intellectual backbencher in the thirties. What added point to the struggle was continuous slump in the basic industries, a mismanagement arising both from continuous loss of foreign markets and the sheer bloody-mindedness of the owners, a situation which, the new industries claimed, hamstrung their own efforts to expand.

From 1939, the issue becomes obscured by other priorities (although it is clear that new industry had won the main fight). But in the 1951 election, a large number of new young MPs, considerably more sympathetic to the pragmatists, entered Parliament—and the accession of Macmillan to power in 1956 symbolised the overwhelming success of their point of view. By now, prosperity and the nationalisation of some basic industries had taken off some of the pressure—State action was no longer required; on the contrary, when important it restricted the activities of the large corporations. In addition, State welfare was less effective for the ends involved than corporate welfare. More importantly still for the old attitudes, the type of demand catered for by the growth industries (as well as the level of national purchasing power required to buy their goods) turned the attention of the new Conservatives more and more to heavily industrialised markets—to Europe and the US. All of which adds up to crucial changes in Conservatism. Which brings us back to Disraeli. To go into Europe (and simultaneously scuttle 'the Empire') contradicts Disraeli's second point. To shift out of

• *cont. on page 6*

GAGARIN AND THE

IN the "Khrushchev era" the Soviet Union has undoubtedly earned the plaudits of the world for its achievements in space research. Another achievement has, perhaps understandably, gone completely unexploited by their massive propaganda organisation. Soviet leaders have actually devised fresh versions of that venerable and ancient phrase "some of my best friends are Jews". We have had "some of our best scientists..." (Khrushchev); "some of our best Generals..." (General Dragunsky) and even, it is rumoured "one of my best sons-in-law..." (again Khrushchev).

Before I am accused of aping the little Jewish boy who, when asked to write an essay on "the elephant" wrote on "the Elephant and the Jewish Problem", let us see if these two achievements are really so unrelated. The first has been hailed by many as establishing the socialist nature of the system which organised it, whereas Soviet policy towards its Jewish minority reveals a situation profoundly different from what one expects in a "socialist" land.

"BLACK HUNDREDS"

Why single out this particular absciss from the many uncovered by Khrushchev's performance at the 20th Congress and its encore at the 22nd? Perhaps because the belief persists that whatever else the Soviet Union has failed in, it has at least solved the terrible legacy of the Tsarist "prison house of nations" particularly in respect of the Jews. Also, there is a salutary lesson to be learned—particularly by those who smugly believe that "come the Revolution" and anti-semitism and similar prejudices will automatically dissolve. The persistence of anti-semitism and the failure of superficial administrative action should be studied.

Finally, the Jews in Russia by virtue of their unique history cannot but act as a thermometer registering the fevers of social and political upheaval, and degeneration; state fostered chauvinism; and finally, the paranoia of the Vhozhd himself.

One of the many aspects of Tsarism which horrified the western world was its deliberate and official foster-

ing of anti-semitism. Periodic outbreaks of mass murder, rape and looting were organised by the state organised "Black Hundred" with the connivance of church and police. Apart from the physical dangers of being a Jew in Tsarist Russia there were the apartheid restrictions. Confined to a "pale of settlement"; restricted to the poorest trades; kept off the land (with few exceptions); it is no wonder that Jews played an important role in the revolutionary organisations—including the Bolshevik Party.

LEGACY

The Revolution swept aside the whole edifice of racial and national oppression overnight. But the legacy of centuries of anti-semitic indoctrination by Church, school, political parties and press could not disappear so easily.

It was expected that, when the Jews left the "pale", entering factory and farm; when the Jewish masses shook off medieval obscurantism under the impact of revolutionary ideas, they would become indistinguishable from anyone else. The anti-semitic appetite would have nothing to feed on and would, in any case, be eradicated by Socialist education. The incorrigibles would be dealt with by law.

PROBLEM 'SOLVED'

The Jews did precisely this and, the Soviet Union proudly claimed the solving of the Jewish Problem within its borders as an established fact. Indeed to the observer this seemed so true as to be obvious. Had anti-semitism not been characterized—forcefully if not very scientifically—as "cannibalism" by the Great Stalin himself? Did the Jews not have their own republic—Biro Bidjan in the Far East—to enable them to conform to Stalin's famous definition of a nation? Were there not hundreds of thousands of Jewish children attending schools using their own language—Yiddish? Where else could the great Yiddish language culture in the Soviet Union be equalled—daily newspapers, literary and political weeklies, monthlies,

quarterlies; theatres and theatre schools; Yiddish facilities in Universities at Moscow, Kiev, Kharkov; Synagogues apparently functioning all facilities. Much was made of the contrast with the parlous condition of Jews in Nazi Germany and with the more subtle anti-semitism of other countries.

The War brought news of Jewish heroism as well as of Jewish suffering. Jews topped their traditional enemies, the Cossacks, in the list of awards for bravery. Indeed—the unthinkable happened—a Jew, General Lev Dovator, commanded Cossacks. A special Jewish Committee was formed to act in liaison with the Jews of the West. Visits overseas were paid by leading Soviet Jewish Cultural figures.

BLOW FALLS

Then, suddenly, the blow fell. In 1948 leading Yiddish cultural figures were arrested, some to be executed and others to die in the forced labour camps. Every means of expression in the Yiddish language—schools, printing, theatres—were closed. All Jewish communal, social or welfare organisations were shut down. The operation was characterized by stealth and deceit. The whole cataclysm was vigorously denied. It was maintained the no-one had been arrested or shot. Yiddish had, it was true, been curtailed but this was the tendency in all countries because of the decline in Yiddish speaking population.

For eight years, until 1956, this peculiar situation—where some maintained that "X" was dead and some (Ehrenberg, Polevoi) said that "X" was "pottering in his garden"—while "X" said not a word, continued. Then a Polish Yiddish Newspaper "*Volks Stimme*" confirmed the worst.

MOSCOW TRIALS

How could this have happened? True, from time to time, there had been rumours—even accusations. Trotsky in 1926 had accused the Stalinist bureaucracy of using anti-semitism against the Opposition. He had also sniffed an odour of anti-

JEWISH PROBLEM

M. BEN REUBEN

semitism at the Moscow Trials in the late thirties when the Jewish names of many of the defendants were resurrected. It was difficult to explain why Trotsky's son, one of the accused, should have been called "Bronstein", a name discarded by Trotsky so many years before, particularly as his own name was Sedov. Such minor matters seemed "spots on the sun" as a well known Stalinist was to say very much later in a similar context. It seemed churlish to say the least to set "Bronstein-or-Sedov" against the outlawing of anti-semitism.

It had seemed tactless when, during the war, Stalin created the "Order of Bogdan Chmelnitzky" named after the champion mass murderer of Jews before Hitler. But had he not reinstated and glorified other historic figures who had spilled not a little Russian and Ukrainian and other blood in their time?

DOCTORS PLOT

In 1952, the anti-semitic atmosphere of the Slansky trials in Czechoslovakia inevitably reflected on the Soviet Union. In 1953 three followed the "Moscow Doctors' Plot" its climax narrowly averted. Stalin, ever the grand tactician, departed this life—just in time, according to some malicious tools of imperialism, to prevent him carrying out the full scale destruction of the Jews.

It would be most satisfactory if it could now be said that, after Stalin quit the scene, all ended happily. The "aberrations" of the Stalin period—the "Black Years" as they are known by the Soviet Jews—receded into the past. The errors were rectified and, in gratitude, the Chief Rabbi joined the Communist Party.

PASSPORT STIGMA

Unfortunately, this was not the case. The "Volks Stimme" article was dubbed "slandorous and anti-Soviet" and it was indignantly denied that any specific action had been taken against Jews as Jews. Everything was lumped together under the all-embracing "abuses of the cult of the individual".

As for the Yiddish language, well—Jews had stopped speaking it anyway—apparently by unanimous and secret vote one night in 1948. In the frenzied international debate which followed, more and more dirt was uncovered—a pattern which should be familiar to all. It was found that there was a professional quota for Jews; that Jews had their internal passports stamped "Jew"; that even the Great Soviet Encyclopaedia itself had a distinct anti-Jewish bias... that Yiddish poets were producing poetry in Yiddish but it was only being printed in Russian translation...

PATHETICALLY SMALL

At last, after prolonged pressure by many delegates and persistent pleas during the visits abroad of Soviet leaders, some sort of thaw seemed to set in. A Yeshiva (theological college) for training Rabbis was opened in Moscow. It has facilities for twelve students! A book by a classic Yiddish writer was published in a pathetically small edition—in Russian. But then, in 1959, there appeared three books by classic Yiddish writers—in Yiddish. Late in 1961 a Yiddish bi-monthly "Soviet Homeland" commenced publication. At the same time it was revealed that of the nearly three million Jews registered in the census, almost half a million had given their language as Yiddish.

NO IDENTITY

When one considers the efforts needed to achieve the publication of three books and a bi-monthly magazine in Yiddish for a community of this size and contrasts it with the attention devoted to creating a written alphabet for a nomadic Siberian tribe numbering two thousand in all, one wonders what unique interpretation of Marxism is at the root of it.

It is of peculiar significance that the Soviet policy of denying the Jewish Martyrs of Nazism their identity continues. Murdered Ukrainians are Ukrainians but Jews are "Soviet citizens". That this is not a matter of academic interest is shown by the uproar which greeted the poem "Babi

Yar" by Evgeny Yevtushenko. In spotlighting the massacre of 34,000 Jews as Jews at Babi Yar he was sure to goad Khrushchev and his Establishment Writers to fury. His poem began—"There are no memorials over Babi Yar..." and had not Khrushchev himself promised a memorial? What was even worse was the fact that Yevtushenko is not a Jew, not even "objectively".

Within recent weeks we have seen the arrest of the leaders of the Leningrad Jewish community; the threatened closure of the Moscow Yeshiva; the visit to France of General Dragunsky, a Jew in command of an important area, who claimed that there were many Jewish Generals in the Soviet Union; the participation of five Jewish delegates to the 22nd Congress—four from Biro-Bidjan and the other being Col. General Jacob Kreiser, in command of the Soviet Army of the Far East.

CONTRADICTIONS

The whole history of Soviet Policy towards its Jewish minority is a sorry mess of contradictions—epitomized in the pressure towards assimilation of people who are forced to carry passports stamped "Jew".

One thing can be said with certainty—it is impossible to fit Soviet policy towards Soviet Jews and Yiddish culture into any relationship with Marxist theory or with Socialism. If Socialism is meant for people rather than for the meaningless cipher "the people", then surely it must be judged by its success or failure in tackling such problems rather than by the courage and personality of Gagarin and his successors.

To close with Yevtushenko's words "Let the Internationale ring out When the last anti-semitite on earth is buried."

Read the—

INDUSTRIAL

WORKER price 4d

from:—K. Dunbar

134 Carlton Vale, NW6.

LETTER

Dear Comrade,

Alasdair MacIntyre concludes his very clear and informative article on 'Congo, Katanga and UN' in the January issue of Socialist Review by urging that "critical support for the UN is the realistic attitude for revolutionary socialists". It seems to me that the path by which he reaches this conclusion—finding that there is no proletariat in the Congo and therefore inferring that it is futile simply to expose both imperialist camps—is a blind alley for socialists, entered on through a misunderstanding of what we can usefully try to do in world politics.

This misunderstanding is to suppose that a sufficiently well informed socialist, parachuted down at any

point in the world, should be able to offer a correct program for resolving the situation in which he finds himself. However, the truth is that there are many situations in life for which there is no socialist solution, and quite agreeing with Alasdair MacIntyre that no organised working class yet exists in the Congo, this is one of them. Whatever comfort we may find in some objectively historically progressive results of the British wars against India, China or Africa, these are not usually considered as calling for critical support from marxists. We may leave it to liberals and stalinists to make the reactionary social system of a colonized people an excuse for critical support for the colonialists. To hold otherwise is to come dangerously close to a cynically "realistic" view of history and politics, which is quite foreign to the marxist's concern for increasing the consciousness of the working people of the world.

Since Alasdair MacIntyre accepts

that "the Congolese central government and the UN force which supports it is also a creature of imperialist powers", and as there are far more illusions in the British labour movement about the UN than there are about Tshombe he would do better to concentrate his main fire on exposing the motives of the UN operation. If it is felt that to refuse at least critical support to one side in every contemporary conflict is "revolutionary romanticism" then a better case could be made for volunteering for the Katangan army, whose success would mean a blow to the plans of "the main enemy", American imperialism, etc etc.

But seriously it should be clear that there is no reason to fall into either despair, or phoney "realism", or idealistic abstention, because of the cruel fact that the ingredients of a human, socialist solution are lacking from some situations.

Yours fraternally

Tony Young

• from page 3

State welfare into corporate welfare leaves little left of the third point. And finally, to give ultimate authority over Britain to a European Assembly, supersedes all the present effective national authorities (the Commons become a sort of LCC, and the Queen a sort of Dame of Sark). Very little is left of Disraelian Conservatism.

That the pragmatists are so strong is indicated by the absence of direct conflict on these issues. It is in the interest of the pragmatists that there should be a conspiracy of silence on the subject, that everybody should be 'waiting to see what the terms are' before we enter Europe. Macmillan knows he may well go down into history as the Conservative who annihilated anything that could be called Conservatism. The Tories sleep—Hinchingbrooke and Walker-Smith are isolated. True, old style Empire issues tend to raise a cry occasionally—some 80 MPs protested against the proposal to deliver 24 1,400 lb bombs to the UN for use in Katanga, but only 6 were prepared to sign the Hinchingbrooke motion censuring the Government. Lambton claims that there was a Cabinet deadlock over the future of Northern Rhodesia, but outside all is relatively quiet. The Immigration Bill was a sop to

keep the ideologists quiet, and smallpox helped Butler overcome his queasiness.

Outside the Commons, the progressives have a fairly easy run publicly—so much so that the National Fellowship consists of little more than the ancient and forgotten. Cheltenham Conservative Association provides a miniature study of a counter-trend. Dodds-Parker (Winchester, Magdalen, Sudan Political Service, Colonel in the Grenadier Guards: very old style) looks like getting the Party's Parliamentary

nomination against Irving (hotel owner, director of a large Cheltenham manufacturing concern, twice Mayor of Cheltenham: standing as new style) unless the present bitter tussle splits the Party.

All in all, Butler's management of the Party seems to have demolished a lot of ideologists: Macleod will no doubt continue the tradition. This is what is called Tory 'empiricism'. Outsiders like Lambton (or Fairlie) call for a return to principle, and ask plaintively 'where are we going?'. Not towards Disraeli, that's for sure.

Year ending 30th June	Total U.S. Expenditure on Armaments and Guided Missiles		
	Total Procurement and Production \$ million	—of which Guided Missiles \$ million	Guided Missiles as percent of Total
1951	3,976	21	0.5
1952	11,478	169	1.5
1953	17,123	295	1.7
1954	15,958	504	3.2
1955	12,997	718	5.5
1956	12,182	1,168	9.6
1957	13,649	2,095	15.3
1958	14,677	2,737	18.6
1959	14,410	3,494	24.2
1960 Estimate	13,943	3,500	25.1
1961 Estimate	13,602	3,479	25.6

Reprinted from Labour Research

OUT NOW!
INTERNATIONAL
SOCIALISM

No 7

includes:

KRUSHCHEV'S CONGRESS
DECLINE OF WELFARE
REFORM AND REVOLUTION
CUBA

2/9 post paid from

47 Fitzroy Rd., London NW1

• from page 1

of the ladder. The economic power of private industry also requires that it shall have a decisive effect upon government financial policy. The result is that Mr. Jay's proposals have no chance of being implemented while private ownership remains what it is. Compared with the Marxists whom Mr. Jay condemns so sharply and so high-mindedly, Mr. Jay is an Utopian dreamer. The trouble is that the dream is not his own but that of the Labour Party leadership. What is wrong with it becomes terribly clear the moment that they are forced to pass from generalised talk about financial policy to choices between real economic and political alternatives which, if they were a government, they would have to make.

DIFFERING POLICIES

Mr. Jay, for instance, is an anti-Common Marketeer. Mr. Roy Jenkins is a pro-Common Marketeer. Mr. Gaitskell, I imagine, wishes that the Common Market had never been heard of. Mr. Callaghan and Mr. Gaitskell are worried by Sir Roy Welensky. Mr. Roy Mason has attacked *The Economist* for daring to attack Sir Roy. Mr. Crosland has radical and definite proposals for the reform of education. The authors of

PAY AT THE TOP

Anyone receiving a salary of £20,000 or more qualifies for the maximum surtax reduction granted by the last budget of £1,775 per annum, or £ 34 per week. Our annual league table showing the companies which pay the highest average salaries to their directors is therefore of more than usual interest this year.

The figure of average director's pay given in the table is obtained by taking the total directors' emoluments from fees, salary, commission and pension contributions, which every public company is obliged by the Companies Act to publish, and dividing by the number of directors. It does not include tax-free expenses which of course may be very substantial indeed.

The board of many firms include a number of part-time directors who may get only £1,000 or so in the shape of fees. I.C.I. for example has six part-time directors, and if we allow for these the average pay of the remaining 19 full-time directors works out at over £23,000 per year, which is close to the £24,000 which Dr. Beeching used to receive. Moreover the senior directors usually receive more than the junior ones.

Thus the salaries of the higher paid directors will be well above the average figures shown in the table. According to the *Sunday Times* (19. 3. 61) the best paid man in industry is Sir William Lyons, chairman of Jaguar Cars with around £100,000 a year, but many others such as top Shell men, Sir Foster Robinson, chairman of the Bristol paper manufacturing company E. S. and A. Robinson, and Mr. Lew Grade of Associated Television are thought to be on the 50,000 mark. Lord Heyworth, who retired recently from the chairmanship of Unilever, received a pension of £24,000 in 1960 and would have received a salary while chairman in the neighbourhood of £50,000 (*Daily Telegraph*, 6. 4. 61.)

So it would seem that the chairman tends to get roughly twice as much as the average pay of the directors on his board.

Company	No. of Directors	Total Directors' Emoluments	Average Directors' Emoluments
		£	£
Jaguar Cars	4	209,109	52,277
Turner and Newall	8	237,730	29,716
Boots	9	235,060	26,118
Shell	11	266,089	24,190
Vauxhall Motors	9	196,801	21,866
E. S. & A. Robinson	15	317,460	21,164
Bowater Paper Corpn.	10	204,000	20,400
Dunlop Rubber	12	238,605	19,884
F. W. Woolworth	15	285,639	19,043
Imperial Chemical Industries	25	452,000	18,080
Gallaher	11	197,448	17,949
Unilever	24	416,000	17,333
Associated Television	11	189,022	17,184
Lewis's	10	171,819	17,182
Courtaulds	17	285,328	16,784

reprinted from *Labour Research*

Signposts for the Sixties believed that vagueness on education was essential. And these examples could be multiplied. If one were unkind, one would point out that Mr. Jay in his book wants income tax raised, whereas in the middle of the last election Mr. Gaitskell pledged himself not to increase it. So that even on this issue what the Right is saying is not clear. In fact the Right are as infected by splits and sects quite as much as the Left has ever been.

NO FEAR OF RIGHT

The worst mistake that Left wingers could make at this moment is to fear the Right. What we have to do is to offer constructive proposals around which the Party can be united: proposals of radical assault on inequalities in British society. If the Right are serious they will want to discuss with us. If they are not, they will continue to show themselves united only against the Left but without either principle or policy.

IN THE RED

R. H. TAWNEY, who died recently, was a very great man indeed. As an economic historian he helped to establish the relation between Protestantism and capitalism. He was a Guild Socialist with G.D.H. Cole, believing in genuine workers' control. He never worshipped the power of the state, as so many gradualist socialists have done. He refused a peerage from Ramsay Macdonald in what is probably the rudest letter ever sent to a British Prime Minister. In the obituary notices the establishment tried to claim him as its own.

ENDS AND MEANS

It was a pity that they did not quote the last paragraph of Tawney's book, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, where Tawney agrees with Keynes that "Modern capitalism is absolutely irreligious, without internal union, without much public spirit, often, though not always, a mere congress of possessors and pursuers." Even more relevant in these present days is the following passage from *The Acquisitive Society*: "When a Cabinet Minister declares that the greatness of this country depends upon the volume of its exports, so that France, which exports comparatively little, and Elizabethan England, which exported next to nothing, are presumably to be pitied as altogether inferior civilizations, that is Industrialism. It is the confusion of one minor department of life with the whole of life... When the Press clamours that the one thing needed to make this island an Arcadia is productivity, and more productivity, and yet more productivity, that is Industrialism. It is the confusion of means with ends." That was written in 1921.

★

Now that the Bishops have condemned capital punishment, what will the government do? One of the things they could consider is stopping some of the nonsense that their own supporters talk about the increase in crimes of violence. Social scientists have recently provided some interesting facts here. The Home Office Research Unit, for example, in its report on *Murder* showed that when

people kill, they usually kill their relatives. Murder in fact is the family crime. Another striking suggestion is that the increase in crimes of violence is largely apparent and not real. Most of those convicted of such crimes are young men in brawls inside and outside cafes. Whether they are caught or not depends on how soon the police are called and quickly they come. How quickly they come depends on how many policemen there are. As more policemen have been recruited, it isn't that more crimes have taken place, but that more people have been caught. So much for the wild indignation of Tory MP's on these matters.

★

Enrico Mattei, who runs the Italian state oil enterprise, is the darling of all those who want cheaper petrol for their cars. Mattei threatens soon to invade Britain with a new chain of petrol stations and to challenge the domination of the big petrol companies. He is the prototype of the modern enlightened industrialist. Signor Mattei pointed out at the end of last year that a billion dollars in-

vested in the Middle East will extract more oil than 24 billion dollars invested in America. Arab readers, please note, that the price of cheaper petrol is Arab poverty.

1880

NATALIA Sedova began her political life by being expelled from her boarding school in Kharkov for spreading anti-religious and radical sentiments. She went to Paris to study art where she met Trotsky in 1902. From then on she was Trotsky's constant help and comrade both in the struggles before the revolution and in the struggles to maintain the revolution against the counter-revolution of the bureaucracy. No sacrifice or hardship was ever too great for her. After Trotsky's murder in 1940 she continued his work, repudiating in her famous letter of 1947 those who thought that they continued Trotsky's work by merely repeating his formulas. Trotsky spoke in his diary in 1935 of the "unspoiled, integral, artistic quality of her nature." She was a lesson to all revolutionary socialists in her humanism. We mourn her death.

1961

WHAT WE STAND FOR

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

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

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

The withdrawal of all British troops from overseas

The establishment of workers' control.

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

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

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