

Socialist Review

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW,
BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

JUNE 1962

4 d.

OPEN LETTER TO A RIGHT-WING YOUNG SOCIALIST

ALASDAIR MACINTYRE

Dear Comrade,

You call yourself a Gaitskellite. You have rather enjoyed the tea-party intrigues of the Campaign for Democratic Socialism and you have been flattered by the suggestion that you are a hard-headed realist and not one of those impractical utopians of the Left. You are perhaps slightly disappointed to find that those who denounced Trotskyism among your friends had never actually read Trotsky and you may even have wondered why your friends campaign so much more assiduously against the Left than they do against the Tories. But now an issue has come up which ought to worry you even more. For you claim to be a democrat, and all around you in the Young Socialists a campaign is going or directed towards proscriptions and expulsions. The despicable untruths about Communist infiltration into CND have no doubt made you uneasy. But you have probably felt happier about the proscription of INDEC, which proposes to run candidates against the Labour Party at elections. Certainly this makes proscription unavoidable. But the question I want you to answer is: who made INDEC or something like it inevitable?

First of all take note that the announcement that an independent committee to promote the intervention of unilateralist candidates in Parliamentary

elections had been formed was greeted by the more Pecksniffian members of Transport House and the Right with public horror and private glee. Surely they had now found an excuse for proscribing at least selected members of CND! It is perhaps worth asking not only you but also those more Gadarene members of the Labour Party as they rush towards disaster to pause and ask who is responsible for the birth of INDEC. The answer is clear: it is Mr. Gaitskell and his friends. For if, at a time of crisis for the Labour Party, Labour supporters are prepared to split the Labour vote in the interests of getting the unilateralist case heard, it is precisely because of Mr. Gaitskell's determination to have his private way in the party, not by answering the unilateralist case, but by preventing it being put, insofar as he can prevent that. For Mr. Gaitskell has openly declared himself against argument. "I have always said that the one thing that prevented the Labour Party getting into power and staying in power was our inherent tendency to argue." (The Guardian, 7.5.62.)

The case against the possession of the H-bomb by any government whose policies we can affect does not rest upon any of the three positions to which Mr. Gaitskell is presumably alluding when he tries to smear his opponents by calling them pacifists, neutralists and fellow-travellers or even

Communists. Very few unilateralists in the country are pacifists. The support for pacifism is tiny compared with the support for CND. Again only a handful of supporters of CND are neutralists (Lord Russell dealt with neutralism in the best possible way by inviting those neutral governments who have proclaimed themselves unconditionally against testing to send their navies into the area of Christmas Island tests and so prevent them—nobody responded at all. But the moral is not just that neutralism is a political non-starter! it is that it was only from Russell's position that it could possibly be exposed in this way). But of course the allusions to neutralism and pacifism are only window dressing for the great CP smear. On this count, either Mr. Gaitskell is ignorant or a liar. The Communist Party are not unilateralists: they could not possibly support the policy resolution passed at the CND Annual Conference in 1961, demanding the unilateral renunciation of the H-Bomb by every government which possessed it. Moreover the Communist Party on this whole issue are fundamentally in the same position as Mr. Gaitskell: Russia must keep its H-Bomb, because it is a deterrent. Russia must test whenever "military necessity" demands it. There is no difference between Mr. Gaitskell and Mr. Gollan about Great Power H-Bombs, about the morality of H-Bombs or the politics of H-Bombs. Nonetheless it would be wrong to use Mr. Gaitskell's own formula of Guilt by Association. What is needed is to point out the hypocrisy of Gaitskell shouting at hecklers to "go and see Mr. Krushchev and tell him to ban his bomb." (The Guardian, 7.5.62.) For he knows perfectly well that this has happened. The unilateralist peace marchers went to Moscow and told Krushchev to ban his bomb. And he didn't, because he too uses the arguments of Mr. Gaitskell. He too is a Great Power H-Bomb man, a member of Gaitskell's Club.

...But the central issue is not Mr. Gaitskell's inner party McCarthyism. It is the way that this is used to observe the central arguments on which the unilateralist cause rests. For the first of these arguments raises the very simple question: why are we Socialists anyway? And the inescapable answer is that we are Socialists because we are against what the existing capitalist social order does to people. But there is nothing worse than what the H-Bomb does to people. Even with all their horrors, the camps of Nazi Germany are over; but in Japan they are still dying from our atomic bombs. And the bombs which Truman and Attlee

CONFED. STRIKE VOTE

KARL DUNBAR

The workers have spoken; here endeth the first lesson. The Pope of Peckham Road might well rejoice that "his" flock have voted 2 to 1 against a national stoppage on the Confederation wages claim, but the unctuous drippings of the AEU Executive will make no difference to the battle for wages. This will be conducted, as always, by the workshops, where the struggle is clearly understood. Neither class solidarity nor consciousness meant a thing in this "secret ballot". Creeping stealthily away from "rule by the book", the AEU Executive arrogated to the individual AEU member the right to take a decision which could only be rightfully taken on the workshop floor, ie on a class basis. Which "individual" in his right mind is going to vote FOR a strike if the ballot merely asks "in favour of strike action" or "against strike action".

For twelve months the Confederation have bitten their finger nails down to the quick, waiting, hoping (praying?), for a glimmer of light from Lothill Street. In desperation, having at last to either do something or delegate their authority to the strike committees, they chose to deliberately murder the wages claim. How well they succeeded.

Why choose the AEU especially? Firstly, they are the biggest single affiliated union in the Confed; secondly, without the engineers, without the factories closing down, all talk of a national wages struggle is impossible.

What does it all mean for the immediate future? On the one hand the Tories have won the pay freeze, and, with the help of the TU top brass hope to win the future "pay restraint". Significantly, Carron talks about "our members feel a deep responsibility to the nation and the national economy". But sitting as he does on NEDC there is a good reason why *he* must be "responsible".

There are signs of a growing consciousness among factory workers that their own problems are reflected outside their factories, in other sections of the community. Nurses are receiving support for their claim from many sections of industry. Will this mean that Old Age Pensioners will get industrial backing for their plight? Will the landlords feel the might of the workshop organizations when they evict workers Will the Bomb raise

industrial action instead of a paper revolution?

The pressure on the top union brass is greater than at any other time in the past decade. At every union conference (with some USDAW exceptions) the leadership find it necessary to reiterate those platitudes about their "constitutional" powers over the membership. Every time this happens the criticisms from the membership become sharper, more threatening. Carried back into the workshops this independence becomes a real challenge, not only to the bureau-

crats but also to the very system. The struggle as yet is sectional, divided and many-headed, but it exists.

Although it may appear that the Executive Committees have won the bosses' battle for them once again, there will be a number of serious and deep-rooted struggles around the wages question in the near future. These struggles will again be sectional, but they will tend to grow together because of the need to combine strength to replace the vacuum left by the "responsible" leadership.

PREJUDICE ON THE RAILS

STAN MILLS (NUR)

In recent years West Indian and other coloured workers have been joining the ranks of the railwaymen, and while we hear quite a lot about prejudice and discrimination by landlords, etc.—and quite rightly so—we hear very little about colour prejudice and discrimination by the workers.

This article, while not intended to be a general attack against railwaymen, will nevertheless show the extent to which many railway workers have allowed their minds to be influenced by the evils of our class society.

While I appreciate that prejudice is not peculiar to railwaymen, it is nevertheless very disturbing to find it so widespread within the industry. And while the West Indians, etc., have been accepted as fellow workers by the progressive few, the majority treat them with varying degrees of intolerance. Of these latter there are those who are openly hostile; there are those—and these seem to be in the majority—who treat them with cold silence; and there are those who accept them, but reluctantly.

To give some examples. Far too many active trade unionists are responsible for agitating against coloured workers. At one large London guards' depot an active NUR member persuaded a considerable number of the guards to sign a petition objecting to the employment of coloured workers as guards. The petition was rejected by the management, although as I will show later, the management's attitude does vary from region to region.

Probably as many as 80 per cent. of railway workers are in favour of the Government's plan to restrict immigra-

tion, mainly because coloured workers are considered to be a threat to the British workers' living conditions. Many railwaymen are of the opinion that all coloured workers should be sent home. It is not uncommon to see "ban the blacks" and "keep Britain white" scrawled up in staff lavatories and guards' brake vans.

Many station foremen and supervisors who are prejudiced can often play havoc with the lives of coloured railwaymen and many of them are constantly reporting them for mere trivialities, causing many to be dismissed and others to resign. At one large London suburban station the inspector in charge recommended to the station master that three West Indian porters should be dismissed to make room for "white workers" who had applied for porters' jobs, although no complaint was made against the West Indians' work. He even went to his union branch to get support, but unfortunately for him this particular NUR branch is one of the most militant in the union, and he eventually walked out after many members had told him what they thought of him.

One leading porter at the same station told me that as many as 80 per cent of the platform staff were cold-shouldering the coloured porters and in some cases the coloured porters were told by the white workers that they were not wanted in the staff room. In some cases guards refuse to travel in the same compartments as coloured trainee guards.

Recently fifty motor drivers threa-

● PREJUDICE

tened to come out on strike if a coloured carriage cleaner was promoted to fill one of the vacancies. There is even a resolution on this year's AGM agenda of the NUR which if passed would commit the NUR to a policy of racial discrimination.

As for the BTC, it is officially opposed to racial discrimination, but in spite of this there have been obvious cases of discrimination. One of the worst recent cases, exposed by the "Daily Herald," and by myself, in the "Railway Review."

The "Daily Herald" report was headed, "COLOUR BARRIER AT TOP PEOPLE STATION," and went on to tell how coloured workers are barred from working at Paddington Station because it is used by so many "top people." It was reported that Mr. Price, a public relations man of the Western Region, stated: "We don't have colour bar—it's just a question of colour preference." When West Indians call for a job they are told: "all vacancies are filled." Because of this the BR's London staff recruiting office doesn't bother to send coloured men to Paddington.

After my letter appeared in the "Railway Review," it published a letter from the General Manager of the Western Region denying the accusation. But as I pointed out at the time the General Manager's subordinates had already let the cat out of the bag.

Much of the prejudice is based on the fact that many railway workers depend on overtime to earn a living wage, and because of the serious staff shortage railwaymen have been supplementing their low basic wages by working long hours. Instead of making a determined effort to gain a decent basic wage they blame the employment of coloured workers for the loss of their overtime.

In spite of this situation there are a number of bright spots, mainly the result of progressive individuals, who because they are respected by the workers, are able often to keep prejudice from developing into actual discrimination.

One such spot is Norwood Shunting Yard. Here more than half of the shunters are coloured workers, yet workers of many nationalities work together as a team. This of course does not mean that the white workers are free of prejudice, but simply that much respected head shunter, Tom Rimmer, is able to dissuade them from discriminating against their colleagues.

This is an example of what can be accomplished when a correct lead is given.

Support Spanish Workers

The strike movement initiated in Asturias several weeks ago continues and extends itself. 70,000 miners are heroically struggling against the consequences of the "stabilization plan" of the bourgeoisie and the Francoist state. The movement has extended to metal enterprises of Asturias and the Basque country. The miners of Penarroya (Cordoba) and of Linares (Jaen) have been incorporated in to the struggle. The students of Madrid have courageously affirmed in the streets their solidarity with the striking workers and their hostility to *Opus Dei*, one of the most reactionary institutions of Spanish clericalism. In Barcelona, in Madrid, and in other cities, workers and students are getting ready to enter the struggle.

The struggle against the Francoist tyranny has entered into a new phase. The movement, because of its scope and depth, is the most important of all produced in Spain since Franco's victory.

The workers are rising against one of the most iniquitous exploitative systems of Europe and they demand a substantial improvement of their living conditions. Given the nature of the ruling regime in Spain, their action has an evident political significance. The miners and the metal workers of Asturia, of Euzkadi (Basque country) and of Andalucia struggle against the bourgeoisie and the totalitarian state.



The Francoist government, which during the first weeks did not dare to brutally face the workers, is getting ready to put into play all its immense repressive apparatus in order to control an action which can endanger the existence of the scandalous and degrading regime which has ruled Spain for 23 years.

In the present circumstances, when the bourgeoisie and the Francoist state are begging for their incorporation into the European Common Market and asking credits from international capitalism in order to reinforce its economic system and its repressive and military apparatus, the struggle of the Spanish workers acquires an extraordinary importance. We must do everything in our power to support this struggle.

The movement, like the ones of 1951, 1953, 1957 and 1958 develops under the sign of unity and of action on a wide front.

The political and trade union forces from inside as well as from outside the country, must coordinate their efforts with the view of obtaining the victory of the striking workers. On the other hand, the international workers' movement—and especially the European—should not remain indifferent to the action of the Spanish workers. The time demands something more than the traditional resolutions and mere verbal condemnations.



The workers of all countries—and particularly those of Western Europe—must affirm through concrete expressions their total and unconditional solidarity with the Spanish workers.

The workers' front is a reality in Spain. The proletariat is the essential moving force in the struggle for the overthrow of the Francoist dictatorship. A new generation of workers has entered into action and is getting ready to resume the traditions of struggle.

Long live the heroic struggle of the Spanish workers against the bourgeoisie and the Francoist State!

Long live the international solidarity of the workers with the strikers of Spain!

The Executive Committee of P.O.U.M.

May 5, 1962.

Dr. Hill's Housing Fraud

JIM KINCAID

The present Government is continually boasting that more houses are now built every year than under the Labour Governments of 1945-51. It is perfectly true that the annual production of houses is 25% higher now than in 1950. Nor is this any amazing Tory achievement. When Labour was in power there were acute shortages of building labour and raw materials. Any large increase in housebuilding would have put Britain heavily in debt with other countries. The overall economic position is very different today.

In any case the simple total of new houses built each year is less important than the question of who gets them. Last year, about 250,000 new houses were completed in England and Wales, and of these about 140,000 were built by private enterprise. Nearly all new privately built houses are put up for sale—only about one in fifty is built for letting. The rest are sold to those who are lucky enough to be able to get a mortgage. It costs about £5 a week to pay off the mortgage of a new two bedroom house. And the money-lenders are most unwilling to give mortgages to people who would then be spending more than one fifth of their income in paying back the loan. This means that to get a mortgage a man must be earning about £25 a week, and, what is more be able to guarantee that he will be earning this sum for the next 20-25 years. Only about one family in eight has a breadwinner in this happy position.

What of the others? When Labour was in power the local authorities used to build about 140,000 every year, and they went to the families that needed them most. Last year the figure was 93,000. Very few of these houses were built for general needs. Families whose houses were demolished as slums had the first claim. Last year they accounted for more than 64,000 of the new council houses. Another 14,000 went to families whose previous homes had been demolished under road-widening or redevelopment schemes. Most of the rest were one bedroom houses specially built for old people.

Of course it is only fair that the old and those who live in the worst of the slums should have first priority when the new houses are shared out. But in clamping down on council house building, the Government is showing itself quite indifferent to the needs of millions of other people. Taking the country as a whole, there are about half a million families on local authority waiting lists. Many of them have been living in hope of a council house for ten years or more. For most, the chances are slim. If the members of a family are neither old, nor living in a slum so bad that there is a prospect of clearance, then they are not likely to get a council house for a long time to come—unless they contract tuberculosis.

The fault does not lie with the local authorities—most of whom would like to build new houses at twice the present rate. But they are crippled by the rocketing price of land in most urban areas. And every year the burden of interest charges which local authorities have to pay out, grows heavier and heavier. The capitalists from whom local authorities have to borrow are making money hand over fist. The homeless, the overcrowded, the slum-dweller, the underpaid worker, cannot afford to buy a house, and may wait ten (or twenty) years for a council house. In the Tory scheme of things, those who are in need are sacrificed to those who can afford to pay.

Gaitskell's Chopper

JOHN PHILLIPS

It is ironical that May Day—the day of solidarity demonstrations of the Labour movement—should this year appear to be the prelude to the organised smashing of the left wing in the Labour Party. What happened at the demonstrations in London and Glasgow is now well known. The ease with which all sections of the press, Labour Party and CND condemned the 'hooliganism' of the demonstrators showed

clearly that any action taken against the Young Socialists for their part in the rout of Brown and Gaitskell would meet with little opposition.

In reality, of course, the moves against the left did not start with May Day. This merely opened the door. Ever since Gaitskell's 'fight' speech at Scarborough the battle has been on. Every opportunity to damage and weaken the unilateralist cause—from

the refusal to endorse parliamentary candidates such as Ernie Roberts to the gagging of the Young Socialists—has not been missed. It is in this light that the action of some Young Socialists on May Day must be seen. Of course, this method of protest cannot be condoned; but it expresses the frustration of the YS.

Now the attack is on in earnest. The fact that the NEC can proscribe the Young Socialist newspaper *Keep Left* without holding an enquiry or giving any reasons for the proscription, gives an indication of the ruthlessness that they will employ. When it comes to prising out all CND supporters in the Labour Party the NEC will obviously have a more difficult task. Although the attack on *Keep Left*, Russell and others is motivated by the same desire, the backing down of the NEC on the expulsions of Russell and his co-sponsors of the World Peace Congress exposes the relation of forces.

Gaitskell's only aim is the winning of the next election and is now faced with the problem of whether he will gain votes by kicking out the dissidents in the party or letting them stay in. Taking into account the general political climate of the country it is certain that the disbanding of the YS, with its militant policies and refusal to accept Labour Party reforms as the be-all of its existence, will not turn voters to the Liberals.

Conversely, the expulsion of Russell would not only raise some faint cry of disgust from the semi-political public but would certainly strain the loyalties of too many valuable party workers.

Here lies the crux and solution to Gaitskell's problem and the problem of the Young Socialists.

It is fair to assume that if the YS were disbanded then there would be little or no chance of keeping an independent organisation for more than a few weeks; the only answer is for the YS to stay in the Labour Party. But how? A YS that does no work in or for the Constituency or Ward Party can have no hope of surviving serious pressure of the NEC. The Constituency Parties are the only section that will defend the existence of YS branches but they will only fight the NEC decision where the YS is integrated in the party.

There may well be a tendency over the next months for many Young Socialists to leave the Party either in disgust or despair. If this happens it will weaken the YS to such an extent that Gaitskell will not have to worry about it at all, so allowing him to concentrate solely on the CND.

ALLIANCE WITHOUT PROGRESS

SERGIO JUNCO

The "Alliance for Progress" of the Kennedy Administration—\$20,000,000,000 in aid have been promised to Latin American countries over the next ten years—has relieved the consciences of some American Liberals who always lamented the fact that Latin America was being "ignored" by the United States. It is no accident that while Latin America was a solid pro-U.S. block there was no substantial aid given to Latin America but when the first crack occurred in the form of Castro's bureaucratic-collectivist regime, then Eisenhower and later Kennedy came up with some important plans for aid to that region of the world. Some Latins have ironically called it the "Castro Plan".

Some aspects of this aid program should be analysed so one can assess its scope and possible consequences. First of all, the money given in aid is to be used in "infra-structural" expenditures (e.g., highway construction, health and education programs, etc.) Supposedly this public investment program should be accompanied by substantial private investments in factories, modernization of agriculture, etc. But it is at this point when the inability of Capitalism (new or old) to solve human problems in human ways is perhaps shown at its best. According to *The New York Times* (January 17, 1962—International Edition—page 11): "...The United States hoped that private investors would provide much of the balance (of investment and aid), but political unrest in Latin America and threatened restrictions against private capital in several countries curtailed the flow of money..." Here lies the tremendous contradiction of Capitalism: it is the "political unrest" produced by, among other causes, the distorting effects of capitalist ways of investing in underdeveloped countries which forces these capitalist countries to give aid which to be successful require nothing less than... lack of "political unrest" and no restrictions to the distorting effects of capitalist investment. To suggest that Latin American governments should cancel restrictive legislation related to foreign investments means not only to take away whatever safeguards reformist governments like the one in Bolivia, for instance, may use, but it also means to ally oneself with the forces of the status-quo against the desire for pro-

gressive changes in such societies.

Most Americans are ignorant not only of the above mentioned contradiction, but of many other important ones. Thus, American "public opinion" seems to be earnest in its expectation "that the native oligarchies of these countries will commit suicide because they are afraid of being killed" as somebody aptly put it. Although it is not true that substantial social changes are achieved *only* through an internal struggle (e.g. witness the sweeping reforms imposed by the American troops in Japan after World War II) it is true that under the present situation in *most* Latin American countries substantial reforms can be only achieved by internal revolutionary movements. And given the fact that most of Latin America has gone through a kind of "combined and uneven development" in relation to the U.S.A. and other advanced countries, it is not possible anymore to have a *revolution* against all the feudalistic remnants in Latin America with the support of the United States since the

latter have been put in a situation, by the nature of events, to rely precisely on those feudalistic elements both for economic reasons and to ensure "the military security of the hemisphere".

A lot of money already assigned to Latin America has not even gone into the "infra-structural" investments mentioned above, but into monetary "rescue operations" which on many occasions are designed to provide funds for paying the recipient governments' civil servants and similar expenditures. *The New York Times'* Latin American correspondent, Tad Szulc, reported on January 17, 1962 that "of \$800,000,000 in loans to Latin America authorized between March and November, more than half went into financial support programs. Brazil alone received authorization for \$338,000,000 in new money to meet her financial crisis..." And these financial crises all over the hemisphere (e.g. lack of foreign exchange, inflation, etc.) are in a very important way tied up with the problem of

● contd page 6

LETTER:

HYDE PARK
SCRAMBLE

Dear Comrade,

It seems difficult to fix the blame for the negative and unhelpful shouting down of George Brown and Gaitskell at the recent May Day rallies in London and Glasgow.

Of course, the right-wing and the press say it was the communists, obviously hoping to discredit CND. Others say it was "spontaneous" and could have been stopped anyway.

Whoever took the lead in this demonstration of political ineptitude should be condemned by all sincere left-wing socialists, especially by those who support "Socialist Review."

The "spontaneity" theory does not hold water, the whole rally—on what should have been labour's great day of mobilisation—was a lamentable affair. Hardly a couple of thousand turning up. If the majority of those were left-wing and the platform in charge of the right-wing, nobody was bound to listen to them, the audience could have moved away to a meeting of its own.

I feel that there were in fact some laying claim to the title of "revolutionary socialist" who allowed their

exasperation over right-wing tactics (ignoring last year's Labour Party Conference decision against Polaris bases, etc.) to lead them along the fatal path of trying a "short cut" to reach their own aims. All they succeeded in doing was to create some sympathy for Gaitskell and Co. among the millions who were not at Hyde Park or Glasgow Green.

I do not in any way think we should compromise with Gaitskell on the question of nuclear disarmament or anything else, but I believe that we can only win out by sticking to the difficult task of winning over those great organisations on which the power of Gaitskell and George Brown rests. The uninspired chanting in Hyde Park in no way helped to achieve this task.

Finally, if we believe that the fight for socialism is also the fight for real democracy then I think this also includes the idea best expressed in the well known words of Voltaire, "I disagree with what you say, but I will fight for your right to say it."

Yours fraternally,
DUDLEY EDWARDS.

ARMS, MEN and MONEY

In Table A we set out the record of 14 years' defence expenditure.

Table A. Arms Expenditure over 14 Years

	£ million	Per Head of population per week
		s. d.
1949-50	741	5 8
1950-51	777	5 11
1951-52	1,123	8 7
1952-53	1,393	10 7
1953-54	1,358	10 3
1954-55	1,447	10 11
1955-56	1,407	10 7
1956-57	1,519	11 4
1957-58	1,440	10 9
1958-59	1,451	10 9
1959-60	1,484	10 11
1960-61 (provisional)	1,604	11 10
1961-62 (estimated)	1,693	12 3
1962-63 (estimated including supplementary estimates)	1,735	12 7

Note: Figures of expenditure taken from Hansard, February 20th, 1962, column 39 for years 1951-1962. They are after deduction of both German contributions and American aid receipts for the years when these were in force.

WHAT IS THE MONEY SPENT ON?

In Table B we set out an analysis of the way the money is to be spent in the coming year. It will be seen that the largest item is number 6—production and research—which takes £705 million. This item covers all weapons and research on weapons and it takes over 40 per cent. of the total bill. (Item 5 "supplies" means food, fuel, petrol, etc.)

Table B. Analysis of Arms Expenditure

	Ministries of				Totals 1962-3	Totals 1961-2
	Navy	Army	Air Force	Aviation and Defence		
	£m.	£m.	£m.	£m.	£m.	£m.
(1) Pay, etc. of Service personnel	73	133	119	7	332	335
(2) Pay, etc. of Reserves	1	18	1	—	20	19
(3) Pay, etc. of civilians	55	126	50	28	259	258
(4) Movements	11	28	14	4	57	59
(5) Supplies	28	41	64	3	137	135
(6) Production and research	209	86	242	168	705	682
(7) Works, building and land	20	50	42	8	120	101
(8) Miscellaneous	25	42	19	4	91	104
	422	524	552	223	1,721	1,693

HOW MUCH OF THE BILL GOES ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS?

The White Paper says that the British "contribution to the Western strategic deterrent" consumes "only about 10 per cent. of our defence resources." This has been widely misunderstood as meaning that nuclear weapons only take £173 million.

The misunderstanding arises because of the use of the word "strategic" deterrent, which is only part of the nuclear picture. Our "strategic" nuclear

● KENNEDY

trade. Thus, while since 1950 the value of exports outside the Communist bloc has risen by more than 90%, for Latin America the increase has been less than 25%. This rate of growth is smaller than is generally considered healthy. It should be remembered here that Latin America derives most of its foreign exchange from the sale of raw materials while it has to use that exchange to buy manufactured goods. It is a fact that while the prices of raw materials tend to go down at present, the prices of manufactured goods tend to go up. In January 1961, Dag Hammarskjöld's office issued a report showing that from 1950 to 1960, while Latin America was receiving \$1,000,000,000 in aid, it suffered a total loss of \$2,000,000,000 because of the shift in trade terms.

With a few exceptions, notably that of Cuba before the Castro regime, the possibilities for social-democratic reform are very limited in Latin America because of structural reasons. Some social-democratic parties, like the A.P.R.A. in Peru, have been able to achieve gains for the unionized and particularly for some urban sections of the population. These gains have been achieved within the capitalist framework of society, without substantial structural changes which would reduce the tremendous contrasts between town and country, skilled and unskilled workers, farm-owners and rural proletariat, etc. The writer believes that these social-democratic parties on the whole, are a spent force because they do not seem to be able to get much more out of the system as it exists at present. On the other hand, almost all organized "revolutionary" forces in Latin America are very elitist and consequently show great addiction to Stalinism. The very composition of these groups, mostly *declassé* students and intellectuals, is a cause of the almost traditional paternalistic contempt that they show toward the mass of the people of Latin America.

A conclusion to be derived from these few remarks on the Latin American situation, and incidentally I do not pretend that they are conclusive, is that unlike some other left-wing groups we should not expect the "revolutionary" elites from under-developed countries to bring socialism about, but that socialists in the economically advanced countries shall strive to create a humanist alternative to the present-day exploitative social systems of the world.

● OPEN LETTER from page 1

dropped on Japan are only toy-weapons compared with what they can pull out of the thermo-nuclear cupboard nowadays. Just as concentration camps could not be part of a socialist policy on any pretext whatsoever, so the use of H-Bombs cannot be. Anybody who would press the button to release nuclear weapons (and I include the misnamed 'tactical' nuclear weapons) has no conceivable place in the socialist movement.

Now I am well aware of the reply at this point. "You are Utopians. We are realists. We do not want to see H-Bombs used any more than you do. But the way to stop H-Bombs being used is to have them as a deterrent and so preserve the balance of terror. If everybody has H-Bombs, no will use them—or at least this is our best chance that they will not be used. Of course, we would not in fact ever use H-Bombs, but we must make the Russians believe that we would." "This represents the one honest and decent anti-unilateralist position, but it rests upon a profound mistake. The mistake is to suppose that the game of "Let's pretend we'll use our H-Bomb" can remain a game. For how far does the pretending go? We know from the expressed dismay of high-ranking service officers that they have not been told that we are never in fact going to use our H-Bomb. We know that the whole strategic procedure of our services is based on the assumption that we would in certain circumstances use it. Our American allies are fully committed to it. The strategists of the Rand Corporation have never been told

that deterrence is all a bluff, and they obviously do not believe it. In fact, nobody except the perhaps highly moral, but if so, highly confused, members of the Labour Right appear to accept this story. And the reason why they accept it is that they are less clear than anyone else about power. In the exercise of power through vast bureaucratic structures the will of individual decision-makers can become relatively unimportant. Those at the top become increasingly dependent upon the information and advice they are given from below. Decision-making is delegated and dispersed. Those who originally made plans become the victims of their execution. What were originally means become ends. If this is true in general it is above all true of what Eisenhower called "the military industrial complex." The H-Bomb was originally a means to the policy of deterrence; it becomes an end which the policies are increasingly distorted to serve. And more and more of those with power become committed, whether they will or no, to the possible use of the H-Bomb. Decisions about its use become the role of the faceless men in a structure of power, largely autonomous and wholly secret, without any public responsibility, and over which little or no control appears to be exerted; above all therefore the power of the H-Bomb is anti-democratic. And this is the second great socialist reason for unilateralism. Socialists are for the dispersal of power; the H-Bomb requires its growing concentration.

This is the case against the H-Bomb which is met by Mr. Gaitskell with silence and proscriptions. It is no wonder that unilateralists in the Labour

Party come to feel that it is both their duty and their right to put their case directly outside the Party and to do this on every platform they can get, including electoral ones. The decision to proscribe INDEC is not surprising. But what its creation entails is a challenge to both Right and Left in the Labour Party. The Right must either expose their total bankruptcy by continuing to substitute bans and proscriptions for argument or they must stop arguing against their own strawmen and meet this case. The Left must show by their struggle that it is possible to make this case heard inside and not just outside the Labour Party. I hope that you personally will learn from the behaviour of your friends on the Right and come over to the Left. It's never too late.

Yours fraternally,
ALASDAIR MacINTYRE.

WORKER TO WORKER

Any firm whose apprentices habitually fail to reach an acceptable standard of skill, should be disqualified from undertaking further training.

This proposal was made by Lady Williams, as part of a comprehensive plan for modernising apprentice training.

JUSTICE

A Conservative member of Nottingham Council, who recently criticised the appointment of a Jamaican as Britain's first coloured magistrate, in Nottingham learned that he had lost his seat in the city's municipal elections.

PROGRESS

The public will be given an extra 40 seconds warning of any nuclear rocket attack. Sirens will sound the alert one minute after the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System detects rockets.

That is 3 minutes before they land.

Within a year this time lag will be cut to 20 seconds.

So there will be 3 minutes 40 seconds to take to the shelters.

● ARMS, MEN AND MONEY

weapons are the long-range ones which can be directed at targets deep in the heart of the enemy's country. "Tactical" weapons are those intended for short-range use between opposing armed forces. These also can be nuclear weapons, and to a growing extent they are so; they are not included however in this "10 per cent. of the defence budget" but are additional to the £173 million spent on the strategic weapons.

Britain's "strategic deterrent" at present consists of the Thor rocket bases and the V-bomber force, now equipped with "free-falling" nuclear bombs, but later to be equipped with "stand-off" bombs. The Memorandum on the Air Estimates makes this quite clear:

"Capital and recurrent expenditure on the V-bomber force, including research and development, weapons, equipment and airfields (together with the cost of Thor), still represents approximately 10 per cent. of the Defence Budget." (Para. 25.)

But in addition to the £173 million to be spent on the "strategic deterrent" there are nuclear weapons carried by the "tactical" bomber force, the "tactical" nuclear weapons with which the army is equipped, and the nuclear weapons covered by the navy. The fact is that this whole talk about "10 per cent. of the "Defence Budget" conceals the fact that all our armed forces are being more and more organised around nuclear weapons and geared to the expectation of their use.

Labour Research, April, 1962.

IN THE RED

Those Labour Party members who are astonished to see the Labour Party leadership turn aside from the urgent political tasks which confront them to the obviously more attractive jobs of proscribing and expelling should remember the past history of the Party's leadership. In January and February, 1937, the Spanish War was in a critical phase. So was the opposition to the so-called National Tory Government in Britain. On January 23rd the Labour Party Executive proscribed the Socialist League. On February 13th Ernest Bevin in a speech at Bristol tried to compare Stafford Cripps to Oswald Mosley. One of the laws of social democracy is: whenever there is a real struggle to be fought, the Labour Party leaders turn against their own Left-wing.

★

It is two hundred years in 1962 since William Cobbett was born. Cobbett marked the transition from the radicalism of the old pre-industrial England to that of the new working-class. He began as a radical reformer who wished to see the agricultural labourer prosperous and the social order saved from revolution by reforming itself in time. He turned into a root-and-branch reformer, who was prepared to challenge any institution whatsoever. He could be read with profit by the Labour Party leaders to-day. Speaking of the movement for reform in 1812 he wrote: "This is the circumstance that will most puzzle the ministry. They can find no agitators. It is a movement of the *people's own*." The explanation of radical movements by converting agitators goes on. So does the attempt to make the working class believe in their own powerlessness. "I am pleased," wrote Cobbett in 1830 about the Revolution in France in that year, "at the Revolution, particularly on this account, that it makes the working classes see their real importance, and those who despise them see it too." He disliked cities; London he called "the Great Wen." And that web of well-connected hangers-on of society who rely for advancement on their class-position and their relation to the power of money he named "the Thing." He denounced indirect taxation as used by the Government to take away part of their wages from the working-class. This too still goes on in some of the many forms of purchase-tax. At the time of Cobbett's death

"SPARTACUS"

(1835) an agricultural labourer would earn about £22 10s. a year. Of this the Hammonds in *The Village Labourer* reckoned that about £11 7s. 7d. went in indirect taxes. It would be interesting to have similar figures for to-day.

★

"The rich get richer and the poor get poorer" says the song. So does Gunnar Myrdal, the economist, speaking of the gap between industrialised and under-developed countries. The statistics are vivid enough, whatever the theoretical conclusions reached. It has been reckoned that in India the average daily intake of calories for an adult is 1750; here we take 3,000—4,000 to be the necessary minimum. Our expectation of life is 71 years; there it is 32 years. Here an agricultural labourer earns £500 a year and is not well off at all; there a labouring peasant's annual income is £8.

Finally, congratulations to Lord Russell on his ninetieth birthday. Philosophers, socialists and members of the peace movement all join in applauding Russell. George Brown and Hugh Gaitskell consider his expulsion from the Labour Party. Somehow that puts things into perspective a bit.

INTERNATIONAL
SOCIALISM

No 8

includes:

THE BOMB

BRITISH LABOUR AND
EUROPE

REFORM AND REVOLUTION
STORY AND POEM

2/6

From:

47 FITZROY RD., N.W.1.

Read the—

INDUSTRIAL

WORKER price 4d

from:—K. Dunbar

134 Carlton Vale, NW6.

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 editors Alasdair MacIntyre and Harold Freedman, 47 Fitzroy Road, NW1.

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