

## ADVERTISEMENT

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

## EVER THOUGHT ABOUT SOCIALISM?

As an NS reader, you probably regard the above question as rather a cheek. After all, most people regard NS readers as socialist almost by definition. Would that this were true!

Unhappily, we in the SPGB consider it is nothing like true. The trouble starts, of course, with the old problem: 'It depends what you mean by socialism.' But before dealing with that directly by giving our own definition, let us give an indirect answer where we will be on common ground with NS readers: 'Socialism is not the same as capitalism.'

## IS THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT SOCIALIST?

On this point we can deal with experienced fact, rather than mere theory. Most of you probably voted for this government, thinking that the Labour Party was socialist. Well, would you say now that the system you are living under is not the same as capitalism? Can you detect any difference in principle between the social set-up that obtained in the fifties when admitted capitalists were in power and the present one? Can you find anything to quarrel with in the following quotations: 'Mr Wilson has the distinction of presiding over a government which has removed the last major distinction between labour and conservative.' 'It is not in the nature of labour governments to be socialist.' Ah, you say, just quotes from the *Socialist Standard*. And you would be quite wrong. They are both from the NS itself although, most unusually, our paper would have been quite happy with either of them (for those who want to check, the dates are respectively 1/3/68 and 17/1/69). They seem true enough, don't they? And just in case you would like to brush off these remarks as aberrations and not seriously meant, you will remember that the NS has recently been featuring serious articles showing how the gap between rich and poor has grown wider under Wilson. Labour means less equality, not more.

## SOCIALISM AND CAPITALISM

Now let us look at some fundamentals. If we all agree that socialism is not the same as capitalism, what are the main differences? It is hardly dispute that the most obvious feature of capitalist society in all countries is that the mass of the people are forced to set their alarm clocks early, go out and sell their mental and physical energies in return for wages. (We say 'all countries' designedly; most people in Moscow are attached to their alarm clocks in state-capitalist Russia exactly as in state-and-private-capitalist England or America.) Now when we say 'forced' we do so knowing that under capitalism there are no slave drivers with whips as there were under previous social systems. But you know what it is that forces people to hire themselves out by the hour or the week, like so many farm-horses or tractors. It is simply that in all countries the vast majority of the people own nothing of the means of production, the means of living. The land, the factories, the oil wells and the stores do not belong to them. Yet they must have access to them to feed themselves and their families. And always access is granted on the same terms: work for the owners so that they make a profit (why else, indeed, would they go to the trouble of employing anybody?). This is the very essence of capitalism.

## WHAT DID YOU EXPECT WILSON TO DO?

If socialism is not capitalism can you honestly say that you expected the Labour government to institute socialism? To abolish the wages system, that hall-mark of capitalism by which you can recognise it anywhere from Cuba to China? To end the system by which the propertyless mass is exploited by the minority which has its grasp on the means of production? You did not expect it because you know that Wilson had no mandate to abolish the wages system. On the contrary, the very idea is enough to send a shudder through the working class (including that section of it which reads the NS). So you can't blame Wilson for not introducing socialism. In the present state of working class political education it was simply not on. But you can blame him (and the Labour Party in general) for paying lip service to the idea of socialism, for pretending to be socialist. And we in the Socialist Party certainly do. Because it is obvious that the more pedlars there are of spurious brands of socialism, be they Wilsonian or Russian brands of nationalisation, or even Hitlerian National Socialism, the more confused does the working class become and the more difficult the task of those like us who propagate the idea of a fundamental revolutionary change in the structure of society.

## THE CRIME OF THE LABOUR PARTY

This is of course the real crime of people like Wilson. Not that they failed to institute socialism. Most people don't even know what it is let alone want it. (This doubtless applies to the members of Wilson's government themselves.) But by masquerading as socialists, while grotesquely failing to make capitalism anything other than a murderous jungle of poverty and wars, they cause a revulsion from the very idea of socialism. In Germany, between the wars, the failure of the alleged socialists to make capitalism work smoothly and in the interests of the majority led to such a revulsion that the outcome was Hitlerism. What makes readers of the NS who support the Labour Party so sure the same thing can't happen here?

## TRUTH IN POLITICS

The Labour ministers may be ignorant about socialism but they are fully aware of their own dishonesty in making long lists of promises to ameliorate the effects of capitalism under their administration and then cynically breaking them. The list is too familiar to NS readers to need stressing here—Health Service charges, Polaris subs., deliberate creation of a pool of unemployed, wage freezes, restriction of unions' right to strike, racial discrimination against Kenyan coloureds etc. etc. ad nauseam. But then dishonesty is an integral part of their trade. When Crossman was an opposition MP he actually wrote in his *Guardian* column: 'In politics honourable men are bound to practise deception and tell lies' (Nov. 2 '62). But this did not stop him catching the headlines recently moaning that TV interviewers actually made politicians seem liars. Here we have a rare case of a politician being accused of practising what he preaches. And he complains about it. Honourable men, forsooth. Shades of Mark Anthony's speech!

## WHAT ABOUT THE LABOUR LEFT-WING?

Well, what about it? Do you really believe that the antics of these state comedians really alter the fact that they are an integral part of the majority in the House which maintains in power a government which runs capitalism (with monumental inefficiency, it's true) and fraudulently pretends to socialism at the same time? One of them, Paul Rose, wrote an article in the *Guardian* recently proudly proclaiming that he and his fellow left-wingers had voted against all the obnoxious measures which the government (his government, of course) had introduced. He was so thrilled with his article that he even wrote a 'reply' to it a couple of days later! But he maintained a craven silence in the face of two letters in the *Guardian* pointing out that he and his friends were part and parcel of Wilson's majority and were responsible for every piece of anti-working class legislation introduced. Their only honourable course would be to resign their seats. But of course they would all do anything rather than face the prospect of going into the wilderness. So, by periodic baring of their much publicised consciences they keep the cash and take the credit too. Included in the attack in the *Guardian* were Michael Foot, Mikardo and Allan (the list could of course have filled a column). All of them kept significantly silent. Mikardo was accused of calling his Prime Minister 'an unprincipled opportunist' during his first administration but saying not a word about this to his electors at the last election. His silence must surely satisfy NS readers that he and his friends will play the same game at the next election too.

## THE COMMUNIST PARTY—AND THE REST

The CP was formed as a sycophant of Leninist state-capitalism and has continued to play that inglorious role ever since. They stood bravely behind Stalin while he was butchering untold numbers of Russian workers (including thousands of their own communist comrades) and neither the *Daily Worker* (at least they have had the decency to drop that undesired name) nor the more aptly named *Mourning Star* have ever told their readers that Russia is simply a vicious brand of state-capitalism with a dictatorship of the Communist Party over the proletariat. They now have the impudence to arraign Barbara Castle for her anti-union legislation in the full knowledge that they have never breathed a word against the USSR which has murderously repressed free union organisation and the right to strike for fifty inglorious years. They are utterly discredited.

As for CNDers, Radical Students and the rest, they may well be sincere but they cannot avoid the futility which attaches to all parties which seek to cure the evils of capitalism while leaving intact the system which is their cause. The long haul of educating the working class (including themselves) to an understanding of and desire for socialism is too hard and too unglamorous for them. Only the SPGB has never deviated from the socialist path and has refused to catch members' and votes on a programme of so-called immediate demands. For this we have been called Utopians. Yet who are the real Utopians? If not those who try to achieve peace and harmony while leaving the capitalist jungle intact? They merely dissipate the enthusiasm of those many sincere youngsters who find that they are merely trying to square the circle and in due course become frustrated and apathetic. It happens time and again.

The pathetic nature of these Radicals is perhaps best illustrated by a Jingle they chanted in the first days of their disillusion with the Labour government which many of them helped to install: 'A tale of two Anthonys, Greenwood and Benn. Now they are ministers, once they were men'. They are quite right to denounce those loud-mouthed lefties of opposition days who have deserted to enjoy the sweets of office (Crossman, Castle, Wilson himself). But there was no excuse for their own folly in not realising that these people never were 'men' and that when they came to administer capitalism themselves they would quickly emulate all the things that the wicked Tories had been doing. SPGB warnings fell on deaf ears. They could not even see that a 'Socialist' party which had a splinter group called 'Victory for Socialism' within it must by definition be a farce as well as a fraud. (It is hardly even ironical that the leader of that faction, Swingler, is now happily bedded down as a member of the government.) As to the new faces, NS readers are probably not so naive as to be taken in by cult-of-personality merchants of the type of Tariq Ali who shows his true worth by joining in the junketing in Castro's Cuba while shutting his ears to the groans of the untried victims of the regime in Castro's jails. He presumes to debate socialism with Michael Foot (who knows about as much of the subject as my foot—or as Ali himself); but there are few takers indeed for the challenge to debate with the only party which has stood for socialism, the whole socialism and nothing but socialism since its inception.

None of the other parties can claim clean hands when it comes to freedom and democracy. All of them flirted with Hitler at various times (the CP of course was actually party to a pact with him). And when this country was at war 'to save democracy' they all kept mum about the horrific doings of Stalin who was not even second to Hitler himself in crushing the slightest pretensions to freedom on the part of the working class. And they all join in praising Dubcek who calls himself a communist and must therefore by definition be an enemy of free speech and liberty for non-communists (and especially for socialists). No doubt he is less murderous than Stalin. But then so was Mussolini.

Socialism without democracy is out of the question. And so the SPGB has always stood for democracy and has always conducted its affairs accordingly. Even its executive committee meetings are open not only to all members but to opponents as well. And the latter have always been welcome to put their case at our meetings or in the *Socialist Standard*. A moneyless, frontierless world can only be run by an informed, socialist majority of the working class. It cannot be achieved by Leninist vanguards, by elitist conspiracies.

It is of course quite impossible to put our case fully in one (albeit expensive!) article. If you would like to find out more of what socialism is really about you are invited to write for a free copy of the *Socialist Standard* where you will find our principles (which are nailed to the mast in every piece of literature we have ever published), addresses of nearest branches etc.

# ADVERTISEMENT

This is the first of a series of twelve advertisements appearing on the third Friday of the month, inserted by a small group who think that socialism is the only answer to society's problems but that too few people know what it really is.

## A SOCIALIST ON THE SCENE

### INTRODUCING SOCIALISM

This series will consist mainly of articles showing how socialists look at the events and the people on the political stage. But first it is necessary to make clear what this socialism is that we stand for. It may well sound rather a cheek to define socialism to NS readers, but it is none the less necessary for that. Many readers imagine that what goes on in Russia or China or Cuba is socialism. Others may even imagine that because governments in England, or West Germany, or Scandinavia occasionally talk about socialism there is a kind of socialism in those countries too (although one imagines they are a dwindling number).

In the present stage of the evolution of human society, there are only two possible systems, capitalism and socialism. And everywhere capitalism rules. No country is socialist. No country is remotely to be described as on the road to socialism or in some sort of transition period. When people like Mao talk about their opponents taking the road back to capitalism, the implication is that they themselves have achieved socialism or are on the way to doing so. All such claims are simply lies. The simple test is the existence in all these countries of the wages system. It is the mark of the beast by which you can recognise capitalism the world over. Who gets wages? The working class. And what is that? It is the vast majority of people who own nothing of the means of life (land, factories etc.) and are therefore compelled to sell their energies to support themselves and their families. And their wages just about enable them to do that (though not always even that). Who buys their power to labour? Clearly the minority which owns those means of life, which they use as capital, for the purpose of producing a profit. They are the capitalist class - not a term of abuse, merely a description of an economic fact of life. And the whole purpose of employment is that they should profit. Capitalists do not employ for the purpose of keeping people at work or to provide wealth that people need. Those things are quite ancillary to the main purpose, which is profit. Profit is the only motive force which drives the wheels of capitalist society. Which is why capitalism can never work in the interests of the happiness of humanity. It is not geared that way and hence all tinkering reforms must leave the system intact as a fetter upon human happiness.

The motive force behind socialism will be simply the well-being of all people (there will only be people, then: now there are simply workers and capitalists). By abolishing the present set-up and substituting one where the means of life are the common property of us all, there will be an end to employment for profit. There will indeed be an end to employment. Employment means exploitation, getting someone to work so as to make a profit out of the operation. There will be no employers, no employed. Just people working together in harmony, producing food, clothes and all the rest not for sale on a market to realise a profit but simply to supply our common needs. Sounds simple? But then it really is simple. Human society will grow food for the simple purpose of satisfying human desires. It is only capitalism with its absurd system of money (absurd in a sane society, that is) which is complicated and crazy.

Is there a capitalist class in England? Of course; you can see them. Silly question. Is there one in Russia, then? Well, we know there is a working class. They are the people who have to work for wages, just as they do here. In Russia or China they don't fail to talk about 'the workers'. They even have trade unions to defend their interests (they are fraudulent but never mind). We won't need trade unions under socialism to defend the interests of a working class because there won't be one. So if there is a class which hires itself out for wages in Russia, just like here, there must by definition be another class which does the employing. And pockets the profit. (There must be plenty of profit. The powers of production of Russian capitalism have been enormously increased while the share falling to the working class there is still only enough to provide 'a living'.) Unlike here, where most capitalists get their share of the swag from ownership of shares in the means of production, the ruling class in the so-called communist countries, where the state is the collective employer, get their share by owning and controlling the state. The beneficiaries are easily recognisable. The apparatchiks and the managers and the top politicians have swish limousines and country houses and members of the working class to act as servants to them. Just like here. And obviously it does not matter a damn to the workers who toil for a living wage how the surplus value that is thus extracted is dished out. In all countries the working class is exploited. That is what a working class is for.

Having used all that expensive space to set the capitalist scene (which should be unnecessary by now but unfortunately isn't), what, I would like to know, is the attitude of NS readers, particularly those who think they are socialists? Can you possibly imagine that it is feasible to reform capitalism, which exists only for profit, so as to have the kind of harmonious, abundant society which is there for the taking? It is clearly an attempt to square the circle. Anyway, if you think capitalism can be made into a decent society what's the point in pretending to be socialist? It is a matter of the utmost difficulty to convert people to socialism. Why should we socialists waste our strength in trying to do that if capitalism can be made to work in the interests of humanity? It would be sheer stupidity. But those people, like the Labour government, for example, who try to run capitalism and solicit support and votes for the purpose, are clearly conning you whenever they use the term socialism. They are capitalists to a man.

It happens that there is a party which does stand for socialism and has done so for sixty years. Oddly enough, in Great Britain, the only party which stands for socialism is the only one which calls itself the Socialist Party. But it believes that only by getting a majority of workers who understand and want socialism will it ever be attained. It will not catch votes by promising reforms of capitalism and pretending they are socialistic. In consequence it is still only a pathetic handful of less than a thousand members. But although this series of articles is by no means inserted by the Socialist Party, it is the point of view of the SPGB which I shall inevitably reflect in these comments.

And to conclude this long introduction, what is the alternative which most NS readers pursue? The answer - the sterile road of reformism - can perhaps be best illustrated by the autobiography of a quintessential New Statesman Man, Leonard Woolf, reviewed all over the place recently. He had it all: intelligent Jewish agnosticism, seems to have practically invented the League of Nations and Bloomsbury, married to a genius and both ardent Fabians. He spent the whole of an inordinately long life working for impossible 'socialist reforms' and at the end, as all the reviews pointed out, 'the world is just the same as if I had played pingpong'. It is a harsh realisation of the truth but it can be applied to all pseudo-socialists from Ramsay Mac to Harold Wilson, from Kingsley Martin to Paul Johnson. The message is that if you want to transform this jungle world, you must get down to understanding what socialism is really about. Otherwise, playing pingpong. It's a good game. And does not lead to disillusion at the end of the day.

### BIAFRA AND VIETNAM

Perhaps the question 'Who are the real socialists?' is always best answered by looking at the attitude of parties to the murderous wars which are more or less inseparable from capitalism. The pseudo-socialist Labour Party played an essential supporting role in the butcheries of the two world wars (not to mention Korea and numerous 'minor' slaughters). The pseudo-socialist Communist Party, formed after the first war, supported, opposed and supported again the second butchery in accordance with the requirements of Stalinism. No principled opposition to war has been shown except, as you should expect, by the Socialist Party.

Idiocies like 'naked ape' theories notwithstanding, the socialist contention that wars are fought for no high-flown ideals of freedom and democracy but simply for 'the economic needs of the capitalist ruling classes of the various countries, no longer excites derision. Even a conservative paper like the Spectator has John Wells discussing Wilson's rôle in the murderous Biafra horror in terms of oil and I.S.D. How any party calling itself human, let alone socialist, can supply arms and other support simply in order to force people in Biafra to remain inside Nigeria almost beggars belief. How the so-called left wing of the Labour Party can remain as essential support for a government which is simply an accomplice in the mass murder of children by that cruellest of deaths, starvation, likewise. And even a paper like the Guardian, friendly to the Government, can no longer refrain from pointing out the sheer brazen lies told by our government of alleged socialists and humanitarians in the House and outside in support of their grisly attitude. No Labour MP has gone into the wilderness rather than keep such a government in power. We even have arch-left wingers making it quite clear that their hands too are dripping with innocent blood. One wonders if they would feel the same about their party's policy if they themselves were among those who were being blockaded into death by starvation. It goes without saying that the Tories, having no less concern for oil and I.S.D., put up no sort of opposition. Indeed it sometimes looks as though Westminster is inhabited by one monstrous collective MP called Sir Alec Michael-Foot.

As for Vietnam, even the NS has recently described how, Pinkville or no Pinkville, the troops obediently followed their Leader into the lobby to register their support for the gallant Yankees, including such specimens as the monstrous regiment of women leffies, Castle, Hart, Lestor, Lee. Many leffies, it seems, voted 'for' even though they had themselves signed a motion condemning the American atrocities. But of course all wars are and must be atrocities. And socialists do not condemn one side in a Russell War Crimes Tribunal and scream support for Ho and his friends who are every bit as criminal. I expect to have something to say about his Lordship next time, so I will merely restate the socialist position, which is that capitalism causes wars with their inevitable atrocities and to attempt to stop wars while leaving the jungle of capitalism intact is worse than useless.

### 'KEEP THE OTHER SWINES OUT' OR 'LET THE TORIES GET ON WITH IT'?

The above quotes are from recent issues of the NS. The first is from a letter from a Labour supporter who clearly agrees with the criticisms of his government but is still going to vote for them next time. To think we are still at the stage when even articulate NS readers think that the only choice before humanity is between Tory swines and Labour swines. The contrary advice comes from the NS itself. If such and such is the case (as it certainly is) you might as well vote Tory. You might indeed. As both parties stand for capitalism, which in turn produces all the evils we see around us, what possible difference can it make whether the evil system is run by Smith or Jones, by Wilson or Heath? Come the election, I will certainly do my little best to rub Labour's nose in this NS advice (though by then the NS will doubtless change its tune).

L. E. WEIDBERG

ADVERTISEMENT

A series of advertisements by a small group who think socialism is the only answer to humanity's problems but that too few people know what it really is.

# A SOCIALIST ON THE SCENE

## BIAFRA. ANOTHER BLOODSTAINED PAGE IN BRITISH HISTORY

No apologies for returning to this subject. By next time you will no doubt have forgotten a million black corpses. Why did they all die? Why did our 'socialist' government provide the means (and the lies) to turn on this ocean of blood? The next paragraph gives an idea of the socialist case for the economic causes of war. If you feel like saying 'Socialist Standard claptrap', the third paragraph will be interesting.

British policy on Nigeria has been dominated all along by the balance of payments. This remains the Government's preoccupation, in spite of the plight of the last three million dying Biafrans. The financial stakes are much higher. This is why the government is so jittery about further blotting its copy-book in Lagos - where its influence is not so great as it hoped the continued sale of arms would buy. The cabinet has no intention of jeopardising the £350 millions investment in oil. They were determined to help prevent the splitting of Nigeria leaving rich pickings for her Francophone neighbours. The CBI, backed by the government, is looking for big business in the £1,200 millions rebuilding programme which Nigeria plans. London will need all the goodwill it can get in Lagos when the contracts and the terms of trade are being negotiated. Any idea of Britain seeking in this desperate hour to mobilise international support for an immediate life-saving airlift is out. It is perfectly legitimate for Britain to protect and enhance the balance of payments. We shall probably have forgotten the Biafran babies by Easter. It is instructive and distressing to examine what makes Britain tick.

Now. Every single word in that brutal indictment is taken from an article in a most respectable capitalist paper and friend of the government (*Guardian* 15 January). It could indeed go straight into the *Socialist Standard* - a rare accolade for a capitalist paper. Pity they had to have a nauseating report by Shrapnel a day or so later under the grisly heading: 'Wilson steals the Nigerian glory.' Yet such indeed is capitalist glory and always has been. Though even the blood-soaked history of British capitalism can hardly show a page to match this appalling, cynical tale: accessory to mass slaughter. After all, it was done in peace time. Calmly. In cold blood. And for all sorts of specious reasons except the one true one: *business is business*. I suppose that's what Crossman meant when he said that honourable men 'tell lies in politics' and it's all right. If you're still not convinced I'll draw it for you. Or rather Horner did, not long ago (he seems to exist on a separate plane from the rest of the NS. But at least they seem to give him a free hand to draw with). Wilson is shown asking Gowon's permission to help in the aftermath and says (I forget the exact words): 'My credentials for alleviating the suffering must be impeccable: I played my part in causing it.' History will take its revenge on our vicious 'socialist' government. Lord Hunt who complained of biased reporting when all the papers were full of horror pictures, and at a time when his beloved Gowon was refusing to allow Uli airfield to be used for the enormous mass of food on Sao Tome when thousands of his black brothers were starving even unto death, should know that not all the snows of Everest will whitewash his government's bloody hands. The Tories... too, of course. But then, they're supposed to be horrible. All in all, a murderous triumph for Sir Alec Michael-Foot.

Meanwhile, back in Africa, next to the horror pictures we get those of grinning Nigerian workers (how do I know they're workers? By their rotten clothes of course) holding a banner: 'Gowon 12; Ojukwu 0; Away!' Fine to have a sense of humour while your brothers are dying. They earned the same clown's hat that Healey was awarded. But white workers have been murdering each other cheerfully for centuries for their masters' balance of payments. No reason why blacks should be better. Meanwhile their humane rulers were commandeering the precious transport which might have saved a few thousand suffering children, to bring a shower of high society guests (not the workers of course) along with chefs and champagne and canapés to a posh wedding in Port Harcourt where two babies were dying of starvation in hospital. Where are those people who have been telling us that the central issue is not the class struggle but the colour struggle? Why, preaching the same poison, of course. Take more than a million black corpses to disturb their ideas. Suppose the Yanks had refused to allow available food to be brought to Uli, after all resistance had ceased (which makes it an even worse horror than Pinkville)? There would have been a human earthquake in Grosvenor Square before you could scream 'Genocide!' Isn't it murder when blacks kill blacks by deliberate starvation? Tariq, art thou listening there below? Don't get me wrong. The world won't be made fit for humanity by mobs of mindless students shouting slogans, whether it's 'Ban the Bomb!' or 'Apartheid Out!' or whatever. A rather more painful process is needed. Thinking. About this jungle set-up and how lunatic it is to expect harmony until it is cut down and replaced by a system of common ownership. Not only students of course. The task of emancipation must be the work of the working class itself - plumbers and professors, bricklayers and bank-managers. Leaders, even sincere ones (if that's not a contradiction in terms) can lead only to continued exploitation in peace and murder in war.

## SOUTH AFRICAN TYRANNY AND BRITISH HYPOCRISY

How fashions in pariahs change! Ever heard of Franco? Time was when the mere mention of his name would make leftists foam at the mouth. Yet now? Why, you can see posters in Madrid advertising the Red Army Choir performing for

the delectation of fascist Spain. No reason why not, of course, Moscow is far more fascist than Madrid. The current fashion is apartheid. It is now so much an obsession that the *Guardian* actually had a letter under the heading 'Hitler and Hess' dealing solely with apartheid! It's the story of the Jewish boy who, asked to do an essay on elephants came up with 'The Elephant and the Jewish Question'. Africans have been treated like dirt for centuries. But who cared a decade or two ago when Smuts was our glorious liberal ally? Certainly not Labour MPs (many still at Westminster) or liberal newspapers or prating prelates. But now? A hundred gallant Labour MPs (an' a', an' a') have threatened to sit on the pitch at Lord's if the Springboks come this summer. And not one of them with the guts to resign his seat in protest against his government's policy of doing all possible trade with these same white S. Africans. Not even one who soon won't have a seat to sit on. Once again the splendid Horner says more in one cartoon than I could say in a book. Remember Vorster holding a rugby ball marked 'Trade' and saying 'Anyone for rugby?' and Wilson and Heath and the rest of the pack trotting up to join his game? What would happen to MPs or long-haired students who attempted to disrupt not sport (which is a mere pin-prick to the S. African whites as long as their class hold on the wealth of the country is inviolate) but trade? Why don't the demonstrators, led by Soper, Huddleston and the rest, play the devil with the trade missions and the visiting S. African businessmen? Can it be because they know that Callaghan, after mouthing his pious platitudes about the evils of apartheid, would pretty soon have his police bang them on the head? How dare they tamper with our precious balance of trade?

The hypocrisy is sickening. Our 'socialist' government wouldn't lose a rand's worth of trade for all the Bantus in Africa. Their own glorious nationalised steel industry, for which the pseudo-socialist Nye Bevan lived and died, has actually bought a piece in S. African steel so that it can have a direct share in the exploitation of the blacks. And Alan Day, the LSE economist, stated in the *Observer* that there is hardly a company on the Stock Exchange which is not closely connected with S. Africa. To misquote Shylock: 'I will eat with you, drink with you and above all do business with you. But please - no cricket.' The attitude of the liberal press is as sickening as the government's. The *Guardian* says 'This show must not go on.' Then in the next breath it proudly announces that it is sending its own man to report the present tour of S. Africa by that other racistist lot, the Aussies; so that its bemused readers can enjoy the delights of games where blacks are often not even allowed in as spectators. Small wonder that their reporter John Arlott, after damning racistist tours at the Cambridge Union, when asked by a bright student if he would commentate on this summer's Tests, instead of replying with an indignant: 'How dare you suggest I might play such a part in a racistist tour?' replied 'Hypothetical question' just like any politician. And why the sudden realisation that apartheid exists? I have read reports of a dozen Springbok cricket and rugby tours over the years. Didn't the avant-Guardian know that they were whites-only till the current bandwagon started rolling?

A comrade whose advice I seek says I should not spend so much expensive space on this side-show. But of course the papers are full of it and to the youngsters it seems that stopping a racistist cricket tour is the key to the millennium. Let's get it right. Apartheid is one of the ugliest features of our jungle society. But only when people see that society straight, in its total nastiness, will there be any hope of eradicating this and all the other social evils inherent in a system of exploitation, which has always bred anti-semitism, colour prejudice and similar abominations. And always will. Till workers of all races and colours see that the only thing that counts is their common membership of an exploited class, the attempt to cure evils piecemeal is useless. And worse than useless. Because the myopic concentration on pieces of evil precludes the straight thinking that is needed to change society. No good can come from double standards, from humbug. Everyone knows that even in the fashionable field of race, it is humbug to praise Kenya for cancelling an MCC tour when they themselves are hounding their own browns out of homes and jobs let alone sport; to play Australia which exterminated most of its natives, treats the survivors worse than blacks, and erects 'Whites Only' signs at its doors; or Americans and Brazilians who have done likewise with their Indians; or Egyptians who imprison Jews; or Israelis who treat Arabs as second-class citizens; or Russians who commit virtual genocide against Tartars and Kalmuks. But of course the last example shows the idiocy of concentration on race. Because whatever the Soviets have done to their racial minorities (or to Hungarians or Czechs) is only in line with what they have done to the Russian workers themselves, millions of whom have been sacrificed in war and peace on the altar of Soviet capitalism. In short all capitalist states are tarred with the same brush. If you boycott S. African games, you must boycott all games. If you boycott S. African oranges you must boycott all food. *Reductio ad absurdum*. The sad truth remains that it is easier to demonstrate than to think about the way to build a new world - classless, frontierless and, inevitably, colour-blind. When all humans can partake to the full of all the fruits of social wealth, envy and greed will become merely obsolete words in the dictionary. Race prejudice will follow. A long road? That depends on how soon how many set out on it. Do you imagine you will ever get anywhere by running around in circles, which is all that piecemeal reformism amounts to?

L. E. WEIDBERG

## ADVERTISEMENT

A series of advertisements by a small group who think socialism is the only answer to humanity's problems but that too few people know what it really is.

# A SOCIALIST ON THE SCENE

## THE POVERTY OF PHILOSOPHY (RIP Atom-bomb Russell)

I know all about the *de mortuis* rule and I have nothing but contempt for people like Hochhuth and Tynan who, afraid to say boo to the living Churchill, were quick to dance on the grave of that enemy of the working class once he was safely beyond the protection of the libel laws. But I had said in my first ad. that I would be having a go at Russell without knowing he was going to die before I could do so and there has been such a torrent of idiotic praise showered on his coffin that it is worthwhile to state a few home truths and point a socialist moral.

Russell was lucky for nearly a century. He had it made from the start—high birth, wealth, great connexions (in all senses), brains, fame, you name it, he had it. Just one thing was denied him. In his time there wasn't a Marx around to prick the bubble of his reputation and thus preserve his name in history like Proudhon or Dushing or the other pignies whom Marx swept out of his path in historic pamphlets. So that, *pace* the assurances to the contrary in all the best papers (I haven't read the others; the best are bad enough for me) Russell's name will quickly vanish from the scene. I get no joy out of that. I know too well that there is never a shortage of equally unworthy successors (I went to a meeting in Hampstead recently, addressed by Paul Foot, and heard him denounce Labour in a way that made me wonder for a moment if he had joined the Socialist Party. He would not speak or write for Labour at the next election as he had done at the last. But he would vote for Labour and encourage others to do so—by animal grunts, presumably. And I had to report sorrowfully to my sons that though their old man might live till he has one Foot in the grave, there will always be other pseudos to plague them *ad infinitum ad nauseam*.)

What did Russell do with all his fame and influence over whole generations (especially of youth) many of whom might have been apt recruits for socialism? He led them up blind alleys so that at the end all was frustration and disillusion. He lived 97 years too long. For nearly 70 of those years he preached pacifism—pernicious nonsense in this jungle world of capitalism as he was to show in his second incarnation when in the 1940s he made nonsense of his whole first life by not only supporting war but actually advocating a preemptive strike against Moscow before the Russians got the nuclear bomb themselves. It is worth a moment to pause here to look at what the greatest organs of bourgeois culture had to say about this little detail which showed up the rottenness of Russell's whole life and philosophy. The *Guardian* gingerly touched on the subject by quoting a speech in the Lords in '47 which seemed to damn Russell as an A-bomb chucker; but, said the leader writer, 'the record is still in doubt'. It did not seem to occur to him that it was rather odd that the crystal clear mind they were praising so fulsomely should not be capable of making itself understood on a matter which would involve the deaths of millions of Russians (presumably the great philosopher knew that A-bombs killed human beings; or perhaps he was too busy philosophising to think of such details). Of course it simply wasn't true that the record was in doubt: it has been clear since 1948 when he said 'either we have a war against Russia before she has the atom bomb or we will have to lie down and let them govern us'. Sir Edward Boyle quoted the words in the *Telegraph*. In an obituary which described him as the greatest British philosopher of the century I can distinctly hear the students at Leeds reciting the new Boyle's Law under the benign gaze of the former Tory Education Minister 'Given constant temperature and pressure, the reputation of a philosopher varies in direct proportion to the enormity of his waddle'. Nigel Lawson in the *Spectator* had a most interesting piece describing the actual lecture where the fatal words were spoken. He quotes the pacifist sage as saying 'we must go for a quick kill now while we have the bomb and Russia hasn't'. And the paper subsequently printed a letter from the man who had actually organised Russell's meeting and who confirms the accuracy of Lawson's account.

The *Times* was even worse than the *Guardian*. An obit of nearly 5,000 words; a leading article; front page splash; and not a single word about this whole episode which cast such a lurid light on Russell's whole career. There was no evidence, they wrote me, that Russell had advocated an A-bomb on Russia. What? The *Daily Worker* nicknamed him Atom Bomb Russell and there was no evidence at all? Come now, old Thunder, even that red-fascist rag couldn't have dreamed the whole thing up (and in the twenty years that remained to Russell he never sued them or forced them to publish an apology—and he was by no means above suing when he thought he had been libelled). Then the *Times* pulled out its ace by sending me a copy of a letter (Nov. 30 '48) which 'we feel sure you will agree puts Lord Russell's view quite clearly'. How sad that we socialists are such pernickety bastards; we never seem to agree with anybody about anything (except when they are telling the truth—which, as I feel sure you will agree, the capitalist press seldom does). Actually Russell's attempted denial of a statement which was so widely reported really *does* make the position clear if only the *Times* could see it. I did not urge immediate war with Russia. I did urge that the democracies should be prepared (Russell's italics) to use every means in our power, not excluding military means... Notice how the sage avoided actually using the dreaded word A-bomb which he was lyingly denying he had used at the lecture. Did not the semantic genius see that 'every means in our power' was just a synonym for A-bomb? The fact is that as well as being an old loon, Russell was a shilly-shallier and a prevaricator. The *Guardian* forgot one or two other incidents in the great man's career which prove that; even though they were themselves involved. They had a leader once entitled 'Not Common Sense' in which they rightly gave him what for regarding his other famous remark 'Macmillan and Kennedy are worse than Hitler and Genghis Khan'. What did the heroic sage reply to the *Guardian*'s attack? Nothing. The heroic sage just ducked—like any slippery politician when he's caught out. And how about the incident when his henchman the Abominable Schoenman took the *Guardian* to the Press Council (where he got a deserved drubbing) in connection with the so-called Russell Peace Foundation's whitewashing of the appalling tyrant Nkrumah, at a time when his opponents were rotting and dying in Accra gaol?

Unsurprisingly, both these liberal papers, bastions of free speech and democracy, refused to publish a short letter pointing out that their obits. did not give a true impression. They would rather the lively minds and the top people remain un-

deceived. I think it is perhaps worth a digression here to refer to the socialist attitude to freedom of the press etc. As socialism can only be brought about by the conscious understanding of what is wrong with our present system and how to effect a revolutionary (which is not synonymous with bloody) change in the social order on the part of the majority of society (which in effect means the majority of the working class), it follows that freedom of written and spoken propaganda is a *sine qua non* for socialists. In Russia, for example, where the dictatorship of the red-fascist ruling class over the proletariat does not permit this essential freedom, there is no possibility of making real progress till the proletariat has first kicked out the tyrants. In this country we have managed to achieve, over the centuries, a reasonable freedom. This very page is one proof. A better one, of course, is the fact that the *Socialist Standard* has always propagated socialism for sixty years, even during world wars when, naturally, it was the only paper which denounced the appalling spectacle of workers slaughtering each other in their masters' quarrels. But of course this does not excuse the so-called liberal press which has almost always made sure that while there is no shortage of space for the various labour and communist pseudos, the real voice of socialism is seldom heard. The BBC is perhaps even more culpable as this public body has always insisted on preserving the conspiracy of silence. I was cynically amused to see on TV a few Sundays ago how a young member of the SPGB, a student at Hull, was able to put the socialist case quite brilliantly without mentioning the name of the party he was speaking for; for fear they would not do the recording. The remedy? A daily *Socialist Standard* with a mass circulation. But, sadly, not yet.

For socialists, Russell is a cautionary tale. The working class (including students) must do their own think and not fall into the fatal trap of being led by intellectuals and politicians. Had Russell used his gifts and his influence to spread socialist knowledge he could have made a real contribution to human progress. But you can't teach what you have never learned so after the pacifism and the bomb-throwing he had the nerve to lead the CND in the 'Ban the Bomb' campaign—a non-starter if ever there was one. He led a whole generation of marching, shouting, *unthinking* idealists, whose discontent might have been channelled towards socialism, into apathy and disillusion. A crime against humanity. And when he got tired of that he ditched them and teamed up with that other genius Sartre in denouncing American murder in Vietnam while praising the ho-ho-holliness of the equally murderous Ho. But, I can hear you say, you don't understand Russell's real claim to fame as a philosopher pure and simple (he had claim to the second attribute but I deny the first). You can say that again. I heroically ploughed through the whole of Ayer's piece in the NS (I reckon par for the course was two paras.) and I understood every word; but not a single sentence. Except where Sir Alf kept saying 'Russell later abandoned that theory.' The Lord giveth; the Lord taketh away; blessed be the name of Lord Russell. But I was intrigued with the Parable of the Liar and can suggest an extension for Sir Alpha to work on: Crossman said all politicians are liars. Crossman was telling the truth. Crossman is a politician. Big deal. What is all this philosophy for? To show Russells how to drop A-bombs? Or Ayers to head round-robins to the *Times* deploring the Greek fascists and yearning for a return to the regime which fought with us against Hitler? Yes, the regime of Metaxas, an even worse fascist than Papadop! In a previous ad. I said the working class comprised plumbers and professors. I can think of a plumber in the SPGB who, in the only discipline that counts, namely how to make this world fit for humans, could eat your Russells and your Ayers and spit out the Kaldors and the Baloghs. Socialists welcome intellectuals, of course; but *qua* comrades not *qua* leaders. We also have vacancies for a few million more plumbers, whose sole philosophy is: demolish capitalism, establish socialism. That is all we know and all we need to know. Workers of all kinds unite! You have nothing to use but your brains!

## "SOCIALISM IS ABOUT EQUALITY": true or false?

A correspondent says he has seen this slogan in the NS over the years from people like Strachey and Bevan and would the SPGB accept it as a definition of socialism? No. It is too woolly, can mean anything you like (as you would expect from these pseudos). Does it mean equal wages under socialism? Well, there won't be. Not equal, not unequal, not any. Rousseauesque nonsense like 'all men born equal'? It is obvious that there are not two 'equal' men anywhere. Anyway, what yard-stick do you use to measure an opera singer against a coalminer? We are satisfied with Marx's 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his need.' Under socialism, neither the ability nor the need will be measured. Capitalism is a bit like the music-hall Jewish wedding: there was plenty for everybody but you had to be quick. Socialism: just plenty for everybody. A full life for every human being on the planet. It really is as simple as that.

## NS STARTS THE GADARENE RUSH

In my first ad. in this series, I pointed out that the NS had made it clear that it didn't matter if you elected a Labour or a Tory govt. How nice to see the SPGB view confirmed by such high authority! But I added that, come the election, they would sing a different tune. And here I am, a few short weeks later and Paul Johnson's election run-up has started already. Labour can win! Suddenly it matters whether capitalism is run by Labour swine or Tory swine (the epithet, you may recall, is a Labour supporter's in the NS). If only Wilson will offer the workers a few more goodies, he can still con them for another five years. For sheer cynicism and contempt for the workers this is in the best tradition of the great Kingsley Martin. And worthy, too, of Bob Smellish, the 'Socialist Chief Whip' (now there's a contradiction in terms for you). 'The nuclear deterrent was the best thing ever invented... there are some people in my party who are unaware that we are in a general election year.' Possibly, dear NS reader, this cynical contempt could be all you deserve?

L. E. WEIDBERG

If you would like to see what a real socialist paper looks like you can get a sample *Socialist Standard* from BM—Box 123, London W.C.1.



ADVERTISEMENT

A series of advertisements by a small group who think socialism is the only answer to humanity's problems but that too few people know what it really is

# A SOCIALIST ON THE SCENE

## THE BRAVE LITTLE TAYLOR SLAYS THE GIANT SOCIALISM

It is clearly essential that I drop everything else and deal with the dreadful news that appeared in the *Observer* literary pages recently. If it is true, as was there reported by a famous historian and TV pundit, that socialism is dead, there is clearly no sense in wasting time and money on these adverts. I dare say we socialists are all sorts of idiots but we are not necrophiliacs.

I first came across the great AJP in 1948. I know that was the year because it was a centenary year and it seemed to me from a number of papers I read that 1848 had been invented specially to enable our hero to display his superior hindsight to Marx's and thus join the ever-growing band of giant killers who have succeeded in slaying the father of scientific socialism (which of course will not obviate the need for him to be slain again by other savants, whether avowedly capitalist or pseudo-socialist). I can now only recall one (albeit the first) of the causes of the revolutions of 1848 (which I had innocently thought Marx had made clear at the time) according to AJP. It seems that as there had been rather a long period since the end of the Napoleonic Wars, men were bored! I pictured the scene as the average Parisian worker arose on the fatal morning: 'Oh! Ma femme! L'ennui! C'est terrible! Aux barricades!' These historians are so divorced from history that they do not even understand that real workers have got plenty on their plates in order to do their work and keep their wives and kids in the lousy standard of living to which they are accustomed and don't go sacrificing their lives to stave off boredom. It's only historians who get bored (from reading the reviews of other historians). And they are not the ones who die on the barricades.

And now, a couple of decades after the slaughter of Marx, we are treated to an obituary book review of socialism. Needless to say, all members of the Socialist Party wept when they read the sad tidings. Dry those tears! Taylor fails to identify the corpse and it is soon obvious that he couldn't recognise socialism if he really fell over its dead body. He has got his foot on someone's neck all right. But it's all got nothing to do with socialism. We get breath-taking snippets like: 'the great French Revolution which Babeuf captured for socialism.' Did he now? Apart from the detail that, as every schoolboy knows, the Babeuf conspiracy never captured anything, being snuffed out in short order, there was no more possibility of the establishment of socialism in France then than in Russia in 1917. Socialism has two essential prerequisites—highly developed means of production and distribution so that all mankind can take 'according to their needs' and a class-conscious proletariat who understand the need for socialism and are determined to get it. The first prerequisite it is the task of capitalism to provide. Yes, capitalism is an essential link in the evolution of society. In the France and Russia of today, as in most other countries, it has now served its purpose and is ripe for replacement—when the second condition has been fulfilled. Of which, sadly, there is but little sign yet. In Babeuf's France, neither condition was fulfilled. Capitalism had barely started on its historic task of bringing up the means of production to the high level required. And as to an enlightened proletariat, why, for all practical purposes, there was hardly a proletariat at all. Capitalism hadn't yet produced that either. The bulk of the people were peasants. If Babeuf had gained power instead of the Directory (and subsequently, Napoleon) it would have made no difference to the fact that the French Revolution made France safe for capitalism and that any talk of socialism only displays the monumental ignorance of our would-be giant killer. Whatever it is Taylor thinks he has killed off, it isn't socialism. But at least it will not be possible for him to claim to be a socialist which is very much a step in the right direction. Once all pseudo-socialists are out of the way, there will be a chance for the genuine article to get a look-in. Meanwhile, let nobody be deceived into thinking that socialism is dead and thus dissuaded from lending a hand in the only cause which, in the modern world, is worthy of your support.

Before leaving our pundit, it may be worth while to look at one or two other gems in the same review (no space for them all). 'Shaw was a clearer-headed socialist than any... he had the most beautifully clear style of any English writer. Yet at the end it is impossible to be sure what he intended to say.' Isn't it bloody marvellous how all these intellectual giants follow the same pattern? Last month we saw how another crystal-clear intellect was able to leave people (or at any rate leader writers in the best papers) sprawling in doubt as to whether he advocated A-bombs on Moscow or not. But if Taylor thinks Shaw to be a great socialist, perhaps Mussolini was too? After all, it was Shaw who thought his invasion of Abyssinia (with the consequent slaughter of innocent natives—and innocent Italians) was a good thing. So did another socialist—nazional-socialist (shortened to Nazi). After all, plenty of nice people, like the Labour Party leader, George Lansbury, had nice things to say about Hitler. And then we have a little revealing reference to Lenin which should not pass unnoticed. 'He was a Marxist, even if he gave Marxism some unexpected twists.' Was he really? I should have thought that made Lenin a twister, not a Marxist. Of course, Taylor is as wrong about Lenin as about Marx. 'Socialism from above was imposed on Lenin by events, not an essential part of his doctrine.' Absolute rot! Lenin always made it perfectly clear that he regarded the working class as incapable of achieving socialism through their own understanding of what was involved. They were only capable of such awareness as would produce trade unionism. Wage-slavery forever. Only a vanguard of intellectual supermen (of which he himself would be chief superman, of course) could lead the working class to the promised land. And in his centenary year, we can see the dreadful mess into which the Leninist elite led them. He was diametrically opposed to the doctrine of Marx (a doctrine which has always formed one of the foundations of the Socialist Party): The emancipation of the working class must be the work of the working class itself. If Taylor is still in doubt about Lenin, he can read his *What is to be done?* If he finds that hard going (and it is indeed turgid stuff) he can read all about it in excellent articles (none by me) in this month's *Socialist Standard*. Above all, he will learn that Russia is state-capitalist, not socialist. It is a mark of some progress that more and more people are now realising this. But not Taylor, who goes out of his way in a later review to state that the Bolshevik revolution destroyed capitalism. Can it be a coincidence that in the adjoining column there was a publisher's blurb: 'A superb political thinker, the best of our age (A. J. P. Taylor, *Observer*).' Who, think you, was this idol of our socialism-slayer, this paragon of all the political virtues? Engels? Rosa Luxemburg? Beaverbrook? Two words will suffice to finish off this intellectual confusionist and pseudo-socialist. Oswald Mosley.

## WORKERS PLAYING AT CENSORS. A DANGEROUS GAME

A few weeks ago I happened to see in the *Sunday Times* a short report on a cricket match played by the Australians in S. Africa which had not appeared in the *Observer*. I was told that this was due to the attitude of the NUJ chapel at the *Observer* and subsequent reports appear to bear this out. Well, it is nice to know that in the great sea of working-class apathy there are little islands of concern and that some journalists are sorry for the lot of the Bantus in S. Africa. So I must take my hat off to these reporters for their heroic stand. But I fear a nagging doubt makes me soon put it on again. In the same issue, a couple of pages away from the part where the small sports

partake in the fruits of the exploitation of the Bantus. (Why not? Wilson's 'socialised Steel Board' does exactly that). Can journalists really believe that cricket is important and industry not? Why this swallowing of camels and straining at gnats? Perhaps there are some hypocrites among the heroes? Wouldn't it be more heroic to censor the news that boosts the vast trade between this country and S. Africa—to the great profit of the capitalists of both countries? It would certainly be more dangerous. Those unctuous hypocrites Wilson and Callaghan who have trumpeted to the world their refusal to watch this summer's Tests would soon show that 'Labour can govern' if long-haired students, lefty M.P.s, trendy bishops, or *Observer* journalists dared to interfere with what really matters to a government that administers capitalism—trade, profits and the precious balance of payments. Only a journalist like John Arlott can really believe that it is 'more tactically simple... to mount a trade embargo or picket S. Africa House' than to demonstrate at Lords'. If anyone tried to 'hound' (the demonstrators' favourite word) S. African businessmen who came to spend their filthy lucre here, Callaghan's cops would bang them on the head pretty sharpish.

So am I saying that journalists should do more censoring? Of course not. Censorship has always been the weapon of the rulers. Freedom of the press is one of the most valuable rights the rest of us have. It is, of course, severely circumscribed by the fact that most of the press (like most of everything else) is owned by the capitalist class who wield their power in their own interests and will always try to suppress anything that would really threaten their class position. It ill becomes journalists to set a new fashion in censorship that their bosses will certainly emulate as it suits them. Even the stupidest journalist should be able to see that if we are ever going to get a world free from race prejudice along with the thousand-and-one other abominations of capitalism, what we want is the fullest possible freedom of the press. Those who want to suppress are innocents who lead the way to totalitarianism. It is by no means without significance that the pro-suppression resolution at the NUJ conference should emanate from Paul Foot who, as I showed last time, wouldn't know a principle if he fell over one. (Incidentally, the thing is really being turned into farce when those great cricketing journals, *Private Eye* and, yes, the *Jewish Chronicle*, jump on the bandwagon of no-cricket-reporting). Where do these high-principled journalists who wish not merely to refrain from reporting themselves but to enforce a ban on their colleagues, imagine this rot will stop? If they abhor racial sport, what about all the other things they abhor? I presume they abhor the disingenuous speeches at annual conferences by Wilson and Heath and Grimond and Gollan. After all, nothing could be more abhorrent than to see these men persuading the working class into accepting their subject position from which flow all the evils of capitalist society. Why publicise their distortions? Why spoil the breakfasts of millions of readers with parliamentary reports (cf. Crossman's Dictum: All politicians are liars). What possible sense can there be in concentrating on one minute reform—the evil of whites-only cricket? It is almost as though they are trying to bring the whole idea of reformism to a *reductio ad absurdum*. Would that this was their motive! I suggest they should be well satisfied with the present position where a journalist can get paid all winter for writing articles damning the tour and then get paid all summer for describing the Detestable Tests in the same *Guardian*. Well, at least John Arlott will not comment on the radio though why he did so on all the other whites-only tours (and, so the BBC informed me, he had agreed to do so this time up to only a couple of weeks ago) is hard to fathom. But I agree that commenting is an even more integral part of the tour than reporting. As Arlott says, it is a matter of 'shared enjoyment'. I look forward to reading his shared detestation this summer! Meanwhile, it would be a good idea if journalists stopped playing the fool.

## LEADERS OF ALL LANDS—GET LOST!

It cannot be repeated too often that the Marxist dictum is vital: the establishment of socialism will be achieved not by leaders but by the working class itself—plumbers and professors, bricklayers and bankmanagers. Even a cabinet of Marxes could not hand society its emancipation on a silver plate. So what price the cabinets that the voters actually do elect to do their thinking for them? The question occurred on reading about cabinet minutes for 1939 now released under the 30-year rule (the sheep must not be allowed to listen in to the shepherds at the time when it matters, of course). The world was going up in flames. Millions were to die. Suffering incalculable. What were the great brains busy with behind closed doors at No. 10? It's worth finding space for one or two examples. What kind of birthday present to buy Hitler (who had already built concentration camps for Jews etc, and who had just swallowed up Austria and Czechoslovakia). What kind of curtsy, bow or scrape should be made to the President of France as compared to King George. Should the royal carriage stop at the cenotaph or 'walk past' (a 'massive file' on those two momentous items representing God knows how many hundreds of man-hours of super brain-power). And, right on the edge, how long an ultimatum for Hitler? In 1914 it was four hours. The FO now wanted not less than six. The French wanted 48. Next time round they should do like the HP companies: a white warning, then a red, then a solicitor's letter. I have no doubt that a letter from Lord Goodman would have stopped Hitler in his tracks. But when will it dawn on the working class that if the best brains can produce nothing better than a script worthy of those other Marxes? *Duck Soup*, it is time they decided on do-it-yourself.

## OTHER PAPERS PLEASE COPY!

There was a highly encouraging flood of enquiries in response to the last advert. It almost seems as though there are a lot of people who really are thirsty for socialist knowledge. They will get it from the *Socialist Standard* (and from the pamphlets dealing with special aspects like war, race, etc which are advertised there). One particularly interesting reply was a cable from New Delhi which arrived first thing in the morning of 23 March, three days after publication date in London—a tribute not only to the influence of this journal but to the powers of communication that capitalism has developed. One day the working class which performs all this clever stuff for the class which rules over them in all countries from Cuba to China via red-fascist Russia and fake-socialist Britain, will wake up to the fact that it would be cleverer to do it all for themselves and thereby emancipate the whole of mankind. The cable was from *Shankar's Weekly* (which I don't claim to have heard of but which the High Commission here says is about the equivalent of *Punch* and has a five-figure circulation) and they wanted permission to reprint the page gratis. Needless to say, this was not withheld. There is no desire to restrict the spread of socialist knowledge by copyright or any other means and if the *New York Times* or *Frankfurter Zeitung* (not to speak of the *Observer* or the *Guardian*) wish to reproduce the *Socialist Standard* each month, in whole or in part, they can not only do it gratis but can expect that the future society will one day raise a statue to their memory. I am aware that miracles take longer. Till then, all power to *Shankar's Weekly*!

L. E. WEIDBERG

If you would like to see what a real socialist paper looks like you can get a sample