

Editorial Comments

International Solidarity

ONE of the arguments which is used in favour of the Common Market is that it will bring the trade unions in Western Europe closer together and enable them to pursue a common policy within the Market.

Judging from a P.E.P. booklet written by Mr. R. Colin Beever, an Assistant Research Officer in the Amalgamated Engineering Union (and a Market supporter), the unions already in the Market are far from being united. Only the West Germans are united under one trade union centre. In other countries the movement is divided between unions in the W.F.T.U. (World Federation of Trade Unions), unions in the International Confederation of Trade Unions, and unions in the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions.

There is not the vestige of united action here. The two main bodies affiliated to the World Federation of Free Trade Unions—the French C.G.T. and the Italian C.G.I.L.—are not nominated by the governments to any Market institution. In these institutions a constant tug-of-war takes place between the Christian (i.e. Catholic) trade unions and the reformist Labour ones. According to Mr. Beever someone has been suggesting that there might be an attempt, if Britain goes into the Market, to form a Catholic trade union centre in Britain. He thinks that:

“the fear need not be taken seriously for two reasons. First the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions has gained negligible support in the predominantly Protestant countries in Europe. Secondly, there is a strong tradition of loyalty to the basically social democratic sympathies of the I.C.F.T.U. among British trade union leaders and they all believe strongly in the merits of unity at the national level”.

Mr. Beever is probably correct as far as a Catholic trade union centre in Britain is concerned. Nevertheless, in this “predominantly Protestant country” Catholic action groups exert a reactionary influence in many unions and are fostered by reactionary trade union officials, who are not themselves Catholic.

Still the Common Market up to this moment has not promoted closer working among the unions to any extent. Assertions that it will do so in the future are empty guesses.

Common Market and Railways

Railwaymen are probably amongst those who feel that the Common Market will have no effect,

favourable or otherwise, on their conditions. In this they may be greatly mistaken. A powerful struggle is taking place in the Market between the motor firms, producing the commercial vehicles, and the nationalised railways.

As rail nationalisation is a long-standing feature on the Continent, none of the capitalist governments there feels the same necessity of sabotaging it, as a form of “creeping socialism”, as the British Tories have done. In countries like France the reorganisation of the railways is far in advance of Britain’s and both freight and passenger traffic is rising.

All Continental railways are subsidised as a matter of course. The great “Beeching” idea, of cutting out all unprofitable lines until the railways are only a shadow of their former self in order to make them pay, finds no particular favour there. A corollary of subsidising the railways is to insist that they give the best possible service, and that competition against them is limited. In France and West Germany, therefore, private road haulage is restricted on the principle that there is no sense in spending hundreds of millions on rail reorganisation if you at the same time allow it to be undermined. So an enormous work on co-ordinating the railways, on the basis of electrification, has already been done in Market countries.

This is hardly in line with the Market treaty, which envisages a completely competitive transport system being set up, in which, as *The Times Review of Industry* (May 1962) expresses it: “the formulation of laws ensuring the same conditions of free competition as exist in other sectors of the Common Market economy”—will be the rule.

However, all of the governments in the Market are beginning to express doubts about this. They are, for example, opposing the removal of all subsidies and are doubtful of giving citizens of Market countries the right to set up road transport undertakings anywhere within the Market. The governments of France, Luxembourg and West Germany state, according to the *Times Review*: “that the general rules under which competition is governed within the Community do not apply to transport.” It seems also that some of the Market states are subsidising rail transport on social grounds, a policy rejected by Macmillan, Marples and Beeching. The outcome of the struggle, which is just opening, is uncertain, but it should be noted that up to this moment no West European state is so stupid that it subsidises the railways with one hand while sabotaging them with the other. Such idiocy is the special characteristic of the British Tories.

Alan Bush's Byron Symphony

Alan Bush, who for political reasons is denied adequate recognition in his own country, has had another triumph in the German Democratic Republic, where his *Byron Symphony* received its world première in April by the Leipzig Radio Orchestra and Choir conducted by Herbert Kegel. This is an odd reversal of the Victorian situation, when it was assumed that good music could be heard in England only by importing it from Germany.

After the performance application was immediately made for a performance in June in Halle at the Handel Festival—a signal honour for a contemporary English composer.

The subject of the symphony is the life and personality of Lord Byron, fighter for freedom, told in four movements. In the first movement passages from Byron's youth are referred to; in the second, the poet's appearance before the House of Lords in an attempt to prevent the passing of a brutal law directed against factory workers; the third movement shows Byron in the house of Countess Teresa Guiccoli in Bologna, the one woman he really loved; the finale describes the poet's journey to Greece, his struggle and death at the side of the Greeks fighting for independence from the Turks.

Professor Ernst Meyer, musicologist and composer of the remarkable *Mansfeld Oratorio*, has sent us an analysis of the work. Professor Meyer spent many years in England before and during the war and wrote the authoritative work *English Chamber Music*. He has a deep understanding of English music. He writes:

"The technique used in the music is not so much of the traditional 'programme' music type but is of a more distinctive kind, as Alan Bush introduces the hero himself in his emotional experiences, portraying traits in his character and mentality rather than depicting concrete objects or phenomena from his life.

"Like Alan Bush's earlier works, his new symphony is of great individual strength, and of an outspokenly national English quality. There are touches of English folk-tunes; there are reminiscences of British and international working-class choral songs (including Alan Bush's own); there are also elements of the English symphonic idiom as it stands out since Vaughan Williams, Ireland and Holst. However, the tension that holds the listener captive throughout the four movements derives chiefly from Bush's own creative genius and personality, from his very original symphonic diction, from his artistic integrity, from the clarity of his conception of history, from the power and optimism of Marxist philosophy. His music is intensely melodic and with all its fine, intricate polyphonic texture, it is certain to have an immediate appeal to popular audiences.

"The writer of this report was particularly impressed by the second movement (where, incident-

ally, there is just one touch of 'Tonmalerei' when scenes in the House of Lords, as well as Byron's own dignified and passionate speech, are presented) and most of all by the choral last movement, the longest and weightiest of the symphony, at the same time heroic and dramatic. Here Bush's work reaches new heights, which makes the *Byron Symphony* one of the most important contributions to contemporary orchestral music."

The work will receive an amateur performance at the Friends' Meeting House in London under Leslie Head, who was present at the Leipzig performance, on June 6th.

It is a pity to end on a sour note, but we have to record the fact that, although nine countries broadcast the performance, the B.B.C. did not, nor, so far as we know, are they preparing to broadcast a recording.

Music and Life

We strongly recommend to our readers the second issue of 1962 of *Music and Life*, published by the Music Group of the Communist Party. Besides interesting articles on "Mozart and the Brotherhood of Man" (Katherine Thomson) and "The Division of Music—Delius and German" (Tom Russell), of special interest is the "Plan for Music in Britain" put out for discussion as a sort of supplement to *The British Road to Socialism*. The plan is in three parts, the first dealing with the position of music in capitalist Britain, the second outlining certain immediate steps for the improvement of the position, and the third dealing with music under socialism. It discusses the question of patronage:

"The extent of public patronage is limited by at least three things: ignorance by the public of the facilities that do exist, lack of demand because the level of education and taste is low, but, above all, by the wasteful and disproportionate amount of public spending which goes into the unproductive and unnecessary field of armaments . . . socialists believe that facilities for people's all-round development should be made available in our rich society so that people would be encouraged to use them."

It then goes on to discuss the position of the amateur, of the professional musician, of musical education, of modern trends in composition, and of jazz. Very striking are the figures given on the extent of amateur musical organisations—the 640 amateur societies affiliated to the National Federation of Music Societies, of which a large proportion are symphony orchestras, the brass bands, with a registered membership of 750,000, the choral singing groups, the 600 amateur operatic societies.

Putting forward proposals for immediate reform, the document makes the demand not only for more money for the Arts Council, but, simultaneously, for a democratisation of the organisations which should distribute the money:

“At the same time as we press for more money for the Arts Council, we also press for a change in its Constitution, so that representatives of artists, amateur bodies, and perhaps of local councils, sit alongside representatives appointed by the government. This also applies to the B.B.C. . . . there should also be set up again Regional Arts Councils, which were abolished some years ago on the ground of economy. And it should be part of the Arts Councils’ Constitution that a high proportion of its spending should be outside London.”

The plan recommends more use by local authorities of Clause 132 of the Local Government Act, which enables them to spend up to a 6d. rate on the arts and allows them to build theatres and concert halls. It presses for a Ministry of Education schedule of musical studies, which it should be the aim of all schools to integrate with the rest of the curriculum, with an adequate number of teachers to do so. It then proceeds to treat of problems of taxation, publishing, broadcasting and television and music in the working-class movement. At the end it discusses the spread and flourishing of music under socialism:

“Art centres will spring up everywhere, sponsored either by the trade unions or the municipality, and more and more people will be brought into an appreciation and love of music in all its forms. In music, as in other things, the day of ‘free for all’, which really means ‘free for a few’ will die and the era of co-operation and ‘each for all’ will commence.”

The Music Group, who prepared the plan, are asking for comments and criticism and we are confident that many will be proffered. We should like to congratulate the Group on its activities. It would be very important and interesting to see similar draft plans for other fields of culture, like the visual arts, architecture, films, the theatre, etc.

Aid for Spain

World history was changed by the long struggle (1936–39) of the Spanish people against Franco and his fascist backers—Hitler and Mussolini. The widespread solidarity and actions of support, marked by their unity and clear purpose, exercised a deep influence on the attitude of many people all over the world; many, indeed, came into progressive activity and towards political understanding for the first time in connection with those heroic “Spain days”.

Last autumn, men who had fought in the Italian International Brigade twenty-five years ago and who were now in various political parties—radical, socialist and communist—came together to commemorate the Spanish struggle. They decided then to convene in Rome (April 13th–14th, 1962) an international conference of representatives to discuss how to help the Spanish people gain their liberty from Franco fascism.

Representatives came from thirty countries. They

included leading figures from many Communist Socialist and Liberal parties, poets, painters, lawyers, trade unionists; from Britain there came members from the Liberal, Labour and Communist parties. Very significant was the Spanish delegation—leaders from groups of political exiles, writers, lawyers and well-known personalities of the Spanish Republican Government.

In such a meeting it was inevitable that there should be some looking back, some pang of conscience for insufficient effort, some shame at mistakes. But looking back also revived the feeling of the strength that comes from unity, the feeling of élan and dedication which marked the movement of the “Spain days”. So the sense of the meeting was to do more to help the Spanish people, to make their cause once again that of the whole progressive democratic world. This feeling was strengthened by the news, messages and greetings, coming from inside Spain, showing the virtual isolation of the Franco Fascist régime, the growing opposition reaching out to the very widest circles and more and more finding the way to united action.

The Rome Conference decided unanimously to strengthen the struggle outside Spain, to help the struggle inside, co-ordinating activities and exchanging information, aiming to prevent any help to Franco or any recognition of Franco by international organisations, thus helping to bring about the complete isolation of the Franco régime.

This conference was significant because of its broad enthusiastic unity against an “old” fascist régime. It will stimulate the taste for similar unity against any would-be “new” fascist set-up.

“Amnesty!”

Meanwhile, there are more and more reports from Spain itself of growing resistance—great miners’ strikes spreading from the Asturias to other areas, and to other industries, struggles of the students and professional workers for democratic rights.

Something both of the poverty and depression in Franco Spain, as well as of the growing resistance, was witnessed recently by the delegation of three British miners representing the National Union of Miners (N.U.M.) of South Wales, Kent and Derbyshire, whose account of their journey (*British Miners Report*) has been published by the “Appeal for Amnesty in Spain”, 21A Pembridge Mews, London, W.11.

When they reached the Asturias they found 60,000 miners on strike and the coalfield at a complete standstill. All news of the strike had been kept from the Spanish press. “Police and Civil Guards,” they wrote, “were very much in evidence . . . all of them armed.” Already at that moment the local miners had been on strike for six days, and others in different

areas for twenty-one days. It was a strike for wages, or, more realistically, as local miners put it to the delegates, "a strike to allow us to live". The delegates found that the basic wage being paid for an eight-hour day was around 4s. 9d. *per day*.

"The poverty in the homes we visited was all too evident. All three of us had been boys in mining villages during the years of the depression, but even the poverty of this does not compare with what we saw here."

They told of many cases of political imprisonment, and ended their report with an earnest appeal for increased efforts "to obtain total amnesty for all political prisoners".

Labour Research Department: Fifty Years

The May number of *Labour Research*, monthly journal of the Labour Research Department, contains an eight-page account of how the Department was started in 1912 and of its development in the fifty years since. The record of its work is at the same time a brief history of the principal struggles of the Labour movement during this period; the Labour Research Department provided many trade unions with the facts and arguments they needed to support their case before the employers and the Government, as well as constantly publishing in its monthly journal and in pamphlets material of general use to the movement. Its "Labour and Capital" booklets—studies of the position in various industries—and the "Imperialism" series examining British imperialist interests in a number of colonies; its "L.R.D. White Papers" on subjects of current interest; and its hundreds of other publications on industrial, economic, and social issues, have played an important part in the development and consolidation of the British Labour movement.

The value of the work done by the Labour Research Department can be appreciated from the fact that in its fiftieth year it has affiliated to it 52 national trade unions, 91 district trade union bodies, 456 trade union branches, 186 shop stewards' committees, 90 trades councils, and 46 co-operative and

other organisations—a total of over 900 affiliated bodies.

"With such support," the L.R.D. statement on its fiftieth anniversary concludes, "we can face the next fifty years with confidence."

Marxism in Canada

We are glad to announce the first issue of the Canadian *Marxist Quarterly* (published by Progress Books, Toronto), edited by Stanley Ryerson.

In recent years some very useful work has been done by Canadian Marxists on the study of the class structure of Canada, the character and development of finance capital, on the origins of Canadian capitalism and on the special features of the Canadian two-nation state. A major impetus to these studies came, in fact, from the debates and discussions held under the aegis of the Canadian Communist Party when elaborating their long-term programme—*The Road to Socialism in Canada*. This first issue contains interesting articles on the development of Canadian thought. One, by the Editor, treats the development of social philosophy in the course of the nineteenth century, and another, by a Soviet philosopher, V. V. Mshvenieradze, discusses the development of Canadian philosophy in the same period.

The Canadian Marxist Study Centre has begun to organise an archive and library of material related to the history of the Canadian Labour movement. And *The Marxist Quarterly* reproduces, with their help, some interesting examples of early documents of the Communist Party and the Trade Union movement. One of the features of the journal will be to see that the memories of the pioneers of militant labour struggle are not lost to the movement, and they already publish in this issue two autobiographical articles, one on the British Expeditionary Force in Europe in 1915, and the other on the pioneering days of the Communist Party. The author of this latter, E. R. Fay, started his political activities at the Liverpool May Day parades of 1893 and 1894. Indeed, these studies are of special interest in view of the very close personal links between the British and Canadian Labour movements.

Latin America

Nan Green

LATIN AMERICA has more cultivable, high-yield tropical soil than any other continent, at least three times as much agricultural land per head of population as Asia, the largest timber reserves in the world. It possesses tremendous potential energy in oil and hydro-electric power, while vast mineral reserves—iron, copper, tin, gold, lead, zinc, almost every known metal—lie buried in its soil. Chile's copper deposits are known to be larger than in any other part of the world; Venezuela is the world's biggest exporter of oil; Brazil has 25 per cent of the world's iron-ore reserves.

Yet of its 200 million people, more than half are undernourished and illiterate, owning nothing but their simple clothing and rickety household possessions. Literally millions of children who desire education can get none. In Brazil half the population goes barefoot; only one in three children can go to primary school and one in six to secondary school; every sixth person has goitre; one in three has intestinal hookworms.

In Mexico half the population gets its nourishment almost exclusively from maize; eight out of ten rural houses are made of mud, and over half have neither plumbing nor water supply. In Paraguay 68 per cent of the town dwellers are without water supply. Brazil's average life-span is forty-six years compared with seventy years in the United States. Chile's infant mortality rate per 1,000 live births is 117, Ecuador's is 106, Colombia's is 96, compared with the United States' 26.4. Fifty-five out of every 100 Nicaraguan children die before their fifth birthday. Among pre-school children in the continent as a whole, the mortality rate is ten to forty times higher than in the United States. Haiti has 0.6 hospital beds per 1,000 population: the United States has 9.2. Adult illiteracy in Guatemala and Nicaragua is 70 per cent. In Haiti it is 89.5 per cent.

Except for Venezuela, where it is relatively—but only relatively—high, annual *per capita* income in the continent ranges from £127 per head in Chile to £33 in Paraguay, Haiti and Uruguay. During 1960, population in Latin America increased five times more rapidly than the total production of goods and services; the total population of the continent doubled between 1920 and 1956 and is now increasing at a rate of 2.5 per year, the highest in the world.

As to whether this miserable picture is improving or the reverse, here are a few headlines from only two newspapers (the *London Times* and the *New York Times*) in the first five weeks of 1962: *Brazilian*

Failure to Cope with Economic Crisis, Two Argentine Ministers Resign—Financial Crisis, Armed Troops out in Santo Domingo—Anti-Government Clashes, 23 Killed in Venezuela Disorders—Threat to Regime, State of Siege in Guatemala, Slump Expected to Hold in Uruguay, Price Dip Rocks Ecuador, Bolivia Seeking Funds to Avoid Collapse. To understand the nature of this problem, it is necessary to go briefly into the continent's history.

History

It was the historical fate of the Latin American countries to win their national freedom from Iberian (Spanish and Portuguese) colonialism, after fierce and glorious battles, when capitalism was starting to carve up the world at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The movement for national freedom, led by slave-owning landowners of the Creole aristocracy (Creole here means people of European descent born in Latin America), stopped short at the achievement of formal independence, leaving a semi-slave, semi-feudal economy with a nascent merchant capital. Predominantly agrarian countries in which pre-capitalist relations prevailed, they had barely begun to develop their own national capitalism when they fell into the economic clutches of imperialism, which was just starting to export capital at a tremendous rate. By the end of the nineteenth century the semi-slave economy had disappeared, the semi-feudal economy had to some extent been restricted, the industrial and commercial bourgeoisie was expanding and a new stage of political struggle began in which the bourgeoisie sought to win political power. But in no instance did this struggle acquire the character of a democratic revolution, with the exception of Mexico in 1911, which then stagnated.

At the beginning of the present century, Britain was the main imperialist intruder, except in Cuba. By the eve of the First World War, Britain had 4,984 million dollars (U.S.) invested in Latin America as against 1,242 million by the U.S., the bulk of the latter being in Cuba and the Caribbean. Following the First World War, the United States started to step up its investments, and more particularly its loans, in the rest of the continent. By 1928 the figures of U.S. and British investments were roughly equal: Britain had 5,891 million and the U.S. 5,587 million dollars. French and German imperialism were also exploring for markets. But by the end of the Second World War, U.S. invest-