Socialist Review

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW,
BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

JANUARY 1962 4 d.

LESSONS OF A STRIKE

Roger Cox (AEU)

IF the British Light Steel Pressings strike at Acton will ever be remembered in the labour movement it will be for one certain reason. Never in any one strike have so many factors come together in such a way as to show what can be expected in the future.

Many questions will be asked about BLSP and any strike which follows a similar pattern; some such questions are—why could the Rootes management sit back and wait for the strike to be defeated?—will other sections of the trade union leadership follow Carron's naked anti-strike actions?—and, perhaps the hardest question of all, why the strike committee, although supported financially from all over the country, failed to gain support, more active support, from the Midlands workers and preventing (at the end) the drift back to work?

The first question can be answered by figures which show the tendency of large enterprises to grow into bigger and bigger concerns with greater and greater reserves and resources. In 1957 12 companies held 20% of the nation's assets and 48 companies controlled 2/5th's of total assets. (aggregate figures of 2866 companies analysed by the Board of Trade).

In the motor industry expansion certainly has not been lax. Between 1954 and 1960 the 'net worth' of the industry *doubled* and 1959 to 1960 it rose by 11% (*LRD* figures). With this sort of expansion, together with a recession in the general economy, any interruption of the production line wll not hurt the capitalist very much—in fact he may welcome such "phenomena" for a limited period. Against such a background we can see the limitations imposed on the Acton strikers.

As if the economic limitation wasn't enough the callous attack from Carron three days after the strike began was enough to break the back of any strike. Again this sort of action is not new and in fact confirms a development rank and file trade unionists have been conscious of for a number of years. The division between rank and file and leadership has grown as the leadership absorb more power from the establishment. The National Development Council will not be the end of this journey by any means, but merely a confirmation of the steps already taken. Their indentification is with the "keep capitalism efficient" brigade, they make some militant demands but always within the known limits, and never relying on any conscious rank and file action. They are the masters of the good ship "Constitutional method".

Finally, the Acton strike is a mirror to us all, for it shows the limitations of our present shop stewards organisation. We can can admire the spirit in those weeks of struggle but militant action confined to one factory, which in turn is only part of a huge combine, will not bring the employers to their knees. I tried to show how their resources go beyond this. The only way is to spread the struggle outwards from the individual factory throughout the whole combine or industry. To do this two things are necessary. Firstly, a wider development of the shop stewards organisation covering whole industries; and secondly, the hardest thing of all to obtain, to try and change the workers indentification from the fatcory level to an industrial one. Here is the need for industrial unions.

This would mean bringing into the factory on all occasions problems facing the workers in the factory, whether it be H-bombs, rents, fares or budgets. In this way we can make our organisation in the factory look outside, act with other factories. To fight and beat these problems we must do our utmost to prevent further fragmentation of the workers' struggle, which means urging factory support for such things as victimised tenants, CND marchers or old age pensioners. We can only start with one or two around us, but with hard work it will grow.

THE LEFT AND THE COMMON MARKET

Michael Kidron

IT is understandable that the labour movement in this country is split in many different directions on Britain's application to join the Common Market. It is a major issue and the repercussions of whatever move the Tories make will be felt for many years. Under the circumstances one could expect the debate to be both serious and informed.

But no. The Common Marketers—Crosland, Roy Jenkins, Charles Pannell and the rest—are content to peddle cartel-Europe in the same terms and tones as are heard around boardroom tables, while the Anti's—and here one is dealing with the established Left of the movement—have laboured to produce a motley of arguments which, were they not such a tragic indication of their poverty in ideas, would be very funny.

...There's no need to reproduce the arguments of the Marketeers here. They can be seen daily in the *Times, Telegraph, Economist* and other such organs of 'enlightened' big business. The 'Left' is less well serviced, and so claims more attention.

Their first argument concerns the Commonwealth and Britain's unique role in world affairs. 'The danger for Britain of "integration" into the common political institutions envisaged by the Treaty of Rome are clear' writes *Trade Union Affairs*, new-look journal of the 'enlightened' trade

● *contd on page 5*

AGAINST THE STATE

Socialist Lawyer

SINCE the Committe of 100 organized its first mass civil disobedience action in February 1961 thousands of its supporters have been arrested for offences committed in the course of its campaigns and hundreds have been sent to prison for terms ranging from a few days to nine months. At the time of writing five prominent members are charged with offences against the Official Secrets Acts, which if they are convicted could result in considerably longer sentences.

Readers of *Socialist Review* who have from the beginning taken a full part in the activities of the movement, are naturally discussing seriously all aspects of the Committee's work, its present limitations and future possibilities, but we desire in this place merely to recognise the fact that for the first time in decades an appreciable number of people are in prison in Britain for political crimes, which has tremendous implications for revolutionary socialists, and to explain some aspects of the legal situation about which there is still much ignorance.

Some of the more serious charges that might be brought against those who participate in the movement, such as sedition, or indeed breaches of the Official Secrets Acts, are so widely phrased that it is really the difficulty of finding a jury ready to convict plus the adverse effect of prosecutions on uncommitted opinion, that effectually protects the ordinary "sit-downer" from the danger of such proceedings. More important, so far, are the minor offences such as obstruction of the police in the execution of their duty or wilful obstruction of the highway.

A number of people have gone to prison for refusal to pay fines to which they had been sentenced by magistrates courts for such offences, although where a person has been given time to pay and does not do so the court will usually, although it need not, seek to recover the fine by selling the offender's goods before committing him to prison. A person so committed to prison can obtain his release at any time by paying the fine, or the appropriate portion of it, and he will also be released if someone else pays it for him.

But most of the courageous people who have been sent to prison for a month or more have endured this as a result of refusing to be "bound over" to keep the peace and be of good behaviour. This is a procedure which the magistrates are especially fond of using against demonstrators with previous convictions, and under which a person can be put to the option of going to prison (for a term not exceeding six months, in the case of a magistrates court) or of promising to be of good behaviour and making himself liable to a far heavier financial penalty on a repetition of the conduct objected to. However, it can be and has been used on first convictions or where no offence was alleged at all, but simply on the application of the police that it was feared that a breach of the peace might occur.

A binding over order may be made if it is feared that the law may be broken, and contrary to what the term "breach of the peace" might seem to imply, there need be no fear of violence. A binding over to be of good behaviour is of wider meaning, and includes conduct of which the Court may disapprove even though involving no breach of the criminal law. The order may also be made although the occasion on which a breach of the peace was feared has already passed.

Where a court for any reason—usually but not necessarily, a subsequent conviction for the type of offence it had in mind—concludes that the conditions imposed have been broken, it may in its discretion forfeit all or part of the sum fixed in the binding over order, or it may decide to take no action. Nobody can be imprisoned merely by reason of having broken a binding over order.

There is no fixed rule as to what a court may hold to have constituted a breach of the conditions of the order, and there is a right of appeal from the decision of a magistrates court to Quarter Sessions. The accused must be told exactly what action is complained of, and there must be precise evidence of it. There is no limit in principle to the amount of the recognisance the magistrates can order, or to the period of the binding over, except that they must be "reasonable". Either would probably have to be very severe indeed before Quarter Sessions would quash it.

Incidentally, a young person under 17 can be ordered to enter into a recognisance in the same way as an adult, but if he refuses to do so would probably be sent to a remand home in lieu of prison for the term fixed. When such a young person has to pay a fine or forfeits his recognisance, the court may order either him or his parents to pay it, and in the latter event may enforce it against the parent as if he were the person convicted.

It is worth noting that a person imprisoned for refusal to be bound over is a civil as distinct from a convicted prisoner, in the same category as those imprisoned for refusing to pay maintenance to their wives or for hire-purchase debts, and consequently enjoys a more liberal regime in some ways e.g. more letters and visits, the right to wear his own clothes, to receive books and papers, etc. However no remission of sentence can be earned, since the person can sign himself out at any time.

(We shall be pleased to try to deal in future issues with any related questions readers may send).

STATISTICS WHICH DON'T LIE

Stephen Hero

BRITISH capitalism is changing under three different pressures. The first is the need to expand its own markets, and this makes entry into the Common Market inevitable. The second is the need to keep its prices down, not only to compete in Europe, but also to survive at a time when the American economy seems about to expand in new ways. The third pressure derives from the unpredictable acceleration of the revolution in technology which automation is bringing about. Taken together these three pressures have led capitalists into a state of basic uncertainty about their investment programmes. This comes out neatly both in the statistics with which we are deluged annually in January and in the attempts of economic journalists to derive conclusions from them. It is plain that small investors in the stock market no longer know which way to jump. The difficulty in predicting growth in particular industries does not extend to industry as a whole, so

● *contd next page*

TRANSPORT HOUSE GAGS YS

Chris Davison

THE Young Socialists came into existence due to a sudden realisation by the Labour Party that it was dying of old age. The problem was how to attract young people who could become reliable cogs in the electoral machine but who would be unable to embarrass the leadership by fighting for socialism. The solution adopted was to impose a constitutional straight-jacket on the Young Socialists which gave them as little room for independent action as possible.

The need for an organized socialist youth movement was apparent from the initial rapid growth of the Young Socialists, but the rigid Labour Party control is now beginning to have its inevitable effect. Branches have closed down, schools get little support, members have become cynical, tired and have lost much of their enthusiasm. Many Young Socialists have come from the YCND, others are apprentices: their allegiance is first to socialism and then to the Labour Party. They have an idealism which is not satisfied by canvassing and addressing envelopes, which is frustrated by a continual struggle with party bureaucrats who treat them like children.

These officials stop at nothing to keep the iron hand of the bureaucracy firmly on the YS. They organize faction groups, encourage dissident elements and attempt to isolate branches. Their most significant success was the manoevring of an unrepresentative National Committee which has become the lap-dog of the NEC and gives the YS no positive leadership. No wonder the YS are sickened by these underhand tricks and that the regional officers are held in utter contempt by most of them.

Young Socialists cannot organize or demonstrate for anything but official Labour Party policy. Despite a two to one majority at this years conference for unilateralism and a neutralist policy they must work for the opposite. Despite a fifty to one majority for nationalization of major industries under workers control they can campaign only for nationalization of iron & steel, road haulage and building land.

The Blackpool conference has made things worse. It has given members of the YCND even less incentive to join the YS and has given Transport House the green light to crusade against the left in the YS. It is little wonder that our members show signs of giving up the struggle and going elsewhere.

The YS can only play a strong and significant role in the struggle for socialism if the organization is completely remodelled. A comparison with the Belgian Young Socialists will show what we should aim for. There the YS is loosely affiliated to the Socialist Party, takes a full part in elections but is able to campaign for its own policies. It is run by its own National Committee and elects the editorial board of its own paper.

With a similar structure our YS could expand rapidly. Its policy would attract both YCND and apprentices, for it would be fighting both their causes. Instead we are bedevilled by old men who, unable to genuinly attract youth with their ideas, must use the party machine to beat the YS into line. At the party conference only four minutes was spent on the YS—proof of the utter contempt with which they hold our aspirations. They must not be allowed to crush us. We will fight, but we need the help of all Labour Party and Trade Union members.

STATISTICS

that for the large investor who is able to spread out his stake, the position is quite different. Last year the insurance companies who represent the financially strongest investing group in British industry did better than anyone else in terms of stock exchange prices. (The next best group, if you follow the *Financial Times* index, were the brewers).

Capitalist uncertainty is strengthened because of inability to predict how far British industries are really becoming more efficiently competitive an dhow far it is merely a new facade that is being constructed. Consider ICI, whose amalgamation with Courtaulds has been widely misunderstood. All the City commentators spoke of it as a sign of stregnth. If it was, why are ICI share prices where they are? In 1961 they moved down 10 per cent altogether. The news of the amalgamation did not save them. Or consider BMC. When BMC announces, as it did on January 2, that it is going to share technical know-how with Rolls Royce, we ought to note that its shares fell 3 per cent in 1961, while its future keen rivals in Western Germany had a record year, raising their exports 4.6 per cent. Investment in the machine-tool industry, with all the problems of its future development, reflects the gambling spirit of capitalist investment over a very wide field. Capitalists don't know, because nobody knows, what their needs over the next few years will be.

What should workers learn from this? That British capitalism, in order to attract investment, needs now labour costs and a manipulable labour force as never before; but that at the same time there are enormous prizes to win on the wages front. The kind of situation is going to arise in which workers can benefit from the uncertainty and the rivalry of uneven capitalist development, if they are prepared to be tough in using the strike weapon. In some sectors capitalism is going to need labour enough to be willing to pay a competitively high price for it. What the labour movement must learn to judge in advance is where this is going to happen. In the trade union movement in the next few years we need an economic general staff, not to participate in the Chancellor's Tory planning, but to devise a wages strategy for labour. This strategy would aim, through strikes or strike threats, at extorting the maximum in wages at any given time. It would try to combine high wage levels and continuous militancy. It would try to make affluence a motive for action and not a deadening influence on the working class movement. But such a strategy can only be effective with expert knowledge behind it. If capitalists themselves are as uncertain as I have argued, workers are likely also to make mistakes about where it will be most profitable for them to attack the system. We need our own trained economists to give us, not the sort of statistics which ask us to pity the employing class and maintain their profit margins in a competitive world, but statistics which will aid us in forcing them, if they are going to meet competition, to raise their wages bill. We need statistics which don't lie.

CONGO, KATANGA AND UNO

Alasdair MacIntyre

KATANGA is the heart of the Congo. When the Congo was a Belgian colony Katanga was its economic base. The export of Katangan minerals took place through Congo trade routes. The royalties and taxes which the mining company, Union Minierè, paid were paid to the central government at Leopoldsville. Without them the Congolese economy could not have survived before independence.

In the last year before Congo became independent Union Minierè paid the colonial government £21m. The rest of the Congo appears to have few economic potentialities, Katanga supplies not only 8% of the world's copper but over 80% of the worlds' cobalt and a large percentage of the worlds' industrial diamonds, silver, zinc, cadmium, and even in small quantites gold and uranium.

The Congolese economy was centrally administered, but with the Belgian colonial administration. What is euphemistically called the paternalism of the Belgians led them to keep the tribal structure of Congolese society as intact as possible. It is not surprising that no Congolese politicians emerged on the eve of independence who were not tribal politicians. This, though a consequence of Belgian policy, did not suit the Belgians who recognised that only a centrally organised state was possible. They therefore discouraged all separatist tribal tendencies and their political representatives, including Tshombe, and encouraged the few who appeared likely to try to transcend tribal division, such as Lumumba. When, after a week of independence, Lumumba broke off diplomatic relations with Belgium, Belgian policy reversed.

...On July 11th 1960 Tshombe had proclaimed Katanga independence. Belgium was inclined to support him until its own government was reformed after the General Strike. Since then it has from behind the scenes unwaveringly supported the central Congolese government and given it large financial subsidies.

In the headquarters of Union Minierè in Brussels there appears to have been a division of opinion and some at least of the direction appears to show the views of the Belgian government. This raises two sharp questions. Why do the Belgians not support Tshombe?, and why have most people in Britain been led to suppose that they do?

The answer to the first question is a simple one. In a wide sense Belgium has as much interest in African stability as any other power. Her quick change act from the patterns of Portugese imperialism to those of British imperialism marks the consciousness of this in Brussels. Ruanda and Urundi, Belgiums other African possessions are now being led through a time-table towards independence in a manner worthy of Mr Macleod himself.

More narrowly, Union Minierè needs a strong central Congolese government for three reasons. First, they need an export route to the sea. The only alternative to Leopoldville lies through Portugese East Africa, a territory whose future stability is unlikely. Secondly, the Tshombe government in Katanga is inherently unstable. It is a tribal government, based on a coalition of two minority tribes against the majority tribe of Katanga. Tshombe's writ does not run very far outside Elisabethville. Thirdly, one leading member of the Tshombe government, at least, has threatened to nationalise Union Minierè and expropriate the Belgians.

Why then did Union Minierè support Tshombe at all? It appears to have been committed by its representatives on the spot. One of the lessons the Belgains may have learnt is that you cannot administer a British-style colonial policy wthout strong white settler opposition. The white settlers of Katanga saw Tshombe as a puppet for them; in his need for a white mercenary military force he quickly became a puppet and remains so. But Tshombe's government would be quite capable under certain circumstances of either nationalising or simply destroying the installations of Union Minierè and returning to pure tribalism. And at this point we can only make the support for Katanga intelligible at all if we look at the activities of another group, which is not primarily Belgian, but British.

Northern Rhodesia is British imperialisms' most vulnerable point. The imposition of a new constitution and African violent and nonviolent resistance have threatened both the political structure of Welensky's federation (which is gone when Northern Rhodesia is gone, because Nyasaland is as good as gone already) and the economic wealth of the British South Africa Company, a major mining company with a finger in many pies—including Katanga.

The stake in Katanga is two-fold. Through Tanganyika Concessions Ltd. the BSAC is a part owner of Union Minierè (14% of the shares, 20% of the voting rights). But more than this it needs a 'safe' border for Northern Rhodesia politically. So do the companies with interests in Rhodesia. Let us now list members of parliament, lords and commons, who either have or have had an interest in Rhodesia or Katanga: Julian Amery, MP, Under Secretary of State for the Colonies; C.J. Holland Martin, MP, Treasurer of the Tory Party; and Lords Salisbury, de la Warr, Selborne, Robins and Clitheroe. The annual report of Tanganyika Concessions and the speeches of Lords Robins and Selborne have made it clear that from these British interests came the powerful and unconditional support for Tshombe. British, rather than Belgian, economic interests in fact buttressed Katanga.

In August 1960 Mr Kimba brought a Katanga delegation to London which paid an unofficial and highly secret visit to the Foreign Office. Afterwards a party was given for them by four Tory MP's, Anthony Fell, Philip Goodhart, Neil McLean and Paul Williams. The British government has been paralysed in its public acts and utterences over Katanga; it could not act against the Katanga lobby, whose interests and influence extended widely through the Tory party.

Impressive reports have come out of Rhodesia of military supplies crossing the frontier to Tshombe. The British government at a key moment threatened to withdraw financial support from UN if the operations against Katanga went on. While Katanga had air superiority, Britain held up the jets from Ethiopia by refusing permission for their necessary refuelling at Entebbe. The British Consul in Elizabethville met Mr Tshombe secretly and sheltered him. The British delegation in New York pressed for Dr O'Brien's dismissal.

What does it all add up to, even

● *contd next page*

● *Common Market from page* 1

union bureaucracy (Spring, 1961, p 104). 'From the day of her entry there would be a corresponding erosion of Commonwealth organs and a diminishing of her special role in the world, which has been quite exceptional for a nation of only 52 million people unbacked by natural wealth'. *Tribune* echoes: to join 'would be to turn our backs on the Commonwealth, to abdicate our independent role in world affairs...'

A nice thought this. Indeed, Britain *has* a special, independent role in world affairs. No other power has played claphandies with Sir Roy so single-mindedly as Britain in the Congo. Who but Britain could have led the Suez invasion six years ago? As for the Commonwealth, a true example of non-racialist (except of course for Australia and Britain) brotherhood it is. Within it capital is capital, guns guns and strikers against the one are shot down by the other as on the British tea estates in Assam.

Moving on, the Left has discovered the virtues of the virgin EFTA (European Free Trade Association) conjured up by Britain to use as a bargaining counter with the Common Market. Barrett-Brown and Hughes have shown in their New Left Pamphlet, *Britain's Crisis and the Common Market,* that 'EFTA is fundamentally a neutralistic bloc'! Shame on MacMillan and Salazar for dragging us out of NATO without telling anyone! Will they never get rid of their predilection for secret diplomacy?

Then there is the danger to socialist planning. *New Left Review:* 'The contradictions for a government trying to steer a socialist economy in tight reign with six capitalist countries, working in close harmony would be immense' (July-August, 1961, pp 9-10). So too *Trade Union Affairs:* 'a future Labour Government might find progressive policies outlined in an election manifesto were impossible of implementation due to the economic and political planning core of the Six' (Spring, 1961, p 105).

Observe the image of Gaitskell steering Britain's 'socialist economy' between the rocks of capitalist Europe, in which, by the way, holidays and holiday pay are better than here (in Germany, Italy and France), pensions more generous (Germany), maternity benefits higher (France) and equal pay for women the rule (France).

'I have no wish', says Anthony Greenwood, MP, an important anti-Marketeer on the left of the Parliamentary Labour Party, 'to transfer political power from the British man in the street to Dr. Adenauer and President de Gaulle... (*Daily Worker,* 10 June 1961). Blessed be the sentiment, but which man in which street is dear Anthony talking about? Selwyn Lloyd in Downing Street?

Finally, it takes the Communist Party to appeal to the very basest, parochial and cowardly defensive instincts in the movement. 'If the free movement of labour were established large numbers of unemployed Italian workers might come to Britain' (Labour Research Department, *Questions and Answers on the Common Market,* p 18). If it were true, so what? Surely the labour movement is powerful enough to extend trade union protection to *all* new workers? But it isn't even true, otherwise German capital wouldn't be combing countries outside the Common Market—Greece and Spain—for workers, nor would Italian industry be stalking the Ruhr to lure Italian immigrant workers back to their home country.

Not all the arguments are so specious, however. *Trade Union Affairs* is right to say that 'we might well find ourselves committed to a sadly unequal struggle with entrenched monopolistic concerns able to insure themselves against pressures or defeat by the international nature of their operations' (Spring, 1961, pp 104-5), and that 'the British trade unions need overhaul, better structures, more specialists: they would be lost in the Common Market' (Summer, 1961, p 5). But surely this is an argument for getting on with the job of adapting the structure of our unions and for linking up internationally?

Within capitalism there seems no escape from cartel Europe. Nor is the decision ours. If it were, we would be on the brink of socialist revolution and looking ourselves for support from Europe's workers. But it isn't, and so long as this is the case, instead of crying 'Commonwealth', 'EFTA', 'Planning' etc with the establised Left, it is our duty to warn the labour movement of the upheavals that are bound to occur as we edge towards the Continent, to fight for the best conditions obtaining anywhere within the Common Market (British National Health Service, German pensions, French equal pay and so on), to link up with the European labour movement and to help inscribe on the program of a united European labour movement—no Cartel Market but the United States of Socialist Europe!

● *Congo, Katanga—contd*

if nothing had been said of Mr Hammarskjold's death? That British support for Katanga was not peripheral and accidental, a blunder to be explained away. British support is the key to the Katanga problem. For it is now tolerably clear that the division between those with interests in Katanga who support the Central government and those with interests in Katanga who support Tshombe is a division between those who have no interests in Rhodesia as well and those who have. The Katanga lobby is a Northern Rhodesia white settler voice.

This leaves British socialists with a peculiar responsibility. They can only discharge this responsibility if they discard two pictures of the Congolese situation which they are being offered. The first of these is the liberal picture of the UN force as a group of knights in stainless armour fighting villainous imperialism. But this will not do, if only because the Congolese central government and the UN force which supports it is also a creature of imperialist powers.

The second dangerous picture is that which cries an equal plague on all imperialisms and looks to the African working class. For this class, in the Congo at any rate, in a social sense does not yet exist. Attempts to present Mr Gizenga as a Marxist have played into the Katanga lobby, who wish to build him into the Communist threat in terms of which they can justify their own activities in the USA. Mr Gizenga, it is quite clear, is not affiliated to the Soviet bloc (he has expelled Eastern European journalists from Orientale) and is as limited by tribal boundaries as his rivals are.

There is in the Congo no socialist alternative. Given this, the UN solution is the best solution we have. Only in the framework of a centralised Congolese state, based on the resources of Katanga, can working class forces and institutions be built up. Only through the UN can such a state be established and, in the even shorter run, only through the UN can the worst extremes of famine and disorder be averted. Critical support for the UN in the Congo is the only realistic attitude for revolutionary socialists.

PAGES FROM KRUSHCHEV'S BIOGRAPHY

AT the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU, Khrushchev went out of his way to attack the terror imposed by Stalin in the '30's, in which "prominent Party leaders and statesmen fell victim to unwarranted reprisals", and he suggested that "we should erect a monument in Moscow SR—9
to perpetuate the memory of the comrades who fell victim to arbitrary rule."

As Khrushchev holds the most prominent place in the world Communist movement, it will be useful briefly to chart his role in the "purges" of the '30's.

Actually, among all prominent survivors of Stalin, Khrushchev was the most vociferous mouthpiece of Stalin's terror policy. Khrushchev used the most elaborate language, which surpassed that of the General Prosecutor Vishinsky, to whip up hatred against the victims. On June 9, 1936, Khrushchev urged that the workers of the Moscow City Party organization become crusaders of hatred of the "enemies" and promoters of love for Stalin. He said:

"Let us with greater energy and persistence cultivate in the masses hatred against the counterrevolutionary Trotskyites, Zinovievites, and the remnants of the Right-wing deviationists, and let us at the same time cultivate in the masses love for the vozhd *and teacher, Comrade Stalin."* (*Pravda,* June 10, 1936). In August, 1936, came the trial and execution of the Zinoviev-Kamenev-Smirnov group of sixteen men. Even before the trial came to an end, Khrushchev demanded death sentences:

"Everybody who rejoices in the successes achieved in our country, the victories of our Party led by the great Stalin, will find only one word for the mercenary fascist dogs of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite gang. The word is execution."...

"Let the ringleader of this gang, the ally of the German Gestapo, Trotsky, be absent at the trial in Moscow—the anger of our people, the sentence of our proletarian court of justice will reach him anywhere." (*Izvestia,* August 23, 1936)

On November 23, 1936, the day when nine alleged "counter-revolutionary Trotskyites" were executed in Kemerovo, Khrushchev, delivering a speech at the Fourth Extraordinary Congress of Moscow Province Soviets, made the following statement:

"The working people of Moscow city and province... fervently approve the fair sentences published today in the press handed down by the Soviet court on the enemies of the people, the foul gang of counter-revolutionary Trotskyites. We draw our proletarian sword to chop off the heads of the loathsome creatures, double-dealers and murderers, agents of fascism... The mad beast must be finished off." (*Pravda,* Nov. 24, 1936)

In January, 1937, when the Supreme Court announced thirteen death sentences and long prison terms against the Piatakov-Radek-Sokolnikow group, the Moscow Party Committee, headed by Khrushchev, organized a mass rally in Red Square, according to *Pravda,* "more than two hundred thousand working people of the capital demonstrated their solidarity with the sentence of the Supreme Court."

Khrushchev went further than all other prominent survivors of Stalin in crawling before "the Leader". Thus, for instance, in November, 1936, at the Fourth Congress of the Moscow Province Soviets, Khrushchev told *"the greatest Vozhd of all toiling people"*, that *"ardent love and limitless faithfulness"* fill the heart of every Soviet citizen. (*Pravda,* November 22, 1936). A few days later, in a *Pravda* article, Khrushchev informed the genius that the *"working people of the capital are happy and proud to live and work in the same city as the beloved vozhd of the peoples"* (Ibid., November 25, 1936). At the Eighth All-Union Congress of the Soviets, Khrushchev insisted that the Soviet Constitution, which was to be adopted by the Congress, be called the Stalinist Constitution, because *"it was written from beginning to end by Comrade Stalin himself."* (Ibid., November 30, 1936). It was in the same speech that Khrushchev coined the expression "Stalinism".

"Our Constitution," Khrushchev said, *"is the Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism that has conquered one sixth of the globe. We do not doubt that Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism will conquer the entire globe... We adopt our Constitution and we celebrate the victory of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism which is not only our victory but also that of the working people throughout the world."* (Ibid.)

Khrushchev not only spoke in support of the "purges", but took a prominent part in them.

It was precisely during the period of mass terror (1937-38) that Khrushchev rapidly climbed higher and higher in his Party career. In 1935, in addition to the secretaryship of the Moscow City Party Committee, he was given the post of First Party Secretary of the entire Moscow province. In January, 1938, when the Purge reached its peak, he was selected by Stalin as an alternate member of the Politburo, and soon afterward he was sent to the Ukraine and made First Secretary of the Central Committe of the Ukrainian Party to replace Stanislav V. Kosior, who soon became a victim of the Purge and whom Khrushchev posthumously described in 1956 as an *"eminent Party and state worker" against whom "a case had been fabricated."* (Khrushchev's Secret Speech to 20th Congress). In 1939, when Khrushchev had fulfilled Stalin's assignment to complete the purge in the Ukraine, he became a full-fledged member of the Politburo.

Five months after his appointment as First Secretary, the 14th Congress of the Communist Party of the Ukraine praised Khrushchev for his active part in the "purges"

"The Bolsheviks of the Ukraine, led by the Central Committee of the CPSU and especially by Comrade Stalin, have in recent months achieved considerable success in the discovery, eradication and annihilation of nests of Trotskyite-Bukharinite and bourgeois-nationalist agents of Polish-German and Japanese Fascism... The Fourteenth Congress of the CP(B)U particularly emphasizes that a large part in the attainment by the CP(B)U of all the above-mentioned successes was played by the fact that the Central Committee of the CPSU sent to the Ukraine the strong Bolshevik and Stalinist, Comrade N. S. Khrushchev."

The head of the NKVD in the Ukraine, A. I. Uspensky, introduced himself at an election meeting in the following manner

"I consider myself a pupil of

● *contd next page*

EDITORIAL

THE silver and the crystal glass glittered at the Lord Mayor's Banquet. The television cameras showed an audience of what Robert Owen called 'the gay and the splendid.' And the Prime Minister completed the show by making one of the great sick jokes of the age. He hoped that we should make it an old people's Christmas.

A great many Old Age pensioners did not have a very gay time this Christmas. In the wards of mental hospitals and in some old people's homes, in the single rooms where many pensioners live alone, conditions are not very good. The remedy is not Christmas visiting by the Bow Group or private charity by Tory ladies.

The remedy is a sharp increase in the old age pension, a high priority for the building of hospitals and homes, and a radical drive for large-scale low-cost council housing. To get these we need high taxation, sharp controls on speculative building and a planned housing drive. Anything less is an insult to the old and the poor.

The old and the poor will go on being insulted. For what confronts them is not just the well-fed Tory government refusing to tax their friends; what stands in the way is the outlook of Tory society. Under affluent capitalism the organized worker can secure a relatively high wage level often enough. What he cannot do is to defend himself when he is unorganised or when he is no longer or not yet a worker.

The children in secondary modern schools, the sick and the disabled, the mentally ill and above all the pensioners, are the defenceless victims of our form of society. They show the value that capitalism places upon a worker who cannot work for it, that's the worker who is a person and nothing more.

Politically, what stands out is that we shall never get the politics we need except in a society which has government strong enough to plan and democratic enough to be controlled by those for whom it plans. Right-wingers are apt to make a sharp distinction between reform and revolution, between trying to mend this and that feature of society and trying to change society as a whole.

This distinction is unreal. Given the nature and value of capitalism any real attempt at reform will confront the barriers of class society soon enough. Serious reformers will have no option but to become revolutionaries.

Equally, revolution is a set of vacuous slogans unless it challenges the existing order at specific points. One point at which we ought to challenge the Tory society now is where the weak and the old have to suffer simultaneously from Macmillan's policies in the country and his crocodile tears on television.

Nikolai Ivanovich Yezhov. Comrade Yezhov teaches us to fight the enemies of the people, to clean up our country, our Motherland from the enemies. I pledge to follow Comrade Yezhov, the militant leader of the NKVD, in every respect.

"And only after the faithful Stalinist, Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev, arrived in the Ukraine did the smashing of the enemies of the people begin in earnest." He concluded his speech with a personal note:

"Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev asked me to transmit to you his regards and to ask you to prepare yourselves in a Bolshevik manner for the collection of a rich Stalinist harvest..." (Visti VTsVK, June 24, 1938).

And the "harvest" was rich. Of the 62 members of the Party Central Committee elected the year before, only one was reelected; of the 40 candidate members elected in 1937, only 2 remained; and of the 9 members of the Auditing Commission, not a single one remained.

To add the final touch of hypocrisy, Khrushchev referred especially in the 22nd Congress to the *"true Leninists"*, Kosior and Postyshev. He proposed that the memory of these *"prominent Party leaders and statesmen who fell victim to unwarranted reprisals"* should be commemorated. He "forgot" to mention that it was *he* who replaced both Postyshev and Kosior in January 1938!

(For a complete account of Khrushchev's bloody record in the "purges" read Lazar Pistrak, *The Grand Tactician*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1961).

COMPARISON OF COST OF CERTAIN ITEMS FOR WAR AND PEACE USES

Annual costs

Production of weapons and research	£659m.
—of which aircraft, armament, ammunition and explosives for the air force	£182m.
—guns and ammunitions for the army	£45m.

Cost of some individual items

Money wasted on Blue Streak	£84m.
Cost of developing Seaslug	£40m.
Half expenditure on Works and Buildings	£56m.
One V-bomber	(over) £1m.
Cost of training a V-bomber captain	£100,000
A single Bloodhound missile	£35,000
National Health Service 1960/1	£630m.
Annual income of 1.65m. persons with below £300 p.a. 1958/9	£629m.
Family Allowances 1960/1	£130m.
Exports of Electronics 1960	£45m.
Output Scientific and Industrial Instruments U.K. 1960	£84m.
Welfare food services 1960/1	£27m.
Expenditure on Stevenage and Crawley New Towns to date	£66½m.
1 m. tons of earth moving equipment	£1m.
1 m. tons of mechanical handling equipment	£1m.
28 new hospitals (with 500 beds each)	£56m.
2,800 cars and commercial vehicles	£1m.
1 secondary school with 500 places	£1.3m.
Long quay Victoria Channel (west) Belfast	£1m.
Cost of 10 years' schooling for one child	about £830
20 council houses	about £34,000
3-lane by-pass road per mile	£150,000

From *Labour Research.*

IN THE RED

"SPARTACUS"

THE Common Market rush is on. From now on all the manoevrings of large-scale British capitalism will be carried out with one eye on the continent. In one direction we shall get mergers of British firms such as ICI and Courtaulds; in the other all sorts of alliances will be made across frontiers. We need not suppose that a narrow patriotism will hold our capitalists back. Indeed this is a good time to recall the spiciest of all moments in the Bank Rate Tribunal, that great strip show of British capitalism.

Jardines of London had received a letter from the General Manager of their Hong Kong firm which ran: *"While I do not for one moment forget that we are a British firm and should therefore support our own currency, I do feel that, with the international nature of our business, we might be wise at this time to transfer part of our sterling investments to North America when there is so much talk of possible sterling devalutation"*.

To this Mr W.J. Keswick replied that *"with regard to the Insurance Companies, I imagine you should continue your policy to switch more into North American bonds and equities. Again, this is anti-British and derogatory to sterling but, on balance, if one is free to do so, it makes sense to me"*. Beside that *"What's good for General Motors is good for America"* seems positively patriotic.

★

THE Eichmann trial has been both a help and a hindrance. It has been a help to be reminded how ordinary Eichmann is. A creature of bureaucracy, a transportation specialist, a man who looked only to doing what he was told. Such men are always needed. Where else could you find pilots for H-bombs?

But in West Germany the trial has been a marvelous alibi. If he is guilty, then we are innocent—of course, he should be punished severely. So have reasoned all those West Germans who like to tell themselves that they never knew about the concentration camps and that anyrate the Jews brought it all on themselves.

MRS. MARGARET COLE'S new book *The Story of Fabian Socialism* (Heinemann, 30s.) throws a great deal of light upon the traditions of the British labour movement. The complete lack of internationalism, the acceptance of narrow national horizons, is a recurring theme. When the Boer War broke out in 1899, and some members of the Fabian Society wished to protest at the British Government's imperialism, the Executive were surprised and pained that matters so irrelevant should be brought before Fabians. At a special meeting S. G. Hobson moved a resolution condemning imperialism and connecting it with the very order of capitalism which the Fabian Society was pledged to change. His extremely moderate speech was met, after an irrelevant amendment by George Bernard Shaw had been defeated, by someone moving 'the previous question.' This was carried by 59 votes to 50. Later a postal ballot produced a majority in favour of the Society taking no stand on the issue of the war. I had never realised before that at least one can say of Fabians that they haven't got worse.

★

THOSE who suppose that bureaucracy is not a permanent threat could do worse than read Carl Sandburg's story in his *Abraham Lincoln: The War Years*, about how Lincoln in the first months of his administration "read each paper carefully through, remarking, 'I never sign a document I have not first read.' Later: 'Won't you read these papers to me?' Still later: he requests merely 'a synopsis of the contents.' And, in the fourth year of his incumbency: his most frequent response was 'show me where you want my name?"

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.