

WORKERS BROADSHEET

6^D

VOL.V NO.5

C O N T E N T S

THE RACIST ELECTION	Page	2
W.P.P.E. ON THE IRISH CRISIS	"	4
CAMBRIDGE STUDENTS AND THE POLICE STATE	"	5
DOCTORS AND THE N.H.S.	"	6
THE SECOND CAPITALIST WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS	"	7
DUST IN THE MINES	"	11
ANNA LOUISE STRONG	"	12

T H E R A C I S T E L E C T I O N

First let us be clear as to the actual effect of the change of Government. It will be almost negligibly small.

The June General Election was run deliberately by Wilson on "presidential" lines as a contest between two rival would-be prime ministers — Wilson as the successful conservative in charge, and Heath as the Tory-Conservative aspirant. On neither side was there any attempt to put forward anything that could possibly be called a policy for the people. The chief differences were on such matters as grammar schools and how much hypocrisy to put into British capitalist support for South Africa and Rhodesia — the Tories being for less hypocrisy and more quick profits.

The only "popular" voice in the whole election was that of Enoch Powell — the aspirant to a regime of unrestricted power for the rich, with the appeal of racism as the means to get it.

Heath refused to repudiate Powell, and Wilson hardly hid his anger at the only serious attack on Powell, by Wedgwood Benn.

Heath needed Powell, and Wilson was determined not to challenge him.

POWELL EXCLUDED ?

Excluded from the new Government, he is the real victor and will be the most powerful man in the new parliament. Jennie Lee was defeated by a Tory in a Midlands mining constituency, and the right wing rich Labourite Woodrow Wyatt admits or claims (Times 23.6.70) that it was miners' votes for the Tory that defeated him.

Powell is at present the only popular political leader in England. The fascist National Front, though still numerically insignificant, got more votes than the "legal Communists" of the C.P.G.B.

If that portion of the leadership of the working class that is still militant and aware that it has class responsibilities, does not wake up to the need to destroy Powellism, then Powellism will surely destroy it as Hitlerism did in Germany.

Powell's own claim to have fought the Nazis means nothing. Imperialists and fascists are of course liable to fight each other at times, and 1970 is not 1939.

The "surprise" of the election result is not of great importance. It seems likely that Wilson would in fact have defeated Heath in their personal race for Downing Street if he had been less complacent, less a simple replica of Baldwin, pipe and all, but in any case this hardly matters. Wilson lost because he was in fact a Baldwin over the whole course of his premiership. But Heath-the-twin has in essentials the same programme of imperialism under a veneer of liberalism and democracy. The housewives' rejection of Wilson-the-inflationist is natural. Much more important is the acceptance, by far too many, of the Tories as the party of racism.

If we do not swing English workers to unite against their class enemy, then Powell will win.

How are we to do this ?

The Wilson line is -- shut up, don't attack, preach tolerance. It can be summed up as "Don't fight, look the other way". In the pre-Hitler period in Germany this line became famous as "Nicht provozieren" — "Don't provoke them". The result is known.

ANTI-FASCIST UNITY

Our line must be positive and aggressive, uniting all who can be united against this main enemy.

And who is this main enemy on the front of racism and the fascism that always goes with it ?

This main enemy is the direct cause of the racist delusion that afflicts so many in our country, and so widely — IMPERIALISM.

Imperialism is not just flag-waving and Rule Britannia. It produces Alf Garnett, but he is a mere by-product. The aim is very simple — PROFITS.

It is not just patriotism, but profits that keeps Lord Salisbury and Sir Alec Douglas-Home and Lord Stokes and millionaires by the score, such staunch supporters of fascism in Africa, however democratic and tolerant and

liberal they may set out to appear here in England, where trade unionists are still a force to be reckoned with and the workers are neither defeated nor helpless.

It is these high profits from foreign investment -- averagely double those at home -- that makes the capitalists who rule our country so keen to retain their "freedom" to invest where they want.

And what they want is quite simple too -- simply the highest profits. The profits are for them, the cost of these profits, though mostly falling on the doubly exploited neo-colonial worker, also falls on us, the English people.

The most terrible aspect of this cost to us is not the economic price in reduced production here at home, it is the racist delusion which imperialism has always encouraged and on which it has thrived. It pays Powell to spread this delusion while all our Liberals strive hard to pretend that it hardly exists.

THE PRICE OF IMPERIALISM

The heavy economic price of the policy of exporting capital made even the prophet of capitalism Keynes disapprove of it forty years ago. It is the cause of the fluctuations in the British capitalist foreign trade balance, that makes all our capitalist Governments, Labour and Tory, restrict economic growth at home and push up unemployment "to prevent overheating of the economy". (Did anybody ever talk of overheating in war time?)

But this direct economic effect is both more obvious and less dangerous than the moral effect -- the delusion of racism. Imperialism has for about 300 years, since the days of Cromwell, or even the first Elizabeth, been demoralising the English worker by inviting him to identify with his own oppressor and despise those, chiefly with differently coloured skins, who are even more oppressed than he is.

What Jews were to Hitler, Blacks are to Powell. And not just to Powell, but to the whole Establishment from Salisbury to Maudling Wilson and Callaghan.

Hitler's Jews did not fight, or not until in the Warsaw Ghetto it was too late. But our black brother-workers are not so passive, they are

resisting already and will certainly resist more. IT IS THE VERY FIRST POLITICAL TASK OF EVERY REVOLUTIONARY TO HELP THEM.

To want to help Vietnam is fine, and to object to apartheid cricket is even finer, because a little nearer to our own imperialism.

But the apartheid that most concerns us, and the imperialism for which we the English people have direct responsibility, is happening here in the British Isles. It is the military occupation of Northern Ireland to bolster the brutal regime in Belfast, and the present existing day-to-day APARTHEID IN PRACTICE here in England.

It was above all this unacknowledged but ever present racial discrimination and racial delusion that helped the Tories back into office -- they have of course essentially always been in power, as was long ago recognised by Wilson's Prime Ministerial model, Stanley Baldwin.

The working people of England have to destroy Powellism. To do this they must destroy Toryism, and cure something like one-third of our working people of their imperialist-racist Tory delusion.

POWELL LEADING THE RICH

Is there any real political difference between Powell and Lord Salisbury, or his protegee Mr. Smith in Rhodesia?

The outlook of all three is essentially fascist, and it is precisely this fascist outlook that threatens, through our millions of Alf Garnetts, to overwhelm the Labour movement. The Labour Party can disappear, just like the C.P.G.B., and we should only say good riddance. But the Labour movement, the organised working people, is something quite different. It is the necessary basis for an anti-Powell, anti-racist, anti-imperialist revolutionary movement of the working people -- the people who alone can save England and bring it back to the greatness it had when it was leading the world in creativeness and discovery.

To develop such a movement we need two things. First, bold initiative from the immediately threatened and most oppressed -- the Black workers. This is already growing fast. Why else did the Establishment select for imprisonment Tony Soares alone from among the hundreds of students and others who were

advocating "violence" in support of Vietnam in October 1968 ? Because as a Black he was organising resistance of the Blacks.

THE CRISIS IN IRELAND

The crisis in Ireland has been forced forward by the obstinacy of Stormont and the complicity of Whitehall, so that the military occupation is now seen clearly for what it is -- the final effort of British imperialism to maintain its Ulster Plantation.

The Establishment is afraid of Blacks, but so far not afraid of whites.

LEAD THE PEOPLE !

The second thing we need is a strong English movement of support for this just and absolutely necessary resistance of the Blacks against their attackers -- not just the street attacks of skinheads but much more the constant persecution by the police, the constant racist discrimination in jobs, housing, and social life generally.

Just as in India at "independence" Muslim massacred Hindu and vice versa, so today Irish Protestant fights Irish Catholic. No revolutionary wishes to support the Catholic Church, but no Irishman, whatever his religion, will line up with the British mercenaries who are more and more replacing the Royal Ulster Constabulary as the gaolers of Ireland.

To develop such a movement is the special responsibility of English revolutionaries. It can only develop successfully in close association with the Black Resistance and with all other anti-imperialist forces, most obviously and first of all with the Irish people struggling for unity and real independence for their country -- only to be obtained under workers' revolutionary leadership.

Three leaders of armed African Independence movements were recently received by the Pope -- to the great anger of their Portuguese Catholic oppressors. If the Pope should declare himself for a united independent Ireland, should Irish or any other revolutionaries reject his support ?

Anti-imperialist unity needs to be the widest possible. It will only succeed if it is also revolutionary, and sees the need to destroy British imperialism to save England and all its working people.

Everywhere and always revolutionaries must seek to unite all who can be united against the main enemy. The main enemy for Irishmen is British imperialism and its Army of Occupation in the Six Counties. So every revolutionary in England, and in Wales and Scotland too, will support armed resistance against armed foreign occupation.

* * * *

(contd. from page 5)

as the result of a deliberate political assault on demonstrators cooked up between the university authorities and local city moguls. They have nothing to do with the preservation of "law and order" or the protection of property.

Will Irishmen who are not Catholics learn in time the lesson of Connolly the Protestant -- that class unity and national unity must combine against the class and national enemy ? A victorious Irish working people will know how to free itself from class oppression disguised as religion.

Chris Stephenson
King's College,
Cambridge.

A final comment from WORKERS BROADSHEET. In the 1930s the Establishment was equally ready to protect the English friends of Hitler from those who denounced him, and who even successfully rioted in Cable Street. Had Hitler invaded England as he did France, most of our policemen, judges, and military officers would have been as ready to join his party here as they were in France. The friends of Hitler's imitators may claim to defend "order -- their order -- but we must never again let them dare to claim that they are patriots. THEY ARE OUR QUISLINGS.

But if that victory is to be won, the sooner the Irish Republicans declare ~~their~~ unalterable support for complete religious freedom, the better for their prospects.

The two-century old slogan of UNITED IRISHMEN remains the right one for today. And where any of the four peoples of the British Isles are fighting for their freedom, all must unite to help them in the interests not of one people, but of all.

For WORKING PEOPLE'S PARTY OF ENGLAND

Alex Hart (Chairman)
Paul Noone (Gen. Sec.)

* * * *

C A M B R I D G E S T U D E N T S A N D T H E P O L I C E
S T A T E

In February last supporters of the Greek fascist regime organised a week's spree to encourage more tourism. A hotel was booked in Cambridge for a banquet to celebrate for the torturers.

Cambridge students decided to make a peaceful protest, but the banqueters for fascism are not so peaceful, twenty-four students were arrested and there was some damage to the hotel dining room.

"The proctors (a sort of university police officer) used this case to smash the left, while hiding behind the courts. They deliberately picked out prominent left-wingers. When there was uproar, they got cold feet." ("A junior don" quoted by Peter Wilby in the Observer 5.7.70)

Twenty-four students were picked out for arrest, fifteen were charged, and of these seven were acquitted. The remaining eight have received prison or Borstal sentences of up to eighteen months, with in two cases recommendations for deportation, to Brazil and South Africa, both fascist states.

The effect on Cambridge and on students generally is likely to be good. The brutality of the sentences will force everyone to realise that the days of peaceful demonstration are over, the enemy is not just regrettably mistaken and needing to be peacefully reasoned with. The enemy is a powerful frightened brute, and powerful frightened brutes cannot be reasoned with, they have to be removed from power.

In October 1968 one -- just one -- organiser of the very large demonstration for Vietnam was arrested and charged with incitement etc. for being connected with a short statement that discussed methods of resisting the police on demonstrations. At a time when various left wing publications were popularising petrol bombs, no one else at all was charged. The man thus selected was a young African and he was given a two-year sentence. The case was reported in the "serious" press and that was all. No further notice was taken save by WORKERS BROADSHEET who, as the parliamentarians say, "had an interest". Other rather similar cases have all involved Blacks, but not previously a "white", except for Irishmen.

We believe these brutal sentences, intended to frighten students into passivity, will have the opposite effect. It is certainly the duty of all socialists, of all anti-fascists, to do all they can to make the government release these victims, selected, as was Tony Soares, because of their activity in political leadership.

It is also a reminder to students and to "whites" that the struggle for a better society is a war, which we must be prepared to fight as our enemy fights it -- only more successfully, because we are many, they are few.

* * * * *

We reprint below the gist of a letter to the "Guardian" (8.7.70) from one of the acquitted students:

Sir, ... some of the exact offences for which the eight convicted were sentenced.

For "shouldering a policeman" described by the prosecution as a "technical assault", nine months in prison. For "pushing and shouting" a conviction of unlawful assembly and nine months imprisonment. A useful comparison would be with the sentence given in the other court at the same assize for assault occasioning grievous bodily harm; 12 months imprisonment. For the actual offences of which these people have been convicted, the sentences are savage by any standards, even compared with sentences given to skinheads.

I would certainly be the last to defend any discrimination in favour of students, the main beneficiaries of which have been in the past, right wing students who have successively, nearly killed a chairman of the Labour Club, threatened a sit-in with shotguns and whips, and put me in very real fear of my personal safety on more than one occasion, with complete legal impunity.

I also recall that right wing students violently broke up a peaceful rally on the first anniversary of Rhodesian UDI, destroying several hundred pounds worth of amplifying equipment, without even any intervention from the police, let alone legal punishment.

These sentences and the ragbag "riot" and "unlawful assembly" charges from which they spring have occurred

(contd. on p. 4)

T H E D O C T O R S ' P A Y D I S P U T E

The recent rumpus over doctors' pay has once again shown the British Medical Association as both reactionary and hamfisted.

The BMA, unnerved and panicking over the rise of the revitalised Medical Practitioners Union and the Junior Hospital Doctors Association, which threatens its monopoly position, rushed into "militant activity" over the General Practitioner-Consultant pay dispute. After invoking the threat of resignation unless the Labour Government granted the G.P.s and senior hospital staff the full 30% increase recommended by the Review Body, the BMA leadership has now subsided into passive euphoria under the blandishments of the new Tory Health Minister, Sir Keith Joseph, who has promised nothing. Perhaps the BMA leadership is hoping to get out of the predicament its "militant stand" had placed it in, as only half their referendum forms on the resignation issue were returned, and only about one-third of the profession declared itself ready to resign from the NHS over the Review Body dispute.

The BMA suggestion that junior hospital staff should reject their 30% increase (already implemented by the Government) and show solidarity with their "senior colleagues", was such a non-starter that it provoked more smiles than anger in junior hospital messes. Junior staff know that the BMA had asked for less for junior staff than the Review Body recommended!

In hospital messes throughout the country, medical staff had opposed the BMA policy of sanctions and resignation over this pay dispute. Again and again it has been reasserted that pay is secondary compared with the problems of conditions of service -- overwork, shortage of all grades of staff, poor buildings and equipment, long hours, the hierarchical system which prevents effective development of a better service for the patients.

Another fear is developing among many doctors -- especially junior staff, but also many consultants in the less fashionable hospitals -- that with the new Tory Government a fresh attempt will be made to expand private practice at the expense of the National Health Service, and for further cuts on NHS expenditure and efficiency. The BMA is already mounting a reactionary campaign on this very point.

The MPU/ASTMS is beginning to develop a counter-offensive to safeguard and DEVELOP the NHS, which to be successful must become a movement embracing doctors, all health service workers and the public themselves. The principle of a real National Health Service must be fought for. The NHS exists to serve the people, not to make profits. This is an issue on which millions feel very strongly. It is an issue capable of mobilising the overwhelming majority of working people to struggle for what is an aspect of People's Power. It is a revolutionary issue.

HOSPITAL DOCTOR

THE CAPITALIST WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS

In the autumn of 1929 a day of share value collapse on the New York Stock Exchange signalled the greatest economic crisis the capitalist world had ever known. For about ten years there was massive unemployment, production fell about 40% below that of 1929, and the whole capitalist world was affected.

One result of this 1930s economic crisis was Hitler and World War II. Another was the general adoption by capitalist governments of the Keynes policy of controlled inflation, to keep production rising by means of a government maintained continuous rise in prices. In previous cyclical crises prices had been brought down at the onset of "overproduction" by a policy of deflation. In the 1930s deflation had proved ~~politically~~ too expensive.

Since 1940 this capitalist policy of continuous inflation has successfully kept the system developing with no major recession for 30 years. It has been helped by a World War that lasted 6 years, and a series of colonial wars -- Korea, Vietnam etc. -- and an enormous armaments and space exploration programme. But now this prolonged imperialist bonanza is at last coming to an end.

In this article we are not dealing with political causes -- the defeats of the aggressor in Asia, the Black rebellion in the U.S., the rejection of the Vietnam War by the American people -- but making an economic analysis of the present general situation of U.S. and U.K. capitalism to enable us to draw the political lessons for our own immediate future.

STATE CAPITALISM

It is essential that revolutionaries should understand the economics of present-day capitalism. Just as Lenin in his "Imperialism" (1915) analysed the effects of the much larger export of capital as compared with the time of Marx, so today there are factors that have developed since the days of Lenin.

1. Politically, one-third of the world has withdrawn from the "western" capitalist world. Although the Soviet Union is returning to capitalism, other countries, led by China, are pursuing a socialist policy and so are directly confronting capitalism.

2. Within the capitalist world, monopoly has advanced to a new stage at which it not only dominates all major production, but has found it possible and necessary to go over increasingly to what can be called STATE CAPITALISM. We see this in various forms in Japan, Italy, France, Germany, Sweden, and in the U.S. itself where the State, especially the Pentagon, is the chief customer of U.S. industry.

3. In the U.K. the trend towards state capitalism was inaugurated by the Attlee government in 1945, then continued by the Tory governments and further accelerated by the Wilson government. In spite of anything said by Mr. Powell, this policy will certainly be continued by the present government. We will go into this later, but first we will consider the general financial policy pursued by capitalist governments since World War II.

PRICES AND INFLATION

If by whatever means a government increases the availability of money or "credit" beyond a corresponding increase of goods for sale, then the effect is to put up prices. This would remain true under socialism, but the essential difference is that under socialism, efficiently organised, there would be no need or temptation to the government, or anyone else, to increase credit beyond the amount required to finance production, at whatever rate of growth could in fact be achieved. "Sound finance" will still be required under socialism, but will be very different from the "sound finance" of capitalist bankers.

Socialist planning will also be required, and experience has already shown (in China) that this must be done not merely from the top but even more from the bottom up, with the workers themselves as the chief decision makers as to what is or is not practicable or desirable. This does not mean that national planning will be less, or that there will be less need for computers. On the contrary, with such planned socialist production, in national priorities, control by the people will require to be centralised and therefore be inevitably indirect. But while the kind of national planning, the main priorities, requires national decision, the carrying out of the plan will require most of all mass mobilisation and mass enthusiasm. Here will

be felt and needed the direct effect of workers' control in production. Prices will not rise, though rationing will of course be necessary, e.g. in housing and in any field where there is still a shortage. But under capitalism, with every producer trying to get the highest possible price for his goods, prices are continuously being pushed up, and can be kept down only by restricting the supply of credit. For the last 30 years the aim of capitalist governments has been to expand credit (i.e. the supply of money) sufficiently to allow prices to rise continuously, but not so quickly as to endanger the whole system. If the prices are rising too fast, everybody begins to allow for this, and you get "runaway inflation".

But this is in fact just what is beginning to happen, first in the U.S. and now here in the U.K.

For the past nine months in the U.S., although prices are still rising, and indeed rising a little faster all the time, production of goods has been actually falling.

THE U.S. CRISIS

The Dow-Jones index of "blue chip" shares (i.e. those considered the most reliable) after rising almost continuously since World War II, has since the end of 1968 been almost continuously falling — slowly at first, but recently with rushes that have caused acute alarm in the biggest bankers. At the moment of writing (end June) it is hovering below the 700 mark, having two years ago been approaching 1,000. Meantime a major international investment trust (I.O.S.) is all but officially bankrupt and the owners of one of the biggest railroad and transport companies, with assets valued at \$7 billions, has actually declared itself bankrupt but has been ordered by Nixon to go on working. This is as if British Railways — only the Penn Central is more than twice as big — were to declare itself bankrupt and unable to go on paying wages. It is not revolutionaries who are diagnosing collapse of U.S. capitalism, it is the capitalists themselves.

Here in the U.K. this process of incipient collapse is not so advanced. We are about 6 to 9 months behind the U.S., but going in the same direction. At the June election Lord Cromer and Mr. Heath were telling the truth, as it happens, while Wilson and Roy

Jenkins were hoping to jump in and secure another 5 years in office — one cannot call it power — on the strength of last year's heavy exports. Production in the U.K. has just been reported, for the first time since 1945, to have actually fallen in the first quarter of 1970.

In the past production has normally fallen in the downswing of every capitalist trade cycle. What has never happened before is production falling while prices are still rising. In the U.S. this has now been going on for over 9 months, too long for any possible "accidental" explanation. And now it is also happening here.

THE U.K. PRICE RISE

In 1949 it seemed that capitalist governments, guided by Keynes, had learned to control their economies and to enable the profit-system to go on working without producing the previously ever-worsening trade cycle, that in the 1930s had threatened to bring capitalism in the whole world to a revolutionary end. For close on thirty years this controlled inflation seemed to be working. Capitalism had never had it so good. Revolutionaries had stopped foreseeing a capitalist economic crisis in planning their tasks.

Beneath this surface of growing capitalist prosperity there was growing contradiction. For over twenty years the U.S. exported massively. First war material for World War II, then the subsidies for client states of the Marshall Plan, then the Korean War, the War in Vietnam from 1946 onwards, and all the time a simultaneous export of capital to enable U.S. firms to buy up an ever-increasing share of industry throughout the world, including a hefty share in the British Isles. The way this buying up was done is a fine example of the "peaceful" method of imperialist penetration. Every year more and more dollars were simply printed to cover the ever-increasing U.S. national budget deficit. These newly-printed dollars went to U.S. firms on government contracts etc. and the firms could then use them to develop, or simply buy up, the most profitable sectors of industry throughout the capitalist world (including the neo-colonial parts of it). The dollars used were dollars like the rest of them, but the U.S. was nonetheless buying up other people's industry by the simple process of exporting its inflation. It was continuously reducing the value of

its own money and by this means forcing up prices in all countries whose currencies were tied to the dollar.

GOLD

The U.S. was using its financial dominance, due to its industrial dominance, for this takeover policy -- just as a City multi-millionaire can buy out a small farmer or even a fairly large farmer, at no real cost to himself (by the normal accountancy fiddle for the tax man) and irrespective of whether the farmer wants to sell his future livelihood and that of his children. The U.K. had of course been doing this sort of thing for the previous century.

Here we had better put in a word on the question of gold. Sterling in the 19th century and the dollar until 1969 were both convertible to gold at a fixed price. This was called "the gold standard". But the industrial price of gold was merely a LIMITING factor in the actual dominance of first sterling and then the dollar over all world currencies. Since March 1969 the whole capitalist world has been quasi-officially on a dollar standard, with gold, after a final struggle in 1968, now relegated to a quite subordinate position, recently officially recognised in an agreement between the U.S. and South Africa.

U.S. export of capital went on happily for the U.S. capitalists for a little over 20 years from 1945. But in the mid-1960s contradictions were becoming serious. Japan, Germany, France, Italy and England -- especially the first two -- had by then developed strong industries of their own and were beginning to invade the U.S. home market; the U.S. itself, refusing to admit defeat and withdraw from its attempted conquest from of Vietnam while simultaneously faced with increasingly expensive rebellion at home, found itself forced to restrict its export of dollars and to cut down on its annual budget deficit. This, in turn, about two years ago, began to reduce industrial expansion in the U.S.. The process of continuous expansion, once halted, spontaneously began to go into reverse, so that since mid-1969 not only has industrial growth ceased, production is actually falling.

But the most alarming fact for U.S. capitalism, and therefore for world capitalism, is that while pro-

duction has so startlingly fallen -- for the first time in over 35 years -- prices have continued to rise, and are still doing so. At this moment (end June) the Federal Reserve Board (corresponding to, though of course far bigger than, the Bank of England) is torn between two policies. Either to worsen the production crisis -- with already over 4 million officially unemployed -- by trying to halt inflation; or to seek to avoid a full-blown 1930-type production crisis by deliberately letting inflation rip.

Either way, there will be a severe social and political crisis. And this time the U.S. people are far better prepared for it than they were in 1930. We will return to this later. We must first consider in more detail the situation in the U.K.

STATE CAPITALISM IN THE U.K.

In the 1920s the state apparatus challenged the miners -- at that time the strongest and most militant of the workers -- and fought the whole organised working class in order to preserve the mines for their "owners". In 1945 the nationalisation not only of the mines, but of the railways too, was carried out by the Attlee Government without serious opposition, for the simple reason that had the Tories won the election, their government would have done exactly the same. British capitalism could no longer afford to let the mines and railways remain in the hands of private profiteers. Now the Government, Heath just as much as Wilson, does the same for steel, and may possibly soon do the same for the ports.

The Wilson Government pushed this process of the capitalist state intervening in industry in a new manner. The Ministry of Technology (run by Wedgwood Benn) and its offspring the Industrial Reorganisation Commission has been investing hundreds of millions both to rescue firms considered to be of national importance from threatened bankruptcy e.g. Upper Clyde Shipbuilders, Rolls Royce and many others, and also to push monopoly developments that it considered desirable "in the national interest".

The scale of these investments has been increasing annually and is already a large proportion of total annual capital investment in industry. It would be impossible for the Heath Government to undo this work even if

it would, and of course it won't even want to try. The senior Treasury officials and the dominant City millionaires do not change their basic policy because of a change of office holder at either 10 or 11 Downing Street. The British capitalist economy will continue on its march towards state capitalism.

THE RATE OF INTEREST

In 1946 Attlee's first Chancellor, Hugh Dalton, a man of moderate intelligence but rather more of a democrat than his Prime Minister, boasted that he would bring the rate of interest down to a permanent 2½%, the rate of Victorian Consols. The rate is now 8 to 10% or even more on gilt edged (fixed interest securities) and recently the 7,000 million-dollar Penn Central Railway in the U.S. was offering 11½%, though it found no takers. English municipalities are now, like colonial and neo-colonial countries, raising money abroad at 8½ or 9%, and of course this all has to be paid for by the ratepayers and the council tenants.

Recently a leading engineering firm in the north was encouraged by Mintech and IRC to take over another firm that was facing bankruptcy. The IRC loan involved such heavy interest payments that the whole concern saw its profit fall heavily, which gave the opportunity for a further "reorganisation". At each such step it is the financiers who acquire more and more control, and the industrialists -- those in charge of actual production -- who are forced more and more into the position of employees of the financiers.

This development was already beginning fifty years ago, but has been increasing at a much greater rate since World War II and is continually accelerating.

One effect is that more and more the actual running of industry is in the hands of salaried staff, while the control of industry moves more and more out of the hands of producers into that of financiers.

Politically this means that scientists, technicians, and even managers become increasingly potential socialists, while the commanding owners of industry are ever shrinking in numbers and so in their social base. This is reflected in the rapid development of the Association of Scientific, Technical and Managerial

Staffs (ASIMS) and in the fact that its leadership is vigorous and militant, in contrast to that of most of the older unions.

But this shrinking of the social base of the ownership of industry has another political implication. As fewer and fewer identify with capitalism, as more and more are ready to ask whether we need it, so capitalist class government by consent of the governed becomes more difficult. If the capitalists find they can no longer govern by consent, then they turn to brute force. For instance, they occupy Northern Ireland with troops, or they develop a fascist movement as in Italy in the 20s, in Germany in the 30s. This is the danger from Powell, the reserve capitalist leader for the time of crisis.

REVOLUTION ?

The question of Power, which in the 1930s crisis did not arise because there was nowhere a revolutionary party strong enough, or clearheaded enough, to pose it, will this time certainly be posed in the U.S., both by the greatest revolutionary movement the U.S. has ever seen, the U.S. Black Panther, and also, we may be certain, by their allies the young generation of students. It remains to be seen whether the organised industrial workers of the U.S. will understand the need to co-operate and so establish People's Power -- or join Nixon's National Guard and so start a prolonged and terrible civil war.

Here in Britain the position is similar though less advanced both economically and politically. Here also production has actually fallen in the first quarter of this year, unemployment is at its highest since 1945, and prices are rising faster than ever before. The essentials are the same, and of course the change of government will make no difference at all -- government economic policy being decided by Treasury officials acting on behalf of the City, with the so-called Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether MacLeod, Jenkins or Callaghan, knowing very well that he has at best a merely consultative voice. (Even Churchill, by no means a yes-man to his civil servants or even to Bank Governors, felt unable to oppose the deflationary policy led by Bank Governor Norman in 1925).

It seems likely that the crisis will begin this autumn, or at latest in the first half of 1971.

It is of the utmost importance that when the crisis comes, there shall be a nationally recognised revolutionary leadership to meet it without surprise or hysteria, but able to give the kind of clear, firm leadership that Lenin was able to give in Russia from March 1917 up to the seizure of power in October, and thereafter, though with some slips, till his final disablement in March 1923.

What happens in a revolutionary situation, when there is no such nationally recognised competent revolutionary leadership, was shown in France two years ago, and much more tragically in Germany in 1932 and in Greece from 1944 on.

LESSONS OF THE PAST

It was also shown -- we think it necessary to state this openly, though no Marxist-Leninist has previously done so -- in Spain in 1937-38. The Spanish people -- especially the workers of Madrid and Barcelona and of the whole of Andalusia -- had marvelously defeated the military coup d'etat in July 1936, then, with international help, halted the fascist advance in the suburbs of Madrid, and gone on to a complete rout of the invading fascist army of Mussolini in March 1937. Thereafter, instead of meeting the enormous difficulties of a blockade by developing a People's War, as in China and later in Vietnam, the mistake was made of leaving the leadership of the struggle in capitalist hands (as in China 1925-27) and conducting the war for the Spanish Republic as a bourgeois national war. The result was inevitable defeat of the side with less arms, less food and less money, whereas in Vietnam it is the side with less arms, less food, and much less money that is winning.

So let every revolutionary in England, and also in Wales and Scotland and above all in Ireland, think hard on the need to organise now before it is too late. To recognise at last that there is a potentially revolutionary situation, present since July 1966 and likely to become more acute in the fairly near future (no one had foreseen May 1968 in France). Such a situation demands a revolutionary leadership. Such a leadership will be impotent unless nationally recognised, and the only way to win national recognition is by CORRECT PRACTICAL WORK.

That is what W.P.P.E. has been setting out to do, has begun to do,

(contd. at foot of next column)

and will continue to do. It appeals to all revolutionaries who are concerned for the revolution and not for themselves, to join freely and unconditionally in this work.

Dust has always been a problem in the mining industry. For years generations of miners have accepted this as part of the job, while thousands have died and many more have been rendered hopeless wrecks as a result of the dreaded diseases caused by dust in the lungs.

Since the advent of mechanisation in the British coal field, dust on the coal-face and roadways has increased to fearsome proportions. This is mainly caused by coal cutting machines cutting into floor muck and the fact that dust suppression on the machines is inadequate to cope with rock dust.

This problem could be solved if the face conveyor was lifted immediately a machine cuts below the level of the coal seam. This would unfortunately slow down production. But, it is better to lose a small part of the output than a large part of a miner's lungs.

Official figures issued recently show a decline in the amount of miners suffering from dust diseases. This could be because there are less men employed in the mines and the dust toll on miners' lungs since mechanisation began has not yet come out. Also many miners who are supposed to be suffering from bronchitis are in fact suffering from dust diseases. This is sometimes proven at the inquest after their death.

J.A.M.

Reprinted from LINK UP (No2, 1969) journal of the Doncaster Socialist Alliance.

Doctors who have worked in mining areas can confirm the correctness and importance of J.A.M.'s statements.
Ed. Bd. Workers Broadsheet.

* * * * *

and will continue to do. It appeals to all revolutionaries who are concerned for the revolution and not for themselves, to join freely and unconditionally in this work.

A N N A L O U I S E S T R O N G

Anna Louise Strong died recently in Peking. She was over eighty, but until fairly recently had continued active in her work as a journalist for revolution on an international scale.

Her political activity started before World War I. In 1919 she was a leader in the General Strike that paralysed her home town of Seattle, the port of the western seaboard state of Washington. This was the high point of the anti-capitalist and anti-war movement in the U.S. for that period. In the 20s she went to Soviet Russia and also made a journey through China during the 1926-27 period of the Chinese Revolution. Her lively report was reprinted in China, with her complete works, to celebrate her eightieth birthday.

In the 30s she was an assistant editor on the "Moscow News" that she had proposed as a journal for the numerous English-speaking workers for the first and second Five-Year Plans. She married a Russian Communist, a fellow-journalist.

She was in Russia throughout World War II, during which her husband died. Later during the final critical phase of the Chinese Revolution, in its struggle against Chiang Kai Shek backed by the U.S., she was again in China and had a celebrated interview with Mao Tse Tung in Yenan. On her return to Russia she was arrested, accused of being a spy, and finally deported to the U.S. There she lived for several years in California, ostracised -- as were all those denounced by the Moscow authorities -- by all left-wing political activists. After the death of Stalin in 1953, the charges against her were withdrawn and she was warmly welcomed on her return to Moscow.

In 1956 she wrote the little book that may survive longest of her many publications -- "The Stalin Era".

This is an honest perceptive account of the terrible and glorious campaign waged for the first Five-Year Plan, of Stalin at his best -- cautious, modest, helpful, decisive; and also of the appalling Yeshovshina, the years of the terror when "we were all mad". A.L.S. does not, as Krushchov did, throw the blame exclusively on Stalin, but accepts that the responsibility was not his alone. She does not show the masterly perceptiveness shown in the Communist Party of China's contemporary analysis

"On the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat" (Pts. 1 2 April/Dec. 1956). The Communist Party of China had already had several lessons to teach them that Stalin could be mistaken. So they were able, directly after that Twentieth Congress, to understand what was happening, to seek to encourage the long-overdue correction of severe political errors in CPSU policy, while also seeking to prevent the confirmation or further development of class division in Soviet society, instead of a move towards socialist egalitarianism, towards the people, not a privileged class, having power. February 1957 produced Mao's now classic development of revolutionary socialist theory "On the correct handling of contradictions among the people".

A.L.S. was already at this time much drawn to China. She went there once more on a visit and decided to stay there rather than return to her circle of friends and comrades in the Soviet Union. In Peking she again became active as a journalist, vigorously supporting the CPC in its differences with the increasingly revisionist CPSU. Her monthly "China News Letter" had a wide circulation. Here it was distributed with "Workers Broadsheet" from 1965 till the "Letters" ceased early in 1969, after the arrest in Peking of A.L.S.'s secretary, Israel Epstein.

In 1968 Anna Louise Strong had a final blaze of glory when Chairman Mao took the occasion of her eightieth birthday to hold a great party in her honour. She, with the modesty of a true revolutionary, pointed out in her Newsletter that this was Mao's way of paying tribute to the many American progressives and revolutionaries who were staunchly fighting with socialist China against the U.S. imperialism that is our international enemy.

Anna Louise was not a great revolutionary leader like Rosa Luxemburg or Eleanor Marx. But she was a great comrade, a staunch independent-minded and loyal fighter, whose memory will be honoured in her own America and throughout the world. She had thoroughly understood that those who wish to make revolution cannot be mere echoes, even of the greatest voices.

A.T.H.