

# The Week

SPECIAL  
REPORT

## War Crimes Tribunal Meets in London

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS

6<sup>D</sup>

VOL. 6 No. 18 17th Nov. 1966

### WELCOME TO THE WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL!

We publish on page four an extremely important document. It is the statement of aims adopted the first meeting of the Tribunal to investigate the allegation of war crimes in Vietnam. This Tribunal brings together a collection of left wing intellectuals, jurists and writers of a most impressive calibre. Three of the world's greatest men hold the most important offices: Bertrand Russell, president; Jean Paul Sartre, executive president; and Vladimir Dedijer, chairman. Other members of the Tribunal include: Lelio Basso, Simone de Beauvoir, Lazaro Cardenas, Isaac Deutscher, Gunther Anders. (we shall publish next week a full list of the members with biographical details, etc.).

The Tribunal has many enemies (not all of them from the American State Department, to put it mildly) and the bringing together of these people on a common understanding was a great achievement. The American authorities have let it be known that they are very angry with the French Government for not banning the Tribunal activities on French soil. In this country the capitalist press acts in a disgusting way by its malicious reports and downright distortions. Their hatred of the Tribunal is self-revealing; they fear its verdict and understand the value of this operation against reactionary propaganda. The opposition of certain sections of the labour movement has more complicated origins but is just as determined and devious. The left must respond by giving this Tribunal the full help it can, by opposing all the arguments, including the subtle ones against it.

## CONTENTS

Page 1	Editorial.	Page 2	Contents and announcements.
" 3	Political notes.	" 4	Tribunal document.
" 5	Tribunal document.	" 6	Monopoly Capitalism.
" 7	Monopoly Capitalism	" 8	Government meanness to deaf.

## NOTES ABOUT THE WEEK

### The Week to move to London

Within the next few weeks, and certainly well before the end of the year, production of The Week will be transferred to London. This move has been under discussion for some time but has been held up by various technical problems. This move will bring many advantages: it will be easier to bring out issues oriented to political events in London, certain sponsors and supporters who live in London will find it easier to take part in the editorial work and sales will rise because we can get our journal more easily into London bookshops. There will, however, be some teething problems: we have built up in Nottingham a really devoted team of voluntary workers who work very hard and efficiently, it will take us some time to build up such a team in London. We would appeal to all London subscribers and readers to consider if they can help in any way and contact us. Telephone either Geoff. Coggan (WHI 4209), Pat Jordan (FRO 3138) or Ken Tarbuck (806 7592)

### Discussions about the future of The Week

It has been suggested from several quarters that The Week should become a co-operatively owned limited company, with shareholders' meetings and a formal structure. No decision has been taken about these suggestions and, indeed, none can be taken until the supporters of the journal have thoroughly discussed them. If any supporter of our journal has any ideas on this matter, or would like to ensure that his point of view is considered on this question, please write in.

### Jumble sale raises £15 for The Week

Taking advantage of the experience of many other organisations, Nottingham supporters of The Week organised a jumble sale for the journal last Saturday. It was an outstanding success and completely sold out. In fact, so successful was it that people had to have their admission money returned because three times as many people came as were expected! We hope other local groups of supporters will examine this method of making money for us.

REMINDER! REMINDER! REMINDER! REMINDER! REMINDER! REMINDER! REMINDER!

There will be a bottle party to raise funds for The Week at 31a, Maury Rd., Stoke Newington, this Saturday, November 19th. commencing at 7.30 p.m. ring 806 7592 for details how to get there, etc.

MONTHLY REVIEW - an independent socialist organ of the American left.

Has established in London an office of its monthly magazine and publishing house, where you can buy Monopoly Capital (see page 6) and other MR Press books.

50s for a one-year subscription to Monthly Review

62s. for Monopoly Capital by Baran/Sweezy.

Subscribe now and save money by buying new MR Press books at prepublication prices. Write to: Monthly Review Press, 33-7, Moreland St., London E.C.1.

"Mark Lane may start court action to have the photographic evidence from the autopsy on President Kennedy made public.

"Mr. Lane, the New York lawyer, whose book "Rush to Judgement" criticises the findings of the inquiry into President Kennedy's assassination, says that if the Government does not permit examination of the photographs and other evidence, he will bring an action in the Federal court.

"The X-rays and photographs were turned over last week by the Kennedy family to the national archives in Washington with stipulations restricting public viewing for the lifetime of the late President's widow, parents, brothers, sisters and children.

"The pictures may be examined after five years by recognized experts, with the family's permission. Government investigating bodies may view them at any time. In a statement, Mr. Lane criticized the handing over of the X-rays and pictures to the archives. This action, he said, officially confirmed that the Warren Commission, which inquired into the assassination "failed to examine some of the most relevant and vital documents in the case."

HOW TO MAKE £3 MILLION-TAX FREE - BY "KEEPING OUT"

from Dave Windsor

The following law report from The Times of November 4th is an example of the inner workings of capitalism:

"His Lordship dismissed with costs this appeal by the Crown from a decision of the Special Commissioners of Income Tax that £3,140,000 received by I.C.I. from five European and two Japanese companies under the provisions of agreements enabling those companies to manufacture and sell in various foreign countries products equivalent to the products manufactured and sold by ICI here under the name Terylene did not fall to be assessed to income tax under Case I of Schedule D on the ground that the sums received were capital. In 1941, Mr. J.R. Whinefield and Dr. I.T. Dickson, two research chemists employed by Calico Printers Association, invented a method of producing Terylene polymers and manufacturing them so that they had special qualities of strength and pliability. C.P.A. took out patents in the United Kingdom and abroad but was too small a company to develop the invention commercially. Accordingly, in 1947, C.P.A. granted I.C.I. an exclusive licence to exploit the patents throughout the world except the United States, for a period of 20 years or the duration of the patents. In the next few years I.C.I. expended much money on research in developing the invention, took out ancillary patents and started commercial production. The possibilities were so great that it was clear that I.C.I. could not meet the overseas demand from Britain; quite apart from the huge capital that the establishment of foreign plants would have required from I.C.I. it was doubtful whether at that time, 1952-53, Treasury consent for the foreign exchange required would have been forthcoming. I.C.I., therefore, entered into agreements with five European companies, Rhodiaceta in France, Montecatini in Italy, Hoechst Glanzstoff in Germany, and A.K.U. in Holland under which I.C.I. granted exclusive licences in the licensee's country and also undertook not to compete in those countries in the manufacture and selling of products of a Terylene character whether made under the patents or not.

## THE AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE TRIBUNAL\*

The conscience of mankind is profoundly disturbed by the war being waged in Vietnam. It is a war in which the world's wealthiest and most powerful state is opposed to a nation of poor peasants, who have been fighting for their independence for a quarter of a century. It appears that this war is being waged in violation of international law and custom.

Every day, the world press and, particularly, that of the United States, publishes reports which, if proved, would represent an ever growing violation of the principles established by the Nuremburg Tribunal and rules fixed by international agreements.

Moved and shocked by the suffering endured by the Vietnamese people and convinced that humanity must know the truth in order to deliver a serious and impartial judgement on the events taking place in Vietnam and where the responsibility for them lies, we have accepted the invitation of Bertrand Russell to meet, in order to examine these facts scrupulously and conform them with the rules of law which govern them.

It has been alleged that in the first nine months of 1966, the air force of the United States has dropped, in Vietnam, four million pounds of bombs daily. If it continues at this rate to the end of the year, the total will constitute a greater mass of explosives than it unloaded on the entire Pacific theatre during the whole of the Second World War. The area bombarded in this way is no bigger than the states of New York and Pennsylvania. In the South, the U.S. forces and their docile Saigon allies have herded eight million people, peasants and their families, into barbed wire encampments under the surveillance of the political police. Chemical poisons have been, and are being, used to defoliate and render barren tens of thousands of acres of farmland. Crops are being systematically destroyed - and this in a country where, even in normal times, the average man or woman eats less than half the food consumed by the average American (and lives to less than one third of his age).

Irrigation systems are deliberately disrupted. Napalm, phosphorus bombs and a variety of other, sadistically designed and hitherto unknown weapons are being used against the population of both North and South Vietnam. More than five hundred thousand Vietnamese men, women and children have perished under this onslaught, more than the number of soldiers the United States lost in both world wars, although the population of Vietnam had already been decimated during the Japanese and French occupations and the famine which followed the Second World War.

Even though we have not been entrusted with this task by any organised authority, we have taken the responsibility in the interest of humanity and the preservation of civilisation. We act on our own accord, in complete independence from any government and any official or semi-official organisation, in the firm belief that we express a deep anxiety and remorse felt by many of our fellow humans in many countries. We trust that our action will help to arouse the conscience of the world.

Continued over/

\* Document adopted by the first meeting of the Tribunal to investigate the allegation of war crimes in Vietnam.

We, therefore, consider ourselves a Tribunal which, even if it has not the power to impose sanctions, will have to answer, amongst others, the following questions:

1. Has the United States Government (and the Governments of Australia, New Zealand and South Korea) committed acts of aggression according to international law?
2. Has the American Army made use of or experimented with new weapons or weapons forbidden by the laws of war (gas, special chemical products, napalm, etc.)?
3. Has there been bombardment of targets of a purely civilian character, for example, hospitals, schools, sanatoria, dams, etc., and on what scale has this occurred?
4. Have Vietnamese prisoners been subjected to inhuman treatment forbidden by the laws of war and, in particular, to torture or to mutilation? Have there been unjustified reprisals against the civilian population, in particular, the execution of hostages?
5. Have forced labour camps been created, has there been deportation of the population or other acts tending to the extermination of the population and which can be characterised juridically as acts of genocide?

If the Tribunal decides that one, or all, of these crimes have been committed, it will be up to the Tribunal to decide who bears the responsibility for them.

This Tribunal will examine all the evidence that may be placed before it by any source or party. The evidence may be oral, or in the form of documents. No evidence relevant to our purposes will be refused attention. No witness competent to testify about the events with which our enquiry is concerned will be denied a hearing.

The National Liberation Front of Vietnam and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam have assured us of their willingness to co-operate, to provide the necessary information, and to help us in checking the accuracy and reliability of the information. The Cambodian head of state, Prince Sihanouk, has similarly offered to help by the production of evidence. We trust that they will honour this pledge and we shall gratefully accept their help, without prejudice to our own views or attitude. We renew, as a Tribunal, the appeal which Bertrand Russell has addressed in his name to the Government of the United States. We invite the Government of the United States to present evidence or cause it to be presented, and to instruct their officials or representatives to appear and state their case. Our purpose is to establish - without fear of favour - the full truth about this war. We sincerely hope that our efforts will contribute to the world's justice, to the re-establishment of peace and the liberation of oppressed peoples.

#### RESOLUTION OF THE TRIBUNAL

We are grateful to the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation for the work which it has already done. We are sure that the preliminary steps already taken by it will help us to complete our task within a reasonable time and with considerable more efficiency than it would have been possible if its preliminary work had not helped our deliberations.

NOTE TO WEEK SUBSCRIBERS This issue is four pages smaller than usual and has come out a day late. The explanation for this simple: a large part of our technical staff has been helping with the technical work of the War Crimes Tribunal in London. Next week we shall have extra pages to make up.

Ed.note: This recently published book has, up to now, attracted little notice in the review columns of the capitalist press, and almost no discussion in the socialist press. The Week can claim with some justification that it recognised the importance of this book by organising the first public discussion on it in London on June 24th this year. We return to the subject because we feel that some of the issues raised in the book are of importance to all serious socialists.

This book is a revisionist work in the very best tradition of that very overworked phrase. It sets out, boldly, to examine the present stage of monopoly capitalism and in the process tries to arrive at an adequate theory of its laws. In doing so the authors felt that they had to revise certain of Marx's concepts, or, rather, to question the validity of their application today. But this they attempt to do on the basis of general Marxist theory and not by contradicting or opposing Marxism. It is perhaps this aspect of the book that gives it some of its novel and most interesting aspects.

The crux of the problem is that they see the analysis that Marx gave as being based upon a competitive model of capitalism and that monopoly is only seen in this context as being marginal to the analysis. They argue that previous attempts by Marxists to analyse monopoly have failed because they were rooted in the competitive model, and not because of their assumption that monopoly is today the dominant feature of capitalism and that new assumptions and new analytical tools are therefore required.

The main revision that they undertake is that of dropping the concept of surplus value and substituting for it the concept of 'economic surplus', which they define as "the difference between what a society produces and the cost of producing it". This may appear to be merely a play on words, and a relatively simple concept. However, it is far more than this, and the actual computation of the economic surplus is today a highly complex and exacting task. Why they undertook this revision was because ".... in a highly developed monopoly capitalist society, the surplus assumes many forms and disguises. .... It is for that reason we prefer the concept 'surplus' to the traditional Marxian 'surplus value', since the latter is probably identified in the mind of most people familiar with Marxian economic theory as being equal to the sum of profits + interest + rent. .... It is our contention that under monopoly capitalism this procedure is no longer justified, and we hope that a change in terminology will help to effect the needed shift in the theoretical position". (page 6)

This shift in theoretical position is probably the one that will give rise to the greatest controversy around this book. The usefulness or otherwise of the introduction of this new concept will, in my opinion, depend on how one uses it. If, as I think they do, Baran and Sweezy use the theory to suggest that crises will tend to disappear or become merely residual under monopoly capitalism, this could lead to serious errors of judgement. If, however, one uses the concept to demonstrate the fundamental irrationality of the system, then it becomes an additional powerful weapon of analysis. The book puts forward the idea of a rising economic surplus as being the distinguishing characteristic of the monopoly era of capitalism: this is brought forward in distinction to the law of tendency of the decline in the rate of profit that has a central place in traditional

Marxian economics. The generation and disposal of this rising surplus is the major problem for monopoly capitalism according to their theory. One is left, however, with the impression that in fact this is not a qualitatively new problem for capitalism but a quantitative one. Marxists have never denied that capitalism has been a tremendous accumulator of material goods, nor that it would do other than prepare the material basis for the transition to socialism on a world scale. In fact they have maintained that this was accomplished decades ago. Moreover, the figures that Baran and Sweezy produce tend to reinforce the law of tendency to a decline in the rate of profit. They calculate that the economic surplus as defined by them rose as a percentage of Gross National Product, in the U.S., from 46.9 in 1929 to 56.1 in 1963. Surplus value, i.e. profit, rent and interest declined from 57.5 to 31.9.

Therefore, one would question the necessity for the sharp counterposing between what Baran and Sweezy call the old Marxian concepts and what they bring forward as new Marxian concepts. This is not to deny the very valuable contribution to our understanding that they have made. The data they produce, to verify their concept of the economic surplus, is most illuminating, both in relation to the U.S. economy specifically and, by implication, to monopoly capitalism in general. The actual analysis, rich and complex both in its more narrowly economic data and of the social relation/ conditions, is of such an order that it does not need the counterpointing that is introduced.

There are, however, a number of other defects that prevent it from being a rounded out analysis of the monopoly stage of capitalism, in the way that Marx gave one of the competitive stage of capitalism. The changes in all the advanced capitalist countries since the end of World War II have been characterised by a number of European Marxists as ushering in the period of neo-capitalism and neo-imperialism. These take into account a number of factors that in my opinion this book does not, or underplays them to a considerable extent, e.g. the changed nature of the trade cycle. The defects in "Monopoly Capital" stem partially from the analysis resting primarily on the American experience, (which the authors freely admit) and particularly the home scene. The forays into overseas questions, e.g. imperialist aggression, seem at times to be solely for the consumption of the economic surplus: in fact they argue that foreign investment is an unimportant element. This, to say the least, makes it a very odd explanation for imperialism. Moreover, I think there is a danger that conclusions of too general a nature are drawn about the nature of monopoly capitalism than are warranted by the material. Some of these defects stem, I think, from a lack of totality of view, and a failure to connect the still very important link between the export of capital and the pattern of imperialist aggression.

On the question of the pricing system of monopoly capitalism, the book advances no new ideas. The essential ideas of pricing under conditions of oligopoly, known as the kinked demand curve, are well known and orthodox - not that one necessarily disagrees with their conclusion, rather it is a little disappointing. One factor that I feel is insufficiently stressed is that under conditions of monopoly/oligopoly there is greater scope for exploitation of the workers, not only as producers but also as consumers, and that the greater the degree of monopoly the greater the chance for this.

Nevertheless, this is an exciting book. For all its defects it is a book by political economists, and Marxian-socialist ones to boot. It should not only have a place on our bookshelves, but also a place in our discussions for a long time to come.

MINISTRY DRAGS ITS FEET ON COMPENSATION FOR DEAFNESS from a special correspondent.

An example of the callous meanness of the Government in its desire to keep down costs is shown in the following item that appeared in the Sunday Times of November 6th:

"A major survey scheduled to take four years, into one of Britain's least-known industrial hazards - deafness caused by factory din - is now to take another two years, will cost almost twice as much as expected, and still may not produce any practical answers. So angry is the Trades Union Congress over what it regards as Government stalling on compensation for this industrial injury, known as occupational deafness, that it intends to press for meetings with the Ministers of Labour and Social Security to demand action. The TUC's medical advisers have decided that research shows no signs of answering practical questions: the most basic being, how may workers be afflicted? Nor, the TUC advisers think, are the project's fundamental investigations into the nature of deafness relevant to a political decision to compensate the sufferers.

The most acute sufferers are boilermakers, weavers, papermakers, quarry process workers, foundrymen and almost anyone in a heavy engineering shop, power station staff and aircraft engine mechanics. Nuclear power stations, for instance, far from the faintly-humming worlds of Wellsian imagining, are even noisier than conventional plants. At the behest of the Transport and General Workers' Union, the TUC is now surveying this particular clangour. But the Ministry of Social Security already paying out £80 million a year in sundry benefits, is in a dilemma. It fears that this could well be the first of a series of payments for afflictions so common that in the end the Ministry could be compensating for one ailment or another, almost the entire working population. "The unions haven't tumbled to failing eyesight yet, but they will" said one expert.

Dismissing as inadequate the copious research on occupational deafness - notably in America, Russia, France and Germany - the Ministry set up early in 1962 its own £65,000 research project. So far, the team has visited 26 factories and examined the ears of about 2,800 workers. Of these, about 600 are the main guinea-pigs; they started with perfect hearing, and its steady deterioration is being measured. To do this will now take another two years and cost £120,000. Even this, the Ministry of Social Security admits, may take the issue of compensation no further."

COVENTRY CSE PUTS DOWN DEEPER ROOTS

As a result of the highly successful car workers' meeting last week, at least 20 new members have been made. Mr. Jack Knight, the local convenor, who chaired the meeting, appealed for affiliations from shop stewards' committees. Already stewards' committees at Massey-Ferguson and Bristol-Siddeley have affiliated, together with the Coventry Trades Council. Mrs. Audrey Wise, the well-known left wing spokesman in USDAW, took the collection at the meeting. It realized £5.15.0d.