

# SOCIALIST DIARY

## Charles Bennett

Dr C. M. Bennett replaced in May this year Mr W. E. Rowling as President of the New Zealand Labour Party, affiliated to the Socialist International. Dr Bennett was appointed New Zealand High Commissioner in Malaysia during the period 1959-63 and was the first Maori diplomat selected to represent New Zealand. The Malayan Government awarded him an honorary knighthood in recognition of his services. Dr Bennett has pledged to do his utmost to ensure the progress and prosperity of the Labour Party and to uphold the high standards set by his predecessor.

## Human Rights

Social Democrats, USA, the Socialist International's member in the United States, established in August two new committees: the Ad Hoc Committee for Intellectual Freedom, to fight for the rights of Solzhenitsyn and other dissident intellectuals; and the Committee for Détente with Freedom, to press for human rights issues to be considered in the context of East-West negotiations. Both of these committees are sponsored by leading US intellectuals, trade unionists, and civil rights figures.

## Solidarity with Chile

The International Conference of Solidarity for the People of Chile was held in Helsinki from 29-30 September. Representatives from the following parties and associated organisation of the Socialist International took part: the Australian Labor Party, Radical Party of Chile, Finnish Social Democratic Party, French Socialist Party, Italian Socialist Party, Japan Socialist Party, Swedish Social Democratic Party and the International Union of Socialist Youth. The aim of the decisions and recommendations of the Conference is to create the broadest possible international solidarity movement in solidarity with the Chilean people. For this reason, the Conference decided to recommend that every country-taking into consideration their circumstances, conditions and possibilities—should establish large, united and active nation-

al committees of Solidarity with Chile. The Conference also considered that it was important to establish an International Committee of Liaison open to all organisations, to coordinate and stimulate the implementation of actions recommended by the Conference. The Conference proposed that the Finnish Sponsoring Committee should act as temporary coordinating group for this purpose.

## Ryosaku Sasaki

The Japan Democratic Socialist Party, one of the two parties in Japan affiliated to the Socialist International, appointed Saburo Tsukamoto as acting Secretary-General of the party on 7 October. Ryosaku Sasaki resigned as Secretary-General on 5 October for health reasons. Tsukamoto will serve as acting Secretary-General until a party convention to be held next January.

## Ben Gurion

The Chairman and General Secretary of the Socialist International sent the following message to Aharon Yadlin, General Secretary of the Israel Labour Party on hearing of the death of David Ben Gurion on 1 December: 'The Socialist International sends sincerest condolences and wishes to express its deep sorrow on the death of David Ben Gurion, Israel's great leader and first Prime Minister. Ben Gurion's fight for peace and the State of Israel's right to exist, is a legacy treasured by all Israelis.'

## Mission to Greece

The Bureau of the Socialist International meeting in London on 9 December, decided to send a fact-finding mission to Greece to make an on-the-spot assessment of the situation there in the wake of the second coup d'état. Antonio Cariglia, Parliamentary leader of the Italian Social Democratic Party, was chosen to lead the group including representatives of other European member parties.

Printed at the Shenvale Press, London and Harlow

## Norway's Government

The new Norwegian Government, led by Trygve Bratteli, a Vice Chairman of the Socialist International, was announced on 14 October. The fifteen-member cabinet has a strong European outlook with Foreign Minister, Mr Knut Frydenlund having been Norway's permanent representative to the Council of Europe, and Mr Jens Evensen, now Minister of Trade and Shipping, as Norway's former chief negotiator in the talks for the trade agreement with the EEC which was concluded last May. The new cabinet also includes three women members whose responsibilities are Church Affairs and Education, Transport, and Social Affairs.

## Visit to Romania

The General Secretary of the Socialist International, Hans Janitschek, visited Romania from 16-22 November at the invitation of the Romanian Government. During his visit the General Secretary met Nicolae Ceausescu, President of Romania and General Secretary of the Communist Party and other leading personalities as well as journalists, writers and university professors. The visit was the first by a General Secretary of the Socialist International to a communist-ruled country.

## Juan Bosch

Juan Bosch, President of the Dominican Republic in 1963 and founder of the Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD) in 1939, resigned as leader of the PRD on 20 November. Professor Bosch, who was overthrown by the army in 1963 said that he and other leaders of the party who quit with him were forming a new group, the Dominican Liberation Party, which would try to unite the opposition against President Balaguer and his right-wing government. The Socialist International has not only maintained close ties with the PRD, through PRD representation at Socialist International meetings, but has given its full support to the PRD when it has been faced with persecution from the Balaguer regime.

# SOCIALIST AFFAIRS

NOVEMBER-DECEMBER 1973 SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION VOL. XXIII NO. 6

## The Labour and Socialist International

## Social Democracy and the Trade Unions

## Social Democracy and the Liberals

## Social Democracy and Fascism

## Party Leaders' Conference

## Social Democracy and the Third World

## Elections • Book Reviews • Socialist Diary

### EDITORIAL

# Forward Comrades

Despite serious setbacks the Socialist International emerges stronger than ever at the turn of the year. There was the tragedy in Chile and, recently, defeat in Denmark, but following electoral victory in Venezuela twenty-two parties of the Socialist International will be in government and there are good prospects for further advance next year.

In Western Europe more people are living under Social Democratic Prime Ministers or Governments in which Social Democrats play a leading part than under any other kind of Government. Altogether fourteen parties of the

Socialist International are at present in government in Europe. Outside Europe there are eight Social Democratic Governments.

All over the world today approximately 250 million people have governments led or shared by Social Democrats.

With its fifty-six parties having at present over 14 million individual members and the voting support of over 78 million, the Socialist International represents the strongest international political force in the world of today.

HJ

NOVEMBER/DECEMBER

q 329.153 (05) 5015

## SOCIALIST AFFAIRS

Vol.23 No.6  
November-December 1973

- Forward Comrades page 95
- The Labour and Socialist International page 96
- Latin America's Trade Unions page 99
- The Liberals have no Answer page 100
- The Socialist International in Chile page 102
- Oppression in Malaysia page 104
- Murder in Nepal page 105
- Conferences page 106
- Elections page 108
- Book Reviews page 109
- Socialist Diary page 110

**SOCIALIST AFFAIRS** covers the policies and progress of democratic socialist parties throughout the world.

Published by the Socialist International, 88a St. John's Wood High Street, London NW8 SJ7.

Tel: 01-586 1103, Telex 261735  
Cables: INTESOCON, LONDON

Editorial Committee: Gino Bianco, Giampiero Rolandi, Israel Gat, Tom McNally, Carlos Parra, Hans Janitschek (Editor)  
Indian Correspondent: M. S. Hoda  
Editorial Assistant: Caroline Soper

Per annum rates:  
Ordinary subscription £4  
(socialist party member £3)  
Payment by sterling or dollars  
USA & Canada \$12 (\$8);  
cheque, postal order or  
international money order—  
payable to 'Socialist International Publications'.

Signed articles in SOCIALIST AFFAIRS do not necessarily represent the views of the Editorial Committee.

## THE LABOUR AND SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

### In Search of Peace

*Between the Wars, the International played a leading part in forming world thinking about international affairs. What follows is a brief account of the contributions made by leading Socialists in those years.*

I start with a conversation which I had with Arthur Henderson early in the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. Henderson had come to Paris to enquire into the plans being made for a League of Nations. He had been a friend of my father's in the House of Commons; I was, under Robert Cecil, the Head of the League of Nations Section in the British Delegation; I was also one of the Joint Secretaries of the Conference Commission which was then drafting the Covenant of the League. It was natural, therefore, that he should ask me to come to see him and tell him what was going on. With Cecil's warm approval, I told him about the draft documents which had been prepared and exchanged; about the Commission's debates, the difficulties that had arisen and the prospects for ultimate agreement. I told him that Cecil, Smuts and Woodrow Wilson were all insisting that general disarmament would be an absolute condition of the League's success, and that Cecil, and other members, were pressing strongly for a Permanent Court of International Justice with wide powers of jurisdiction. I quoted Smuts' dictum: 'We don't want a League that is a fifth wheel to the diplomatic coach', and the strong feeling that the secrecy and power-politics of 'the old diplomacy' must be ended.

I remember how Henderson wound up our conversation. In substance, he said this: 'I'm glad the League Commission is making serious progress; I agree with all you've told me of the views of Cecil, Smuts and Wilson. We've had enough of the "old diplomacy". War is the great problem of this century; until it has been abolished, nothing else will matter very much. Disarmament and a Court of International Justice are the way. If the League ever gets on its feet, the Labour Party will give it their warm support, and so will Socialists in other countries.' To me, this was an uplifting ending to our talk.

In the following years, Henderson and his fellow Socialists at home and abroad, lived up to what he said in 1919. He, himself, in office as a Senior Minister of the British Crown, or in opposition, founded his whole policy on the League, Mussolini fought back. He bought the silence of Poincaré's France, and of

on the loyal application of the Covenant, on Article 8 of the Covenant, by which its Members had undertaken to disarm. He knew very well—none better—the great strength of the forces of militarism, and not least, their power to obstruct and to delay. He led the Socialists of the International in meeting their challenge head-on; among them, they helped to write some notable chapters of history.

#### The League Tested

The first great test of the League came in 1923. Mussolini, not long established as the Fascist dictator of Italy, seized an excuse to occupy the Greek island of Corfu. He started building air-fields, and made it plain that Corfu was to be the first jewel in the 'new Roman Empire' which he had resolved to create. By chance, the League Assembly gathered in Geneva on the very day the Fascist troops were landing in Corfu. Greece, immediately, put the matter on the Agenda of the Council, which was to meet that afternoon. Geneva seethed with excitement. Everyone knew that, if Mussolini kept Corfu, the blow to the League might well be mortal. What should, what could, the Council do?

When it met, the first to break the tense silence was Paul Hymans, the Foreign Minister of Belgium. Hymans' legal adviser was Henri Rolin, already a great international lawyer—later the first Socialist President of the Belgian Senate. On Rolin's advice, Hymans declared that the Council must uphold the law upon which 'a new international order' had been founded—a new international order 'in which we have placed great hopes'. Rolin firmly established, in the opening speech, the basic issue that was at stake—a Fascist triumph would destroy the 'rule of law'.

Branting, the Socialist Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Sweden, followed Hymans. Branting was an imposing figure; his deliberate, almost hesitating English, gave great weight to every word he said; his firm support of Hymans, and his firm demand that the Fascist soldiers must evacuate Corfu, made a deep impression.

Mussolini fought back. He bought the silence of Poincaré's France, and of

Japan. The debate spread to the Assembly; Robert Cecil took a strong line for Britain; Nansen of Norway was indefatigable in holding the Delegations firm; as the weeks went by, the weight and unanimity of world opinion became harder and harder for Mussolini to resist. Before the Assembly ended, every Fascist soldier was out of Corfu, and the law of the Covenant was intact. Venizelos called it the greatest achievement of the League.

But, at the next Assembly—the Fifth in 1924—there was a general feeling that the Covenant must be strengthened against the risk of war. Again, Socialists were in the lead. The General Debate was opened by Ramsay MacDonald, the British Labour Prime Minister, and Edouard Herriot, Prime Minister of France. After a week's debate, in which many nations took part, MacDonald and Herriot presented a joint Resolution which became the mandate for the Committees which drafted the Geneva Protocol.

#### The Protocol

After this notably successful week's work, MacDonald left Geneva, and put Arthur Henderson in charge of the British Delegation. Henderson was also very much in charge of the work of the Assembly. Under his impulsion, with important help from Henri Rolin and others, the Protocol rapidly took shape.

Its authors had three main purposes in view: the compulsory arbitration of disputes; the drastic all-round reduction of armaments and collective security for states which had disarmed against any aggressor who might disturb the peace. In pursuit of compulsory arbitration, it proposed that all the signatory powers should accept, without reservation, the Optional Clause of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, which gave the Court obligatory jurisdiction, in any case, which the Court decided could be dealt with by law.

For collective security, there was provision that a permanent scheme of economic sanctions should be worked out by the League Secretariat. It was to be submitted to the Disarmament Conference, which was to meet within a short period of time. The Protocol was unanimously and rapturously received, and adopted, by the Assembly; most Members of the Assembly believed the Protocol might be the decisive act by which war and armaments could be ended. Christian Lange, the father of Halvard Lange, said in the final debate, 'This is the golden hour of opportunity; it must not be lost.'

Alas, it was lost. A month later, Ramsay MacDonald, utterly exhausted by the physical and mental strain of office, allowed his Government to be defeated in the House of Commons on a matter of third-rate importance; in the ensuing election, the Tories came to power, and they lost no time in killing the Protocol. They had two substantive reasons: they were against acceptance of the Optional Clause; and they would not guarantee the frontiers of Poland. Within fifteen years, they were to look very foolish over both.

#### Germany Admitted

The outstanding event of 1926 was the admission of Germany to the League. It was not an easy passage. A special Assembly was summoned for the purpose in the Spring. Everyone agreed that Germany, as a great power of the European Concert of pre-war days, must be given a permanent seat in the Council. But, unanimity in the Council was required, and Spain, Poland and Brazil tried to blackmail the Council into giving them permanent seats as well. This aroused general resentment, and Sir Austen Chamberlain incurred great unpopularity when, in a series of private unofficial meetings ('Hotel bedroom diplomacy', Geneva called it), he tried to reach agreement by yielding to Spain and Poland's demand.

This was generally regarded as a sacrifice of principle, and as a dangerous precedent. A new Swedish Foreign Minister, the Socialist Unden, who had replaced Branting when Branting died, took the lead in opposing Chamberlain's plan. He had warm support, and not only in Geneva; British opinion was so much against Chamberlain that, on the crucial days, the London evening papers brought out mid-day editions with banner headlines: 'Unden stands firm'.

Unden killed Chamberlain's plan; the Assembly broke up without a decision, referring the problem to a special Commission with Robert Cecil in the Chair. Cecil found an acceptable compromise, doing it all in public debate. Unden's courage gave him a special position in world affairs; it helped to build the personal authority and prestige which enabled him to stop Sweden 'going nuclear' after 1945.

Arthur Henderson had another notable success in 1929. Once more in office, this time as Foreign Secretary, he secured the acceptance of the Optional Clause, not by Britain alone, but by Britain and all the other Members of the British Commonwealth—Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Eire, and India. Some other countries joined

them in the special Signature Ceremony in Geneva during the Assembly. When Henderson asked the House of Commons to ratify British acceptance of the obligatory jurisdiction of the International Court, the Tories did not even venture to vote against it; they knew that British public opinion was overwhelmingly on Henderson's side.

In 1930, Henderson obtained something to which he attached even more importance: he induced the Council of the League, after ten years' procrastination, to fix the date for the Disarmament Conference which the Covenant required. The date for the Disarmament Conference was 6 February 1932. The Council not only fixed the date, they also invited Henderson to be its President.

#### The Fourth Congress

In 1931, the LSI held the fourth—the greatest of its Congresses between the Wars. It met in Vienna in July. I have a vivid memory of visiting, with Leon Blum, the houses, the schools, the crèches for children, the parks, swimming pools and playgrounds constructed as 'unemployment works' by the Socialist City Council of Vienna. Their work had won them world renown; I remember Blum saying: 'It's a dream, a Socialist dream, come true.'

I have a less vivid personal memory. Arthur Henderson was in office, and so could not go to the Congress. He sent me instead, with instructions to make a speech in favour of disarmament, as strongly phrased as I desired. The whole Press of Europe knew that the voice was his and not mine; the publicity it received, put disarmament very firmly on the international agenda.

If Henderson had still been Foreign Secretary when the Conference met, he would have been in a position greatly to influence its outcome. Robert Cecil would have been the British delegate—that, in itself, would have much increased the chances of success. It was not to be. As in 1924, with the Geneva Protocol, Ramsay MacDonald brought down his Government just when it had the opportunity for epoch-making international achievement in its hands. In September 1931, with the Conference close at hand, he dismissed nearly all his Labour colleagues, and with a handful of them, formed the so-called 'National' Government—a Coalition with Tories and Liberals which boded no good for Disarmament and The League.

Yet, Henderson so contrived that the Conference came close to full success. He persuaded the 'Bureau' of the Conference—not all were very

willing—to give the first day of its Session to hearing the spokesmen of the Non-Governmental Organisations which had been for Disarmament. The spokesmen were a formidable array. Vandervelde, then President of the LSI with its thirty-eight million members; Jouhaux, the leader of the International Federation of Trade Unions, with forty million; a Finn, President of The International Co-operative Alliance, with eighty-five million families; a lady from Brazil, speaking for four hundred million organised Roman Catholic women; the Churches; the Women's Organisations, acting in close unity; and Lord Robert Cecil, President of the International Federation of League of Nations Societies. Cecil was asked by his colleagues to put forward the practical plan for Disarmament on which all the Organisations had agreed.

#### Disarmament Planned

The plan was simple: to proceed, by stages, to carry out for all nations, the kind of Disarmament which Part V of the Treaty of Versailles had imposed on Germany in 1919. Part V had disarmed Germany with the purpose, proclaimed in the text, of rendering her incapable of aggressive war; it had, accordingly, limited her manpower to the number required for maintaining internal order and policing her frontiers; and, much more important, it had forbidden her to have any weapons of the categories which experiences in the First World War had shown to help offensive operations against defence.

Tanks and other armoured vehicles; heavy mobile guns of over 105 mm calibre; poison gases; all military aircraft of any kind—Germany was forbidden to organise an Air Force; Naval Aircraft Carriers, submarines; surface vessels of more than 10,000 tons displacement.

Cecil Vandervelde, Jouhaux argued that, if these offensive weapons were generally abolished, as Part V of the Treaty of Versailles had promised, the danger of aggressive war would be enormously reduced; the strength of national defence enormously increased. This argument in law, in morality, and in terms of military 'realism', was so compelling, that it converted many delegations. It was constantly referred to in the opening general debate; Sir John Simon, MacDonald's 'National Government' Foreign Secretary, called it 'qualitative disarmament', and early in the Conference, moved a Resolution which was adopted, and which endorsed the concept. In prolonged technical debates in the Conference Commissions,

in which many Army, Navy and Air Force officers took part, it was decided that the *offensive* weapons were precisely those which Germany had been forbidden to have.

In June 1932, President Hoover of the United States put forward a plan for drastic, all-round disarmament, based on the 'qualitative' principle. The plan had an immediate and resounding success in the Conference. It did not give Germany the full and immediate equality for which its delegates had been asking; but, nevertheless, the spokesman of the Weimar Republic gave it unreserved support. So did Litvinov for the Soviet Union, the delegates of the Commonwealth countries, of Scandinavia, and, indeed, of all the 'middle' and smaller powers. Only Britain held back—with France and Japan waiting for what Britain would decide to say. After a fortnight, Simon, in violation of his own convictions, put forward a rival plan, which meant no effective disarmament at all. The Conference quickly killed this British plan; but British opposition—Britain was then the greatest military power in all the continents—killed the Hoover plan.

#### Second thoughts from Britain

Nine months later, Britain had second thoughts, and put forward a new British plan which, in June 1932, might have succeeded. But, by then—March 1933—it was too late; Hitler had been two months in power. So, the Conference was allowed to end in disintegration and defeat. Someday, Disarmament will be carried through. When it is, the men who do it will read what Vandervelde and Jouhaux said in 1932; they will study the careful Commission work of the Socialists who were there—Senator Louis de Brouckere of Belgium, Sandler of Sweden, Grumbach of France, and of Henderson himself. They will find virtually everything that is required to make a treaty of general and complete disarmament today.

But, the failure of 1932 proved fatal then. It was, as Henderson predicted, the true beginning of the Second World War. The military-industrial complexes, the vested interests, had carried out a furious campaign against the Conference. They reaped a rich reward; the arms race, after a fourteen-year pause, began again with a momentum never known before.

Against all national expectation, there was a second chance to save the League. When Mussolini invaded Abyssinia in 1935, world opinion rose against him; the League with vigorous Socialist leadership and support, had

## Contributors

PHILIP NOEL-BAKER, former member of two British Labour governments, former MP and winner of Nobel Peace Prize, was closely associated with Arthur Henderson, who was elected as first president of the Labour and Socialist International when it was founded in 1923, fifty years ago.

CHRIS JECCHINIS, a Greek socialist and trade unionist in exile, is presently Associate Professor, Department of Economics at Lakehead University, Ontario, Canada.

PAUL DERRICK is a senior official of the International Cooperative Alliance based in London and a frequent contributor to British labour journals on political, trade union and cooperative matters.

MOHAMED S. HODA, director of the aviation section of the International Transport Workers' Federation, is the European representative of the Indian Socialist Party.

JOHN FERNANDEZ is European representative of the Democratic Action Party of Malaysia.

G. G. PARIKH is editor of *Janata*, the weekly journal of the Indian Socialist Party.

ALAN J. DAY, former editor of *SOCIALIST AFFAIRS*, is a member of the Editorial team of Keesings Publications Ltd.

HOMI KATRAK is senior lecturer in Economics at the University of Surrey.

brought to life what the international lawyers called 'the juristic conscience of mankind'. Everywhere, Socialists called for action to halt the aggression, and uphold the League. Henderson, by dying; his last words were: 'I suppose the pocket Napoleon is in Abyssinia by now.' But, the British Labour Party Annual Conference was loyal to his stand; it voted for sanctions against Mussolini, including *military* sanctions, if required, by a majority of 95.4 per cent.

Again, the militarists, the appeasers, the advocates of power-politics, who childishly believed that they could win Mussolini as an ally against Hitler, won their victory. They ensured that the

Second World War would be long and bloody. I remember, with pride, that Emile Vandervelde said to me at a meeting of the LSI in 1938: 'The stand of the Labour Party for the League is the greatest moral fact in world affairs today.'

#### The Socialist Ideal

The Socialists, of whom I've written, were fine men, renowned for their integrity, splendid debaters, and in their day, great orators. Between the Wars, they stood for a Socialist philosophy applied to world affairs: The demilitarisation of society; the firm

establishment of the rule of law; a conviction that the true interests of all nations, are common interests, which they can only promote by common action. They were beaten in the end by the 'realists' who thought that only armaments make nations safe and great. The Second World War was the result.

Someday, politicians, and even historians, may recognise that only true peace can save mankind. If that ever happens, the record of the International between the Wars, will shine in letters of gold across the pages of our century's history.

Philip Noel-Baker

## SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND THE TRADE UNIONS

## Trade Unions in Latin America

The trade unions in Latin America as a whole, have not been able to contribute effectively to any substantial improvement of the wage earners' standards of living in the region because of their inherent weaknesses. Partly because of this, there are great disparities in income distribution, and the majority of wage earners receive low wages and work and live in unsatisfactory conditions. Some trade unions in certain more industrially advanced countries, such as Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Venezuela, have managed to acquire considerable influence and power, but only during periods of extraordinarily favourable political conditions, when they had the support and encouragement of established political parties and governments. Such support, however, has in the long run contributed also to the serious weaknesses of the trade unions, because the kind of support and encouragement they have received has never been divorced from the desire of political parties and demagogic political leaders to manipulate and exploit the trade unions.

It has never been therefore, a case of real partnership of the kind we have experienced in Europe between the trade unions and the social democratic or labour parties. In fact trade unions in Latin America played but a small part in the enactment of labour and social legislation. The moderate social reforms achieved were imposed from above by the political establishment and a few political or military leaders who have played the part of benefactors and patrons of the working class. The moderate gifts, however, of their social and labour legislation were initiated by

the direct and indirect controls which accompanied them, and which in the long run worked against the independence and effectiveness of the trade unions. There are, however, also a number of other important factors which have contributed to the overall ineffectiveness of trade unions in the region.

#### Weaknesses and Isolation

Another important contributory factor to the ineffectiveness of the Latin American labour movements can be found in the inherent structural and organisational weaknesses of the trade unions. These weaknesses are the result of the socio-economic, geographical, as well as political conditions of Latin America. These conditions in turn make out for local rather than national collective bargaining, and so invest the trade union organisations with a regional rather than a national character of strong industrial unions. In a number of countries in South America, the existence of national federations (or national unions) still leaves the local or regional organisations the more directly active bodies. The State laws, perhaps recognising the prevailing socio-economic and geographical conditions, encourage local and individual collective agreements, but the widespread use of this system has been supported and maintained by political leaders and public authorities who find it easier to control local disputes and small local trade unions than industry-wide action by national unions.

The geographical and geological peculiarities of Latin America have undoubtedly contributed to the con-

siderable isolation of certain regions and the consequent development of regional trade union structures. High and rugged mountain ranges, deep canyons, wide rivers, and thick jungles, separate one region from another much more sharply than in Europe or North America. The lack of sufficient communications and transport have further effectively isolated the various regions which in some cases have become states within a state. The people of these regions adhere far more to local than to national institutions and to their own local, social and cultural traditions and habits. Their economies too, have developed on a regional basis with their industries and products varying accordingly both in output and type. For instance, 80 per cent of a certain industry, with all its major trade unions, may be concentrated in a single region, while the remaining 20 per cent is scattered over all the other regions in small establishments, with only a small number of local unions which seldom have more than a hundred members each. These disparate local conditions and costs of living in the various regions not infrequently cause a corresponding discrepancy of interests among the workers of one and the same industry or trade, which results in chaotic wage differentials and a confused and weak trade union movement.

#### Public Regulation

The wage scales or minimum wage rates contained in most collective agreements in the region—with a few exceptions—are fixed by the governments which also, either by direct regulation or by compulsory procedure, intervene in the establishment of working conditions; and in some occupations, where the trade unions or the employers' organisations are weak or non-existent, determine such matters directly without trade union consultation or participation. So, in fact, the State in these countries controls and directs industrial relations, for while some local collective bargaining is encouraged, it is by the State that wages and working conditions are ultimately determined.

The system of regulating almost all wages and working conditions by the government is in many cases unsatisfactory, but it is favoured strongly by the traditional political parties which have thus managed, through this system, to control not only wage determination but the trade union movement as well. In spite of this control, however, Latin American governments find themselves sometimes in serious trouble when a militant trade union goes on strike and disrupts the economy. In such occasions

peaceful settlement is very difficult to achieve, because in almost all Latin American countries there is a lack of adequate machinery for joint consultation or conciliation and arbitration. When there is a serious industrial conflict, governments often intervene dictatorially and violently, sometimes with disastrous political and economic consequences.

#### Influence and Intervention

Foreign economic interests and political ideologies have confused further the trade union situation. Foreign, and especially United States, investment has always been very high in public utilities and basic industries in Latin America. Foreign companies have contributed to the development of some important sectors of the Latin American economies but, as their policy was based on quick and large returns, one of their major objectives has been the maintenance of cheap labour markets. Towards that end, therefore, they have supported, along with native commercial and industrial business interests and the big estate owners, dictatorial regimes which could maintain order, low wages, and low direct taxes. The policies of most dictators in Latin America have been anti-labour, with the exception of Getulio Vargas in Brazil and Juan Peron in Argentina. They both introduced progressive social legislation and adopted policies which encouraged high money wages. Irrespective of the inflationary effects that these policies have had on the economy of these countries, the workers have never forgotten the gesture of interest. This explains perhaps why the Labour Party of Vargas remained very popular in Brazil long after his death, and why ex-Dictator Peron is still adored by the masses in Argentina.

Foreign influences, however, have not always been one-sided. Marxist and non-Marxist revolutionary movements in Latin America can be traced to European influences. It was in Europe after all, that the workers' organisations developed close relationships with socialist revolutionary or socialist reformist political parties, including the more moderate social Christians. Trade unions in Bolivia joined the MNR and took part in the revolution of 1952. In Peru, trade unions joined the reformist revolutionary party of APRA, and in Mexico the trade unions joined PRI, the party of the Mexican reformist revolution. The trade unions in Cuba were not part of Castro's war against Batista, but they joined the revolution *afterwards*—just as did the communist party. In Chile and Uruguay, left wing socialist

and communist-dominated unions have joined the 'popular fronts' in both of these countries. And the Christian trade unions have joined forces with Christian democratic parties or related political movements in the region.

#### Foreign Influence Established

In the 1950s and early 1960s, when Latin America experienced strong political upheavals, foreign influences in the trade union movement took four concrete forms. The first, under the communists and their allies formed CTAL (Latin-American Confederation of Labour), which was influenced and related to WFTU; the second, under the reformists who with the help and participation of the North American unions formed ORIT, which is affiliated to ICFTU; the third, under the Christian democrats who formed CLASC (Confederation of Latin American Christian Trade Unions), which is affiliated to the International Confederation of Christian Trade Unions; and the fourth, the big independent trade unions, which refused to join any of the three organisations. In the fourth category were the strong Peronist federations of Argentina and the miners' unions of Bolivia, as well as some important industrial trade unions in Brazil.

In the last few years, however, a combination of factors (which include the deterioration of socio-economic conditions, a change of American policies in the region since President Kennedy's death, and the polarisation of political forces between the extreme left and the extreme right), has contributed to the considerable weakening of ORIT and CLASC, and the strengthening of marxist oriented unions as well as the strengthening of the Peronist unions. ORIT has been suffering from the lack of adequate funds and from diminishing popular support and prestige. Accusations of AFL-CIO interference and control are hindering the effective revival of ORIT, because in the existing political mood and anti-US feeling, what counts is not how much is true or untrue, but what Latin Americans

Chris Jecchinis

believe to be the truth.

#### ITS's Help

The only encouraging development is to be found in the increasing importance and effectiveness in the region of the international trade union secretariats (ITS), which are affiliated to the ICFTU. The International Metal Workers Federation, the International Transport Workers Federation, the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical and Technical Employees, as well as a number of other important international federations, are fairly good examples of what can be done in Latin America—to develop democratic and effective industrial trade union organisations—which can contribute to the solution of the pressing socio-economic problems and to the survival of democracy and social justice. The international secretariats have helped their affiliate member unions in Latin America to educate their leadership, to organise and negotiate more effectively, and to prepare for participation in the planning process for over-all socio-economic development. In effect they (the internationals) have succeeded in helping their affiliated trade unions in the region not only to gain strength and prestige, but to acquire also for their rank and file members better living wages and working conditions, without any obvious control or interference in their internal affairs and politics.

They are thus helping indirectly the revival of the left-of-the-centre parties which rely on the support of progressive trade unions to reverse the present trend of political polarisation. The recent tragic events in Chile are a set-back for democracy and the effort against violent political extremism in the region, but the situation is not hopeless. The effective collaboration of trade unions and the two wings of the progressive political party of AD in Venezuela are encouraging examples of the political stability and socio-economic progress that such collaboration can bring about in a democratic system of government.

Chris Jecchinis

## SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND THE LIBERALS

### The Liberals have No Answer

Liberals and Socialists have a number of aims in common. They share, for example, a concern for personal freedom, civil liberties, human dignity and parliamentary democracy. But at the same time they differ sharply on economic

policy. Liberal parties around the world have been closely identified with the free enterprise system under which the many work for the profit of the few and in all countries liberal parties insist that they are non-socialist and are sometimes

strongly anti-socialist. Socialist parties, on the other hand, are committed to the replacement of capitalist ownership by common ownership. They may differ in the ways in which they seek to achieve socialism but they are united in their rejection of the free enterprise system based upon the exploitation of man by man.

In some countries, such as the Federal Republic of Germany, Switzerland, Belgium and Finland, liberal parties are in coalition with Socialist parties, as they have been at times in other European countries. In some countries, such as Holland, Belgium and until this year in Sweden, liberals win about 15 per cent of the vote; while in others such as Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany it has been 7 or 8 per cent. Only in Denmark, Switzerland and Canada have liberals in recent years received a significant share of the votes cast, and in Canada the world's only Liberal Government depends upon the support of the New Democratic Party.

In some countries, such as Australia, Japan and some Latin American countries, the name liberal is used by parties that have no genuine claim to it but find it a convenient label. In others, such as the USA and South Africa, the name is used by some people of very radical views. In Britain in recent months the Liberal Party has made significant gains in a series of by-elections at Rochdale, Sutton and Cheam, Ely, Ripon and Berwick; and the Liberal vote has increased substantially in other by-elections as in the safe Labour constituency of Chester-le-Street and the safe Conservative one of Hove. The Liberal Party has been doing better than the Labour Party in by-elections even though everyone knows that the Liberal Party has no chance of forming a Government; and it is worth asking whether these Liberal successes are due mainly to the failure of both the present Conservative Government and the previous Labour Government to control inflation or whether the Liberals have something positive to contribute to the solution of the country's economic problems.

#### Acceptable Capitalism

While firmly committed to the 'free enterprise' system the British Liberal Party has, over the last fifty years, developed a habit of trying to find ways of tinkering with capitalism in order to make it more acceptable to the voters. This has led Liberals to advocate various co-partnership, profit sharing, employee-shareholding and capital - sharing schemes in order to try to bridge the gulf

that capitalism creates between capital and labour. The last Liberal Government in Britain, in the years before the First World War, did nothing to encourage such schemes; but in the years since the Second World War the very small Liberal Party has, from time to time, sought to promote such schemes through, among others, tax concessions.

In 1948 a Liberal report called *People in Industry* proposed that all companies employing more than fifty people should be required to share their profits with their workers and provide for workers' representation on boards of directors. This was four years before workers' representation on the supervisory councils of companies was generally introduced in the Federal Republic of Germany. The way in which workers would share in the earnings and control of companies was left very vague indeed; despite this, such a commitment was too much for the business people supporting the Liberal Party and the proposal was quietly dropped after a few years. Other schemes followed such as a scheme in 1960 for wider share ownership or 'Peoples' Capitalism' along lines pioneered in the Federal Republic of Germany by Preussag and Volkswagen.

#### Workers' Representation

In 1962 the Liberals abandoned any idea of meddling with profits and adopted a scheme for workers' representation through a system of assemblies and councils analogous to that developed in the Federal Republic of Germany. These proposals appear to be Liberal policy still. In the original 1962 proposals there was much emphasis on the need for workers to have equal representation with shareholders; but in the Federal Republic of Germany it has been the Free Democratic Party, now in coalition with the Social Democratic Party, that has strongly resisted such proposals for equal representation.

In the Federal Republic some kind of compromise may be worked out between the socialists and the liberals. In Britain the Liberal Party, in a resolution approved at the 1973 Liberal Assembly, calls for 50 per cent workers' representation on the Board of Directors of companies employing from 50 to 200 people and on the Supervisory Councils of larger companies. In this the Liberal Party goes further than the European Commission and takes a similar view to the British TUC which also favours 50 per cent representation, though insisting that it should be through trade union machinery. As the Labour Party and the Conservative Party are also likely to support some form of workers' repre-

sentation on company boards or supervisory councils there is nothing particularly Liberal about the general idea. In any case companies continue to be run on a capitalist basis for the profit of private shareholders.

In 1967 the Vallon legislation on compulsory profit-sharing, supported by massive tax concessions, was introduced by the French Government. The bonuses available for workers after a variety of deductions were, in effect, financed by the tax-payer. The following year a Liberal Committee in Britain put forward similar proposals in a report called *Partners at Work*; but this was twice rejected by the Liberal Assembly. It was, however, later accepted in modified form so that Liberals are now more or less committed to compelling companies to introduce approved profit and asset-sharing schemes. It rather looks as if the British Liberals envisage that wage earners should be left to negotiate 'investment wage' schemes similar to those negotiated after the 1965 and 1969 Capital Formation Acts in the Federal Republic of Germany, or the French system.

Profit-sharing and capital-sharing schemes are to be welcomed insofar as they are redistributory; but they nevertheless leave industry on an essentially capitalist basis run for the profit of private shareholders. Any restraint by wage earners must still mean gains by shareholders and such schemes can contribute little to the control of inflation. The Liberals are just as unconvincing as the Tories in what they say on inflation. The Conservatives were returned to power in Britain in June 1970 because a majority thought that they might be more successful than Labour in controlling inflation. Instead prices increased by more than 30 per cent in their first three and a half years and by more than 10 per cent in the year after they introduced statutory controls over wages and prices in November 1972. There were supposed also to be controls over profits; but profits reported in the first nine months of 1973 were 24 per cent higher than a year earlier and those reported in September and October were more than 42 per cent higher. By contrast the Conservative Government proposed, under Phase III of its policy on inflation, to limit increases in money wages to 7 per cent, increases that are only too likely to be wholly eroded by price increases.

**Inevitable Inflation**  
In the face of this kind of massive inflation the British Liberal Party has nothing to offer. It proposes to impose a

special tax on wage increases if they exceed a specified statutory maximum with a similar tax on employers paying such increases. It also proposes a special surcharge on corporation tax paid by companies that increase prices or dividends. It is easy to imagine the kind of chaos that would result from policies of this kind. The special tax on wage increases would simply add to inflationary pressure and increase industrial disruption, while the tax on price increases would merely drive companies to cut back on investment. The fact is that the experience of European and other industrial countries shows that in contemporary conditions inflation cannot be controlled within the context of the capitalist system. Capitalism is crumbling in continuing inflation; and liberals are not prepared to replace capitalist ownership by common ownership.

The great bulk of industrial investment comes from undistributed company profits. In Britain over the last six years only 2.8 per cent of industrial investment was financed by the issue of ordinary shares. Higher profits are needed to finance necessary investment; but these higher profits mean social injustice unacceptable to trade unionists so long as industry is run for the profit of private shareholders. It is therefore imperative that a permanent limit should be set on the return as well as the liability of the shareholder and that industry should be organised in the interests of the community if inflation is to be brought under control.

This is something Liberals are not prepared to do. They talk vaguely of profit-sharing and capital-sharing without ever giving any indication of the kind of shareout that they have in mind. The sharing of profits between workers and shareholders is, in fact, incompatible with common ownership and trade unionists have long been suspicious of profit-sharing schemes. Employee shareholding, wider share ownership, 'Peoples' Capitalism' and similar schemes are intended to give wage earners an interest in capitalist relationships and a stake in capitalist companies.

Twice in the past fifty years Liberals in Britain have been on the brink of recommending measures that could have marked a break with capitalism. In 1928 the Liberal Yellow Book commended the 'Valder Plan' for applying the co-operative principle of a limited return on capital to companies—a scheme that derived from Maori co-operatives in New Zealand. Nothing more was heard of this proposal from Liberals. Then in 1948 a Liberal Committee, under the Chairmanship of Mr A. J. H. Mac-

Donald, produced a report which again proposed that the co-operative principle of a limited return on capital should be applied to companies; but the report was not acceptable to the party and was not even published. The example of John Stuart Mill was forgotten. The Liberal Party remains committed to capitalism.

#### Socialist Solution

Liberal successes in by-elections in Britain are not the result of any belief that Liberals could solve the country's economic problems in the very unlikely event of their being returned to power. They are the result of the failure of Labour and Conservative Governments to control inflation. It is thus vitally important that the British Labour Party and other socialist parties should de-

velop fully socialist policies for the control of inflation, that is to say, policies involving the replacement of capitalist ownership by common ownership throughout industry. It is not going to be enough to extend state share-holding in capitalist companies or to bring about wider share ownership through capital-sharing schemes. It is going to be necessary to organise production in the interests of the community, to implement Clause Four of the Labour Party constitution and secure for workers by hand and brain the full fruits of their industry, and from that most equitable distribution that may be possible upon a basis of common ownership. The alternative is to attempt to make capitalism work, which today means accelerating inflation, continuing confrontations and chaos.

*Paul Derrick*

#### SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND FASCISM

## The Socialist International in Chile

A delegation of the Socialist International returned from Chile on 6 October, having spent five days in the country on behalf of the Bureau of the Socialist International. The delegation was composed of:

ANTOINE BLANCA (*Rapporteur*), Member of the Executive Committee of the French Socialist Party;

BETTINO CRAXI MP, Deputy Secretary of the Italian Socialist Party;

ANDRÉ VAN DER LOUW MP (Chairman of the delegation), Chairman of the Dutch Labour Party;

ANNIE-MARIE SUNDBOM, Secretary-General of the Swedish Social Democratic Women's Federation, who represented all Nordic member parties of the Socialist International (the Swedish Social Democratic Party, the Danish Social Democratic Party, the Finnish Social Democratic Party, the Norwegian Labour Party and the Icelandic Social Democratic Party).

The delegation was accompanied by the General Secretary of the Socialist International, HANS JANITSCHKEK, and DAVID STEPHEN of the British Labour Party who acted as interpreter.

Upon their return to London, Hans Janitschek, on behalf of the delegation, sent the following cable to the United Nations Secretary-General, Kurt Waldheim:

*Following the five-day fact-finding mission to Chile, the Socialist International delegation is firmly of the belief that:*

**1. There was never any plot by the constitutional government of the late President Salvador Allende against the Chilean armed forces, and assertions to this effect by the Junta are grotesque fabrications.**

**2. A crude and naive propaganda machine has been set up by the Junta and has initiated a vicious smear campaign against the leaders of the Popular Unity coalition, and even against the deceased President himself, but this merely brings discredit upon its authors, while no sudden discoveries have been reported of the 'hidden face' of a government which always allowed total freedom of expression to the opposition, who frequently made use of it in the most violent fashion.**

**3. The serious economic crisis which Chile faces was deliberately brought on and intensified by those very forces who form or sustain the new regime.**

*As the United Nations prepares to debate the events in Chile, the delegation affirms: The new regime in Chile is one which has banished all freedom and which is persecuting leaders and activists of the Popular Unity coalition simply on account of their political convictions. The press and broadcasting media exhibit all the features which characterised the Fascist and Nazi press in Europe. Court martial dispense summary justice to those whose*

*sole offence has been the defence of constitutional legality. To the thousands killed in the first few days must be added the numbers—undoubtedly higher than the regime will admit—of those being summarily shot all over the country. The delegation witnessed one incident of particular significance; when the members of the delegation went peacefully to lay flowers on the grave of the late President Allende, they were encircled, threatened at gunpoint and detained for two hours by the armed forces. No more needs to be said of a regime which prevents friends from honouring the dead. The Socialist International delegation wishes respectfully to draw your attention to these facts. Yet again the Universal Declaration of Human Rights has been cast aside. Yet again brute force has taken the place of the rule of law. This must be stated at a time when those who ought to be standing trial have come here to cast themselves in the role of accusers before the United Nations, intended by its founders to be a great human rights court for all mankind. We urge you to make all UN delegations aware of this communication.*

## Portugal under Attack

The French Socialist Party, led by Francois Mitterrand, First Secretary, and the Portuguese Socialist Party, led by Mario Soares, General Secretary, held a Special Conference on Portugal in Paris on 4 October, agreeing on a joint veto against the fascist dictatorship.

Before starting their conversations, the two delegations paid homage to President Salvador Allende and all the Chilean patriots, executed or persecuted by the fascist junta, and underlined solemnly their determination to lend every support to the people of Chile and their democratic organisations, fighting the fascist dictatorship.

The two representatives of the two Parties then opened a broad exchange of information regarding the political situation in their respective countries.

The Portuguese delegation underlined the value of the example of the policy of unity of the French left, expressed in its governmental programme and welcomed the important electoral and other

successes of the French Socialists, since their last National Conference at Epinay, and showed special interest in their grammatical and organisational efforts.

The French delegation took note of the political programme of the Portuguese Socialists, expressing satisfaction in view of the growing strength of their party. The French Socialists had full understanding for the decision of the Portuguese Socialists not to take part in the most recent fake elections organised by Prime Minister Marcello Caetano and his 'single party' and to maintain this attitude until universal suffrage, freedom of association and a really democratic election legislation are installed in Portugal.

#### Recognition of Guinea-Bissau

After a thorough discussion of the international situation the two delegations arrived at the joint conclusion that the present European configuration was

## Hero in Santiago

This is the verbatim transcript of a BBC interview with HAROLD EDELSTAM, the Swedish Ambassador in Santiago who was also representing the interests of Cuba in Chile, as recorded on 7 November 1973.

MAJOR: Hello Mr Edelstam. I gather there's been some trouble with the former Cuban Embassy this evening. EDELSTAM: Yes, that's true. We've had difficulties because people are not allowed to enter the embassy, only the Swedish diplomats. And the wife of a Swedish journalist was arrested and two of my chauffeurs. And we have not been able to speak to them. They are sitting, they are imprisoned over the night and we are getting news about them first tomorrow morning.

MAJOR: Is the former Cuban embassy actually surrounded now by troops? EDELSTAM: Yes, it is surrounded. We think about 50 soldiers.

MAJOR: Were you inside yourself at one time?

EDELSTAM: Well, I came here in the afternoon and I've been here since

6 o'clock. And I always stay here overnight to protect the refugees I have in this house.

MAJOR: I see, you're actually in the Cuban embassy at this moment, the former Cuban embassy.

EDELSTAM: Yes, that's true.

MAJOR: How many refugees are there there?

EDELSTAM: Well, the number I can't say but there are some refugees here.

MAJOR: Why do you think the Chilean authorities have moved at this moment against . . .

EDELSTAM: Well, it's a sort of a provocation I think. They don't like Cuba, they don't like me very much.

MAJOR: They are mostly Cuban refugees are they in the embassy?

EDELSTAM: No, they're Uruguayans and a couple of Chileans.

MAJOR: Are they letting in food or . . .

EDELSTAM: Yes, I can go out to meals but my two chauffeurs who are Chileans were arrested when they were outside which means that I can't use any one on my staff who is not Swedish and who has a diplomatic passport. That is not normal you know according to the Vienna Convention you're not allowed to hinder

people who come into an embassy.

MAJOR: What action are you going to take about this?

EDELSTAM: Well, tomorrow I will have to speak with the protocol in the Foreign office and tell them that we can't allow this and I hope they will change their attitude.

MAJOR: There's been no attempt made to take the refugees out of the building?

EDELSTAM: Well, last Saturday there was the police coming here and they wanted to enter but we didn't allow them and that was provocation too, which was very serious as you're not allowed to violate a foreign embassy.

MAJOR: Yes. But none of the troops or police have entered the embassy today?

EDELSTAM: No they haven't because we haven't let them in.

MAJOR: No, I see. Sweden is looking after the former Cuban embassy for the time being, that is right is it not? That is so?

EDELSTAM: Yes, it's true. We took over the interests of Cuba already the same day as they left on the 12th of September the day after the coup.

MAJOR: Yes, I see. Well, thank you very much indeed Mr Edelstam.

favourable for the external isolation of Portuguese fascism and colonialism. In this respect, the two delegations welcomed the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and expressed their conviction that this historic act represents a considerable step towards the international isolation of the present Government of Portugal. The two delegations considered the measures to be taken and the French Socialist Party will make all efforts to achieve the expulsion of Portugal from NATO and to prevent the admission of Portugal to the European Communities, as long as no democratic regime is installed in the country which alone is capable to put an end to the colonial wars.

The two delegations further studied in detail the close links existing between the present Governments of France and Portugal. The representatives of the French Socialist Party condemned vigorously the present cooperation of the French Government with the Portuguese Government and committed themselves to undertake the following steps when the United Left comes to power:

- To suspend all armament deals with Lisbon and to investigate together with

the democratic Portuguese organisations the question of the status of the French military base in Portugal;

- to investigate the question of teaching in Portuguese in France in a manner which is in line with the necessities of tens of thousands of children of migrant workers;
- to guarantee to deserters from the Portuguese army a legal status in conformity with liberal French traditions. The present denial of the right of residence on French territory to Portuguese democrats will be abolished;
- to terminate the recently signed French-Portuguese social conventions and to enact social legislation with the aim of bringing real improvements to the conditions under which the migrant workers and their families live. Legislation is also foreseen in the field of the trade union rights, living conditions in general, social promotion, social welfare and social assistance.

The two delegations decided to keep regular contact with each other in order to strengthen the links of cooperation and to give joint actions a concrete content both on the national and the international level.

*Robert Pontillon*

#### SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND THE THIRD WORLD

## Oppression in Malaysia

The term 'totalitarian state' applies to any system of government which controls potentially, or actually, all aspects of social existence within a given state. Whereas non-totalitarian government systems allow the preservation of the distinctions between the public and the private, between the political and the non-political aspects of social life, totalitarianism recognises no such distinctions.

Since totalitarianism is an ideal-type concept it is possible to find examples only of states that have approximated to the required conditions and commentators usually cite the cases of Nazi Germany, Stalinist Russia and now possibly Communist China as states which have come nearest to the achievement of totalitarianism.

In order to answer this vital question as to whether Malaysia is in fact moving towards a totalitarian state one has to examine all the aspects of its social existence as well as the laws and conditions governing such an existence. It is perhaps best to begin by examining press freedom in Malaysia.

The Constitution of Malaysia, which is a fairly lengthy document, does not mention a single word about the press let alone the freedom of the press, apart from Part Two, Article 10, Section (1), Clause (a) which states rather briefly that 'every citizen has the right to freedom of speech and expression'. Section 2 of the same Article talks of the necessity to impose such restrictions that may be deemed necessary or expedient 'in the interests of the security of the Federation'.

#### Freedom of Press

Other brief mentions of matters relating to the Press or its freedom are found in Sections 21 and 22 of the Ninth Schedule of List 1 (or the Federal List) of the Constitution. These two sections merely say that the Federal Government has powers to legislate on matters relating to newspapers, publications, publishers, printing and censorship.

The other Act pertaining to the above is the Printing Presses Act of 1948 which has been subject to recent revision. Section 3 requires all printing firms or per-

sons who want to use the press to print documents to apply for a licence annually. Under Section 7 no newspaper can be published without a licence which is subject to annual renewal. In granting such a licence the Minister of Home Affairs may at his discretion grant, refuse or revoke, or grant such a licence subject to conditions to be endorsed thereon.

Under the Emergency (Essential Powers) Ordinance, a police officer above the rank of an inspector or any competent administrator from the Ministry of Home Affairs may enter any newspaper editorial office to vet any news or article which they believe is 'prejudicial to the national interest or security of the state when published'. Very often this is followed by what is commonly known in the newspaper world as a 'request' to the editor not to publish certain items of news. Failure to comply with such a 'request' would mean a fine of \$10,000 or three years imprisonment. Needless to say it is very common for editors to be summoned to the Ministry of Home Affairs for what is commonly known as 'routine briefings', that is an occasional dressing up of what should and what should not be published.

Thus it can be seen that there are a multiplicity of press laws to be followed and it is these very laws that are being used by the present regime to repress, oppress and castrate the press.

#### Unions in Jeopardy

If one examines another aspect of social conditions, for example, the prevailing trade union laws, one has to conclude that it is a disgrace by international standards. Under Section 12 of the Trade Union Ordinance 1959, the Registrar of Trade Unions can refuse to register a trade union without giving any reasons. Thus workers who want to get themselves unionised or organised are completely at the tender mercies of the Registrar and he, being the sole judge in such matters, there is no right of appeal. This is an infringement of Article 23(4) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights Charter (1948) of the United Nations which states that everyone has the right to form and join trade unions.

Under sub-section (3)(b)(ii) of Section 12 of the above mentioned Act, the Registrar can refuse to register a trade union if the name under which the trade union is to be registered is 'in the opinion of the Registrar undesirable'. As a result 80 per cent of the workers are unorganised and, with one exception (the National Union of Plantation Workers which has a membership of

76,000 members), there is not a single union with a membership of 10,000 members or more.

Most of the trade union laws are, by and large, anti-labour and pro-management and the workers do not have any hope of fighting their employers in their rightful struggle for industrial dignity and justice. The most oppressive of these laws is the Industrial Relations Act of 1967, which is used to oppress, repress and suppress the workers so as to enable the local and foreign capitalists to work hand in glove with each other to carry out economic rape against the state. As a result hundreds of millions of dollars flow out annually to foreign capitalists.

There exist a multiplicity of laws which have made inroads into basic and fundamental rights of Malaysians. The Constitutional (Amendment) Act 1971 and the Sedition (Amendment) Act 1971 have banned the public and parliament from discussing the so-called 'sensitive issues'. Not even Members of Parliament can discuss these issues within their Parliamentary Chambers and as a result the Malaysian Parliament is the only Parliament in the world where MPs do not enjoy parliamentary immunity.

Under the Societies (Amendment) Act 1972, the Minister of Home Affairs can disallow fraternal links of political parties, trade unions and student bodies with international movements and organisations.

#### Rights Eroded

The latest Alliance gimmick is the Universities and University Colleges Act 1971, the sole aim of which is to emasculate and repress the student movements. The Act bans student bodies from affiliating or holding office in political parties or trade unions. It also prohibits students from 'doing anything which can be construed as expressing support, sympathy or opposition to any political party or trade union'.

With every passing day the basic and fundamental rights of Malaysians are slowly and surely being eroded. Local council elections which are the grass roots of democracy have been suspended indefinitely. The Alliance regime has recently taken another step towards a totalitarian state by declaring Kwala Lumpur a 'Federal Territory', thus depriving more than half a million people from their right to vote in the next state elections. The reasons for this are twofold:

(a) to undermine the Federal system of government of separation of powers between the state and Federal authority,

and

(b) to frustrate the Opposition plans to capture the state government (seven out of eight state seats declared as Federal Territory belongs to the Opposition) as the Alliance leaders have been having nightmares for quite some time that the state Government would fall to the Opposition in the coming general elections.

The most repressive law in Malaysia today is undoubtedly the Internal Security Act of 1961 under which any person or persons can be arbitrarily detained and thrown into prison for years-on-end without being given a trial in an open court of law. This Act is very similar to the Terrorism Act in South Africa and is an infringement of article 9 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) which states that no person shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

#### Towards Totalitarianism

Under the above Act, hundreds of Malaysians are held in detention centres in Muar and Batu Gagah without being given a trial. Further, more than twenty Malaysians have been deprived of their nationality for political reasons and are being detained under the Banishment Ordinance pending banishment to other states if political asylum could be obtained.

The writing on the wall is crystal clear. As a political entity, Malaysia has got all the features and characteristics of a totalitarian state, because the present regime controls all aspects of its social existence. With every passing day it is becoming more and more a closed society. Every new Act of Parliament is another step towards a totalitarian state.

*John Fernandez*

## Murder in Nepal

Wheresoever there is one-man rule or, in other words, dictatorship, the first and foremost act of the dictators has been to exterminate the opponents of their regime by any means. Resorting to criminal acts such as murder, mutilation and kidnapping, they feel complacent for having fortified and ensured junta rule. They eye their political opponents their enemy Number One to be exterminated forthwith, being oblivious of the consequences in the long run. This has become a common phenomenon, more so with the modern dictators all over the world. The present day Nepal is one, in this context.

Since the dismissal of the first-ever elected government on 15 December, 1960, by the King, Nepal has been ruled in the fashion of a modern dictatorship. The system, though authoritarian, is euphemistically called panchayat democracy, where the people's voice is strangled, the press is gagged and hundreds of persons are kept behind the bars indefinitely without charges and trial, in the name of the Security Act. The system is partyless panchayat democracy where there is no freedom except, of course, the freedom of upholding the King in particular and his system in general.

#### Democracy Overthrown

The Nepali Congress, a democratic socialist party, under the dynamic leadership of Shri B. P. Koirala, brought an end to the century-old oligarchic rule of the Ranas by armed revolution in 1950.

The revolution not only emancipated the people but the King, who being virtually a prisoner under the Ranas, was restored to his legitimate position. The King, on this auspicious occasion, made a solemn pledge to the people to fulfil their aspirations for a democratic way of life, and declared in his maiden proclamation that he would hold General Elections for the Constituent Assembly as his first act. But as soon as the King got hold of the power, he not only bypassed the people's aspirations but got involved in the 'palace intrigue' of 'divide and rule' to ensure his personal rule.

The Nepali Congress, after an arduous and long struggle with a 'power-hungry' King, ultimately forced him to hold General Elections. The Nepali Congress came to power with a landslide victory in 1959. But to a King, mad with 'lust for power', the Nepali Congress in general and Shri B. P. Koirala in particular have been an eyesore. One fine morning, 15 December, 1960, the King, with the help of the army, ruthlessly strangled the eighteen-month-old 'parliamentary democracy'.

Once again the struggle for the restoration of democracy, under the banner of the Nepali Congress, started. The despot now began the 'politics of murder' as a weapon to exterminate his political opponents, one by one.

In this new machination of the monarch, among others, a ministerial colleague of Shri B. P. Koirala, Shri Ramnarayan Mishra, became the first

victim. Shri Mishra, suffering from stomach cancer in detention (unfortunately, Nepal has no provision for the treatment of cancer) was released only after the King realised that the disease was fatal and incurable. Shri Mishra passed away within a few months of transfer to the Institute of Cancer at Vellore, in South India. Shri Mishra was an esteemed and dedicated leader of the Nepali Congress from Central Tarai of Nepal.

Shri Tej Bahadur Amatya, a revolutionary leader in exile, was the second victim. He was shot dead at his exile town at Raxane in Bihar. The assassins escaped to Nepal in a stand-by Jeep.

The third victim was Shri Yogendra Sherchand, one of the youngest Ministerial colleagues of Shri Koirala. Shri Sherchand, a learned intellectual, was a popular leader of his area adjoining the Sino-Nepalese border. He was detained and released along with Smt. B. P. Koirala, after a long incarceration of eight years. Shri Sherchand was crushed to death by a speeding Government vehicle as he stepped onto the road from his bungalow in Kathmandu.

Shri Devan Singh Rai, who also was amongst the young Ministerial colleagues of Koirala and who had been arrested and released along with Shri Koirala, belonged to one of the martial clans of Rais, famous for their valour in the eastern hills of Nepal. He was the most popular leader of his region. Shri Rai was brutally killed in his village farm by the 'Murder Squad' of the ruler.

Shri Tursha Hemrom was kidnapped by the uniformed Nepalese police from his abode-in-exile near Naxalbari in West Bengal. He has presumably been executed in Kathmandu. Shri Hemrom was a strong and powerful leader of the tribal 'Santhals', famous fighters using bows and arrows. Santhals are the backbone of the Nepali Congress in the Eastern Tarai adjoining Naxalbari. Shri Hemrom had been in India since 1960.

The recent planned murder of Shri Saroj Prasad Koirala, a cousin of Shri B. P. Koirala, in his exiled town at Madhubani in Bihar is gruesome. Shri Koirala was a founder-member of the Nepali Congress and an elected member of parliament. There are very few leaders who have struggled so hard incessantly for the cause of democracy as he. From his boyhood, he took an active part in the difficult politics of Nepal. He fought against the Ranas as a dedicated soldier in the 1950s. Though young, he commanded high respect in the party. Dedication and determination to work, boldness in action, nimbleness in decision and an 'ever-smiling' face were

some of the rare attributes of his character. He was popular among the youths and students of Nepal. He was a true revolutionary in every sense. Shri Koirala had been in exile since the eclipse of parliamentary democracy in 1960.

The series of murders of Nepali leaders on Indian soil has caused great consternation in the hearts of freedom-loving Nepalese in exile. Banished from

their country for their political beliefs, they have been taking refuge in India from time to time. They have begun to feel that their life is not secure even on Indian soil. They had come to India not only for their personal safety and security but for moral sustenance for their sacred cause of freedom, liberty and equality.

G. G. Parikh

## CONFERENCES

### Party Leaders meet in London

The second Party Leaders' Conference of the Socialist International to be held this year took place in London on Sunday 11 November. The Conference, hosted by the British Labour Party, was convened in order to discuss the situation in the Middle East and other current political problems.

Party Leaders and representatives from twenty-two parties affiliated to the Socialist International attended the Conference which was chaired by the Chairman of the International, Dr Bruno Pittermann.

The Conference gave considerable support to a proposal that a high-level working group of the Socialist International should be established, which would seek to discover what Israel and her Arab neighbours considered to be secure and acceptable frontiers and what guarantees were felt to be necessary. According to the proposal the working group would, on the basis of this information, put forward proposals aimed at contributing to the creation of a permanent peace in the area.

The proposal to set up the working group was discussed by the Bureau of the Socialist International at its meeting in London on 9 December.

The Conference also heard a report from Carlos Parra, European Representative of the Radical Party of Chile (which formed part of President Allende's Popular Unity Government) on the situation following the overthrow by right-wing military forces of President Allende's democratically-elected government. The Conference unanimously confirmed its support for the forces of Popular Unity in Chile and other Chilean democrats.

The Socialist International has held Party Leaders' Conferences since the early 1960s, once or twice a year, in

order to give the leaders of its parties, and in particular those in government, an opportunity to discuss current affairs in privacy. The last Party Leaders' Conference of the Socialist International was held in Paris in January of this year.

The following representatives of member parties participated at the Conference:

Austria, *Socialist Party*  
BRUNO KREISKY, *Federal Chancellor of Austria, Party Chairman*  
KARL CERNETZ, *International Secretary*;

Belgium, *Socialist Party*  
EDMUND LEBURTON, *Prime Minister*  
JOS VAN EYNDE, *Joint Chairman of the Party*  
ANDRÉ COOLS, *Joint Chairman of the Party*;

Britain, *Labour Party*  
HAROLD WILSON, *Party Leader, Vice-Chairman, Socialist International*  
JAMES CALLAGHAN, *Party Chairman*  
RON HAYWARD, *General Secretary*  
TOM McNALLY, *International Secretary*;

Chile, *Radical Party*  
CARLOS PARRA, *European Representative*;

Denmark, *Social Democratic Party*  
KJELD OLESEN, *Vice-Chairman of the Party*;

Finland, *Social Democratic Party*  
PAAVO LIPPONEN, *International Secretary*;

France, *Socialist Party*  
FRANÇOIS MITERRAND, *First Secretary, Vice-Chairman, Socialist International*  
ROBERT PONTILLON, *International Secretary*;

Germany, *Social Democratic Party*  
WILLY BRANDT, *Federal Chancellor, Party Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Socialist International*  
HANS-EBERHARD DINGELS, *International Secretary*;

Ireland, *Labour Party*  
JUSTIN KEATING, *Minister of Trade and Industry*  
BRENDAN HALLIGAN, *Secretary of the Party*;

Israel, *Labour Party*  
GOLDA MEIR, *Prime Minister, Party Leader, Vice-Chairman, Socialist International*  
MICHAEL HARISH, *International Secretary*  
ISRAEL GAT, *London Representative*;

Italy, *Social Democratic Party*  
ANTONIO CARIGLIA, *Chairman, Parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee*  
GIAMPIERO ROLANDI, *London Representative*;

Italy, *Socialist Party*  
PIETRO NENNI, *Party President, Vice-Chairman, Socialist International*  
GIANNI FINOCCHIARO, *Assistant International Secretary*  
GINO BIANCO, *London Representative*;

Luxembourg, *Socialist Workers' Party*  
ANTIONE WEHENKEL, *Party Chairman*  
Malaysia, *Democratic Action Party*  
FAN YEW TENG, *International Secretary*;

Malta, *Labour Party*  
DOM MINTOFF, *Prime Minister, Party Leader*  
EDGAR MIZZI, *Advocate-General*  
JOE CAMILLERI, *International Secretary*;

Mauritius, *Labour Party*  
SIR SEWOOSAGUR RAMGOOLAM, *Prime Minister, Party Leader*  
Netherlands, *Labour Party*  
JOOP DEN UYL, *Prime Minister, Party Leader*  
HARRY VAN DEN BERGH, *Assistant International Secretary*;

Norway, *Labour Party*  
TRYGVE BRATTELI, *Prime Minister, Party Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Socialist International*  
Portugal, *Socialist Party*  
MARIO SOARES, *General Secretary*;

Sweden, *Social Democratic Labour Party*  
OLOF PALME, *Prime Minister, Party Chairman*  
BERNT CARLSSON, *International Secretary*;

Switzerland, *Socialist Party*  
RICHARD MÜLLER, *Vice-President, Leader of Socialist Group in Parliament*  
*Socialist International*

BRUNO PITTERMANN, *Chairman*  
HANS JANITSCHKEK, *General Secretary*  
RODNEY BALCOMB, *Assistant General Secretary*.

### Terror in the Air

When the nations of the world met in Chicago in 1944 to sign a treaty on international civil aviation, they recognised in the preamble of the Convention that international civil aviation could be the best instrument for promoting international understanding and friendship among the nations and peoples of the world, but that its abuse could pose the greatest threat to the world's peace and security. The basic aim of this Convention was 'the development of international civil aviation in a safe and orderly manner'. In using the word 'safe', those who framed the Convention were obviously thinking in terms of the safety of flight, i.e. that the aircraft would be airworthy and that the necessary air navigation facilities and services would be provided by the nations of the world so as to make flying a safe means of transport. They could have hardly visualised at that time that, almost a quarter of a century later, the safety of international civil aviation would be threatened from entirely different sources, i.e. hijacking and other acts of violence and terrorism which we experience today.

Although the history of hijacking goes back to 1930, it is only in recent years that its incidence has grown in dimension and has greatly occupied the world's attention. The first recorded hijacking was in 1930 when Peruvian revolutionaries hijacked an aircraft to escape from their country. However, as from 1947 the incidence of hijacking occurred in waves, reflecting disturbed political and social climates in different countries. For example, during the period 1947-53, political turmoil in Eastern Europe gave rise to a number of hijacking incidents from Eastern European countries to the west. Similarly, from 1958-61, the establishment of a new regime in Cuba gave rise to a number of hijackings by people or groups running away from that country. However, as from 1967 this traffic reversed and a wave of hijackings took place from the USA to Cuba. From 1968 onwards there was a dramatic rise in activity by the militant urban guerilla movement in Latin America and more particularly in Palestine where the Palestinian guerilla movement has been responsible for most of the hijackings and other acts of terrorism against civil aviation in recent years.

**Action Imperative**  
However, the incident which most

shocked the world was the mid-air explosion of the Swissair Coronado in February 1970 in which all the occupants were killed. There was world-wide clamour for international action and the ICAO,\* under pressure from international public opinion and the world trade union movement, convened an Extraordinary Session of its Assembly in Montreal, in June 1970, to discuss what international action could be taken to deal with this sort of crime. After weeks of deliberation the ICAO Extraordinary Assembly directed its Legal Committee to convene international conferences to draw up international instruments to fight this menace. The Assembly also directed the ICAO Secretariat to draw up a comprehensive manual on airport security to prevent criminals from getting access to airports.

As a result of this decision a Diplomatic Conference on international air law was held in The Hague, in December 1970, and a treaty against hijacking was drawn up and signed by a large majority of the nations. This treaty, which is popularly known as 'The Hague Convention Against Hijacking', has now been ratified by over sixty countries. Again in 1971 another international conference was convened in Montreal and a treaty on other acts of violence or terrorism against civil aviation was drawn up and signed. This Convention, known as 'The Montreal Convention against Sabotage', has now been ratified by over thirty-four countries.

Despite these Conventions the incidence of hijacking and terrorism against civil aviation went on unabated. It became increasingly clear to the international trade union movement and the public that these Conventions were useless, unless there was machinery to enforce their provisions by penalising non-conforming or defaulting States.

**Action Imperative**  
The ITF† together with other international trade unions called for a worldwide demonstration stoppage on 19 June 1972 in order to impress upon the governments of the world that, unless effective action was taken against the growing incidence of hijacking, the civil aviation employees would refuse to run these vital services to the international community. The ITF, in a cable to the

\*International Civil Aviation Organisation  
†International Transport Federation

United Nations, made it clear that the civil aviation employees were no longer ready to be the sacrificial lambs through the inaction or indifference of governments. As a result of the demonstration stoppage, the ICAO Council met in an emergency session and directed its Legal Committee to draw up a new instrument of sanctions against non-conforming or defaulting States. A meeting of the ICAO's Legal Committee was called in Washington in September 1972 and a second one was called in January 1973 in Montreal, to discuss the new draft instrument on sanctions against defaulting States. The proposal was, however, rejected by the Legal Committee, because many countries were unwilling to consider the possibility of sanctions outside the jurisdiction of the United Nations Security Council. It was also clear at these meetings that newly-independent countries were so jealous of their national sovereignty that they would not accept any Convention on sanctions, particularly because they felt that such sanctions would only be applied against smaller nations by big powers and that there would be no possibility of sanctions against economically and militarily powerful countries. Doubts were also expressed about the effectiveness of any international sanctions and examples of United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia and South Africa were cited.

After the failure of the Legal Committee meeting in Montreal in 1973, the ICAO Council decided to convene an Extraordinary Session of the Assembly and Diplomatic Conference in September 1973 to see if anything short of sanctions could be done to make the countries abide by the provisions of the Conventions which they had signed and ratified. Four proposals were submitted at this conference, held in Rome, out of which the one which initially received a great measure of acceptance was the proposal submitted by the governments of the UK, Switzerland and France. This proposal, in effect, asked the Conference to consider that the main provisions of the existing Hague and Montreal Conventions be incorporated into the body of the ICAO's basic Convention, i.e. the Chicago Convention, which already contains a penalty clause for non-conformity.

Article 87 of the Chicago Convention provides that action against a non-conforming airline could be taken by refusing that airline the use of airspace in other countries. The UK/Swiss/French proposal suggested that this Article should be extended to cover defaulting States. Thus, in effect, the UK/Swiss/French proposal was designed to make

the Chicago Convention, and therefore the ICAO, the guardian of all aspects of safety and not just technical safety, as is the case at present. However, the amendment of the Chicago Convention required a two-thirds majority for its acceptance and when the proposal was put to final voting it failed to get the required number of votes. Similarly, all the other proposals before the Conference were defeated one by one, with the result that the Conference ended without achieving any positive result whatsoever.

#### Rome and After

The Rome Conference made it abundantly clear that the world community

of nations is not yet ready to accept any collective discipline to stop this menace which has plagued international civil aviation for so many years. It does not seem possible that this situation will change in the near future and, in the meantime, the international community will have to live with this crime, unless a dramatic change of attitude takes place through further catastrophic incidents of hijacking or sabotage. It seems a great pity that the governments of the world only react to tragic incidents and cannot take effective measures, on a long term basis, to safeguard the world from these calamities.

M. S. Hoda

#### ELECTIONS

### French Socialists Advance

The French Socialist Party, led by Francois Mitterrand, a Vice-Chairman of the Socialist International, made substantial gains in the cantonal (local) elections held on 23 and 30 September. The Party registered the most net gains and improved its position as the strongest party in terms of seats, despite a high voting abstention rate (46.6 per cent in the first round and 45.8 per cent in the second).

In the elections a total of 1,988 seats were at issue, an increase of 316 since the last local elections in 1970, owing to the creation of 300 new cantons and the boundaries of 480 others having been modified to correct the under-representation of the towns. The elections did not involve the City of Paris which is a separate administrative unit, its council being elected within the framework of the municipal elections.

The results of the elections, indicating the allocation of seats, are as follows: UDR (Gaullists) 244, Independent Republicans 153, CDP (Christian Democrats) 60, Reformers 123, Socialists 423, Left Radicals 68, Communists 205, Various Left 174, Extreme Left 9, Moderate Majority 373, Moderate Opposition 93.

Although the increase in the number of seats enabled all the major parties to register gains, the polarisation between the Left and Right is evident with both the Socialists and Communists on one hand and the Gaullists on the other achieving substantial gains at the expense of the Centre parties. M. Claude Estier, a member of the secretariat of the Socialist Party, said that the elections had shown the Socialist Party to be 'the foremost of all the French political formations'.

### Left Swing in Italy

Two million Italian electors voted in the provincial, local and municipal elections in Italy on 18 and 19 November. A high turn out was recorded—87.7 per cent compared with 86.7 per cent in the last local elections in 1968.

Voters gave their support mainly to the parties which form Signor Rumor's Centre Left coalition, while both the neo-Fascist Party and the Right-Wing Liberal Party lost support substantially.

The Socialist Party (one of the Socialist International's two member parties in Italy) increased its total percentage of the vote in almost all districts, while the Communist Party gained in some areas, maintaining control in Sienna and Ravenna, but lost in others.

The results are a positive indication of a swing left of Centre in Italy, putting any threat of a right-wing takeover out of the question.

#### SOCIALIST AFFAIRS

#### BOOK REVIEWS

### Business World

Charles P. Kindleberger (Ed.): *The International Corporation*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., pp. 512, £7.00 (hard back), £2.80 (paperback)

This volume contains papers on the International Corporation (IC) presented at a seminar held in the Sloan School of Management, MIT in 1969. The papers are grouped into six parts: The Theory of the International Corporation, Finance and Technology, Law and Politics, Three Industry Studies, Three Country Studies and Prospects for the Future. This wide coverage is both impressive and interesting for it shows the diversity of issues raised by international corporations (however the neglect of the implications of IC's for labour relations seems an important omission).

The most interesting and provocative papers are those dealing with the theory of the IC particularly as some of the analyses offered differ from J. J. Servan-Schreiber's well known argument in *Le Défi Américain*. Robert Z. Aliber offers 'A Theory of Direct Investment' which suggests that the large flows of US investment to Western Europe during the 1960s may have been encouraged by the earlier strength of that country's currency: US firms may have had an advantage over local (European) firms in competing for local assets because local investors may have considered a factory owned by the US firm to be an asset denominated in a strong currency. If this view of things is correct, and if the recent weakness of the US dollar continues, the 1970s may see a reverse flow of investment across the Atlantic.

Concern about the influence of IC's usually stems from their large size and monopoly position. In this context Harry G. Johnson's paper is of considerable interest for he suggests that direct foreign investment occurs when firms have monopoly advantage in technology: the imperfections in the market for technical knowledge enable a firm to earn high returns through ownership and control of assets abroad. There is in fact an important problem here for although efficiency in the use of technical knowledge requires that it be made freely available, a firm that undertakes research requires an incentive of high profits via a monopoly position. A lot may depend on whether the knowledge brought over

by the foreign firm can spill over to the local economy. Of interest here is John H. Dunning's paper: he points out that United States investment in Europe has been directed to the fastest growing sectors and, on the basis of some statistical analysis, suggests that the causation was from direct investment to growth rather than the other way around.

The economic consequences of IC's seem to have attracted rather more attention than have their legal and international relation's aspects. Seymour J. Rubin, as the lawyer contributing to this volume, argues that although IC's may raise problems of conflict of national policies the conflict would not be hard to resolve. There is not much support here for the Galbraithian view that the IC's may impose pressure on national governments to harmonise their economic policies and weaken the independence of national economies. And Kenneth N. Waltz as an international relations scholar is sceptical of the notion that the rise in international trade and investment due to IC's has increased economic interdependence among nations: the concept of economic interdependence is a difficult one to measure; in this connection Waltz makes a useful reminder that lessons drawn from Britain's position in the world economy in the nineteenth century may not be appropriate for the United States position today.

The concluding paper by Raymond Vernon speculates about the future of IC's. An important unknown here is whether an initial advantage of an IC based on, say, technical knowledge, will in the long run be converted into an advantage based on their size. Another, and perhaps even more important question concerns the role played by national governments. If the EEC countries' governments provide increasingly larger subsidies for research and development they are likely to take greater interest in the national ownership of the aided firms. At the same time as EEC based firms grow to rival the large United States' IC's they may face the United States Government with the same questions as at present concern European countries, and this may lead to some form of international regulation of IC's.

Future developments in the nature of the IC and in the economic and political framework in which they operate may raise issues not yet foreseen or covered by the contributors in this volume but, as of date, their analyses help considerably to an understanding of the implications of IC's.

Homi Katrak

### British Socialism

Michael Barratt Brown: *From Labourism to Socialism*. Spokesman Books, Nottingham, pp. 252, £3.25

Anthony Crosland said again only the other day that he wished someone would write a book pulling together the strands of democratic socialism in the way that he himself did in *The Future of Socialism* back in the fifties. Unfortunately, there appear to be no takers within the current mainstream of the Labour Party, which means that Labour is likely to go into its next period of government without the kind of generally-agreed ideological blueprint which Crosland and others provided for the last.

Whether this is a good or a bad thing depends upon one's view of the record of the last Labour Government. Michael Barratt Brown clearly believes that a Labour Government ought to have such a frame of reference, provided it makes a complete break with the 'reformed capitalism' and 'consensus politics' of the Gaitskellites. And in this dense and difficult book he endeavours to provide it.

Subtitled 'The Political Economy of Labour in the 1970s', the book attempts a fundamental critique of capitalist society and shows how it can, and indeed inevitably will, be superseded by a socialist system. The author writes from an unashamed Labour Party standpoint, believing that only the institutions to which the British working classes remain 'stubbornly attached' can be the vehicles of real change. But even though the Labour Party has moved to the left since 1970, Mr Barratt Brown stands too far out of the mainstream of the Movement for his views to have much influence. This is a pity, because although the book provides no ideological blueprint, there is much in it that ought to be digested by those who will direct the next Labour government.

Alan J. Day

### SOCIALIST AFFAIRS

Bound volumes  
for  
1971 and 1972  
are now available  
price £6 each (plus postage)

Orders to:  
The Socialist International  
88A St John's Wood High Street  
London  
NW8 SJ7