when they arise. Well it seems to us folks that we do get around to dealing with them but that inevitably we find that nobody's interested in them any longer. They've gone on and other problems have replaced them. And by and large, what it seems to me as a propagandist, is that some of these things are talked about only as long as the newspapers want them to be talked about. People take an interest in them and feel that you ought to have a view on them. Of course we've got a view on them, but naturally our view is not palatable to a great number, particularly our view on Apartheid. We don't believe in struggling for the right of the Black worker to enjoy the same dubious privileges as do the White workers. That is of course anathema to a number of our critics who only have time for such activity and no time for propagating socialism.

But nevertheless, it does seem that problems like Apartheid, nuclear weapons and so on come and go, while one or two old faithful problems remain. In general people are concerned about unemployment and insecurity. They are also concerned about war in a general way. And they are concerned with the social unhappiness and the social ugliness and whilst we can say that in general, capitalism hasn't changed, it has got a bit more complicated. We aren't, as it were, presented with a ready made set of circumstances. We haven't got unemployment on a mass scale; we haven't got war at the moment that we can deal with and at least to some extent, capitalism is a more complicated system than it was shall we say, in 1904. This merely means that the responsibility for trying to analyze it falls more heavily on the socialist parties throughout the world. It seems that it's entirely our responsibility and nobody else's if capitalism becomes more complicated. We've got to spend more time in unravelling it and trying to make its problems more palatable to the listener or to the reader of our journals, and so on. So that in the long run, we've got to deal with this more complicated type of capitalism and try and show it up as the same old capitalism of the early 1900s.

Well, as I mentioned, we've got the same old problem and eventually when we've argued our case we get the same old objections — "human nature" and we get the "lazyman" argument, which is the "human nature" objection with a false beard. And we also get all the other inevitable, what appear to be catastrophic, objections to socialism. Well, I don't doubt that we can deal with these and we do deal with them and the fact that they are active and come up regularly just merely goes to demonstrate the uniformity of ideas that exist among most members of the working class.

Since I've been in America we've had the General Election which I needn't remind you is on a par with your Presidential election, a smaller edition of the American presidential elections, and we had the usual chatterboxing match between the political parties. Harold Macmillan, the Prime Minister "abolished" the Class Struggle and then we discovered in December that the largest number of workers ever, came out on strike. There were more strikes in 1959 than ever over questions of wages and working conditions so that at least the Class Struggle may have been abolished on paper or in speechmaking by Macmillan, but it was very real in the form of strikes and lockouts, which as you know is the economic manifestation of the Class Struggle.

Again, later on in the year, we had rising unemployment — not much — but rising slowly, and last week we had the spectacle of one of the largest car firms — Messrs. Vauxhall — shutting down a portion of their plant and cutting the price of cars by about $300.00. One of the peculiar reasons given for this, something that could only happen in capitalist society, was that the Vauxhall workers in the past 10 to 15 years hadn't gone on strike, but had a happy and harmonious labor relationship with the bosses, and to that extent had maintained full production. Hence the production of that particular model had exceeded the demand for it — so workers were being put on short time and the threat of unemployment hung over them. On the other hand, that good old faithful American firm, Henry Ford, who have a large factory outside London are enjoying full order books. They're not cutting the price of their cars and the reason they give is that they're falling behind in production. The reason why they are in this happy condition is that their workers have gone on strike once or twice a year and to that extent their order book is behind, supplies are behind and all because of these workers who have been going on strike and who have not been attending work as regularly and as constantly as the Vauxhall workers. So it seems to us that the paradox is obvious, that if you work hard you work yourself out of a job, while going on strike, in the long run, even within the limitations of that aspect of the Class Struggle, is a more useful proposition for the workers and bosses alike. But you can work it out, we've given up hope in England, of being able to make sense out of this sheer anarchistic form of production.

Well, my comrades, I'd like to close by wishing you a most successful Conference. From my point of view anyway the spreading of socialist propaganda is the most useful thing that anybody can do and therefore it is always difficult to distinguish between the doing of it—the anticipation of socialism—and its realization. Or as Stevenson says, sometimes its as well to travel as to arrive. And that is the view that most of us in the Party take — that the pleasure and the satisfaction of propagating socialist ideas probably is only on a par with the achievement of socialism itself.

ROOM AT THE TOP

The caption reads: "Plight of Small Business Held Worse Than 30s." The New York Times of 4-17-60 reports that small businesses are steadily disappearing and there are more vacant stores on main streets of the United States now than during the height of the depression of the nineteen-thirties, according to a House committee member.

Representative Tom Steed (Oklahoma) of the Small Business Dairy Subcommittee has expressed alarm at what he described as a trend toward the direction of large business and monopolies in the last decade. The Oklahoma Democrat and others have introduced two bills to strengthen the parts of the anti-trust laws administered by the Federal Trade Commission.

"My personal view and that of some of my colleagues is that until we get this kind of additional law, the trend of the last ten to twenty years against the American economy's small business community will continue unabated to the end that this part of our economy, as we have known it, will cease to exist," Mr. Steed said.

Now Tom, old boy, you mean well, and no doubt you are not kidding us. You are probably a good Tom, and no more naive than those whose votes sent you to Washington, D. C. to tilt at windmills. We are willing to bet you a quart of Oklahoma hooch, though, that you cannot arrest the inexorable process that is relegating small business to the limbo of early-Americana.

The fancied ace in the hole of Marx critics has been their contention that Marx was wrong in pointing out the inevitable elimination of the middle man. These shoddy economists, by mathematical legerdemain, proved only to their own satisfaction that the small businessmen were increasing in numbers. Actually, whether it be the small manufacturer, farmer, or little storekeeper, the "entrepreneurs" are being rapidly shunted into the ranks of the hired workers.

Manufacturing necessitates an ever-increasing investment in new labor-saving devices. The cutting of production costs is mandatory to compete in the markets. Electronic devices, which are cost cutters, become a dire need. Those lacking means or outside financing are soon eliminated. Those