



A DIGEST OF NEWS AND VIEWS ON BRITAIN'S ECONOMY
AND OUR ROLE IN OVERSEAS TRADE AND PAYMENTS

Vol. 2, No. 5

September/October, 1972

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Facing the Truth	2
NOP Survey on the Common Market	4
The European Communities Bill	6
What hope for Commonwealth Sugar?	8
Technology, Inflation and the British Economy	10
Nationalism, Inter-nationalism and Supra- Nationalism	13
Readers' Commentary	15

Published bi-monthly

Editor: Edward Holloway

Published by Commonwealth Industries Association Ltd..

6/14 Dean Farrar Street, London SW1 HODX.

Subscription rates: U.K. £2 p.a. Australia \$5. Canada \$6. New Zealand \$5.
U.S.A. \$6.

FACING THE TRUTH

"We shall go into Europe as willing partners". So stated Lord Jellicoe, principal spokesman for the Government in the debate in the House of Lords on the European Communities Bill. If by "we" Lord Jellicoe meant the people of Britain, then surely he was wide of the mark. Even the most enthusiastic pro-European can hardly claim that the British people, or even those in industry who have supported the proposal to join the Six, are showing signs of that dynamism to which so much reference has been made in official circles.

As the White Paper (Cmnd. 4289) of February, 1970 put it—"There would be substantial advantage for British industry from membership of this new Common Market, stemming primarily from the opportunities for greater economies of scale, increased specialisation, a sharper competitive climate and faster growth. These may be described as the 'dynamic effects' of membership on British industry and trade."

In the present economic climate, with raging inflation, increasing unemployment, the collision between trades unions and Government on industrial relations and wages, the underlying unease of the electorate shown by recent public opinion polls, demonstrating beyond doubt that the great mass of people are convinced that the Government's proposals to join the E.E.C. conflict with their wishes, surely the advantages claimed for entry into the E.E.C. seem completely unattainable as well as unrealistic.

PROPOSAL GONE SOUR

The truth is that the whole proposal has gone sour, and this does make the Government's steam-roller tactics to take us into this venture highly dangerous.

So much hostility has been created and the feeling of bitterness and frustration by many millions of people will make it almost impossible to achieve that willing co-operation without which the vast changes in national, economic, social and political life cannot be achieved.

In Norway, where the people have been consulted by referendum, a highly literate and democratic people have turned their backs on Europe. The first National Opinion Poll taken in Britain since the Norwegian referendum demonstrates a remarkable swing against entry, as is shown on page 4 of this issue. With 51% of those consulted against entry, and only 31% for entry, no one can claim that this demonstrates whole-hearted support! **Most significant of all is the fact that 77% of those consulted want a referendum to be taken before entry. This clearly illustrates that the majority of the British electorate feel that the refusal to consult them before an issue of such fundamental importance is taken is an affront to our democratic way of life.**

LOSS OF SOVEREIGNTY

The mainspring of the opposition in Norway was the fear that membership of the Community would result in a serious loss of

sovereignty and that this would not be compensated for by any real or imagined economic benefits. The same fear is implicit in the increasing opposition to be found in Britain. Nowhere has this issue of sovereignty been better described than by Sir Arthur Bryant, the distinguished historian. Writing in the "Illustrated London News" in December 1966, he summarised the position thus:

"The over-riding objection to our joining the Common Market is not economic but political. The powers given by the Treaty of Rome to the supra-national administrators and technocrats who control the Market deprive the peoples whose rulers subscribe to it for exercising authority over many matters which have hitherto been decided, in the last resort, by popular will. The means by which the electorate in each successive generation expresses its will would no longer exist, for Parliament could not over-ride the powers entrusted in perpetuity to the supra-national authority created by the Treaty."

Every effort has been made by the authorities to conceal the truth of this statement from the people, but now the truth is out and concealment is no longer possible. While, on the one hand, the Government appeals for the support of the people for its policies against inflation, on the other hand it completely disregards public opinion in the even more important issue of joining the Community. They cannot have it both ways.

END OF AN ERA

In the meantime, the erosion of our vital trading partnerships with the Commonwealth is proceeding apace. Already the Australian Federal Government is proposing that the long-standing trade agreement between Britain and Australia should end on February 1, 1973. At the same time the Australian Government is proposing to lift the first of the preferences enjoyed by Britain under tariff protection laws. These proposals were described by an Opposition spokesman as "the end of an era."

New Zealand's preferences for British imports, with some exceptions, will be phased out between July 1, 1974 and June 30, 1977. Mr. Brian Talboys, N.Z. Minister of Overseas Trade, said that the ending of preferences over the three years followed Britain's decision to enter the E.E.C., and the termination of the U.K.-N.Z. trade agreement. It is significant that New Zealand will maintain the option of retaining preferential rates with other Commonwealth countries who are not entering the E.E.C.

Those who have claimed that by joining the Community Britain will be safeguarding the future of the Commonwealth should, by now, be having second thoughts, for increasingly the signs are appearing that the effect of these policies have soured the feeling of goodwill and kinship on the part of our older Commonwealth partners which we, in Britain, have taken too much for granted. An Australian correspondent writes that there is an increasing feeling of bitterness in that country,

and expressions like "Britain has given us away" come from most unlikely quarters.

Typical of letters appearing in the Australian press is the following: "England has seen fit to reject us by severing past ties, by joining the European Common Market and treating us as aliens. Right. Then let us stand on our own feet as a separate country. Let us be an independent nation and proud of it, and what's more, proud to show it."

In the circumstances such comments are understandable, but all who value the ties between Britain and the older Commonwealth countries must feel sad at heart that, as a result of Britain's action, such comments have become commonplace in a country whose association with us has been so mutually beneficial.

OPEN SEAS POLICY MUST BE MAINTAINED

Whatever happens on 1st January, 1973, when our accession to the European Community is due to take effect, our course is clear. **We must use all our endeavours to see that Britain's Open Seas policy is maintained and that attempts to narrow down our interests to a purely European role are resisted.** It is increasingly obvious that the areas of greatest future growth are in countries like Australia, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa, and it would be fatal for Britain to acquiesce in the setting up of regional blocks which exclude those areas where lie our best hope for future expansion.

In a recent article published in the "New Humanist", Lionel Gelber summarised the situation as follows:

"The United Kingdom is searching for ample economic opportunities. An alternative to Europeanization could be that freer trade which industrial countries may negotiate in 1973 or 1974. As for the European Community, it might yet discover that so reluctant an addition as the British people would be no asset. While treaties must be honoured, they can also be terminated by mutual consent. If Britain secedes from the European Community, she may not only extricate herself from courses of action that would be repugnant, she might also avoid that continental trap which must, willy-nilly, revolutionize her traditional character. It may not be too late to retrieve links with overseas countries of the Commonwealth and with the United States. In world politics as a whole, moreover, a British factor could acquire a new lease of life. And for it, even if diminished, there is still plenty to do."

N.O.P. SURVEY ON THE COMMON MARKET

NATIONAL OPINION POLLS LIMITED was commissioned by the Conservative Anti-Common Market Information Service to carry out a survey of electors in Great Britain on certain questions on Common Market entry.

Main Findings

- (1) 51% of adults now disapprove of Britain joining the Common Market. 31% approve.

- (2) The main change in attitudes has occurred amongst Conservatives. There has been a reduction from 61% approving entry in July, 1972 to 49% approving entry now.
- (3) 77% of adults think that Britain should have a referendum on the question of Common Market entry.
- (4) The main change in attitudes has occurred amongst Conservatives. There has been an increase from 56% wanting a referendum in April, 1972 to 63% wanting one now.

Q. Do you approve or disapprove of Britain joining the Common Market?

		July '72	Now
APPROVE	All	38%	31%
	Con	61%	49%
	Lab	23%	21%
	Lib	38%	30%
DISAPPROVE	All	46%	51%
	Con	29%	36%
	Lab	59%	61%
	Lib	46%	52%
DON'T KNOW	All	16%	18%
	Con	10%	15%
	Lab	17%	19%
	Lib	16%	18%

Q. As you probably know, when all the electors in a country are asked to vote on a particular question, it is called a referendum. Do you think there should be a referendum in this country on whether Britain should join the Common Market or not?

		April 1972	Now
YES	All	70%	77%
	Con	56%	63%
	Lab	83%	87%
	Lib	72%	87%
NO	All	25%	15%
	Con	40%	30%
	Lab	12%	8%
	Lib	23%	11%
DON'T KNOW	All	5%	7%
	Con	4%	7%
	Lab	5%	6%
	Lib	5%	2%

THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES BILL

THE FINAL STAGE

The final stage of the European Communities Bill took place in the House of Lords on 20th September, 1972. Moving that the Bill be now read a third time, Earl Jellicoe said, "Our debate today marks the final stage of the proceedings in Parliament on this Bill and indeed the final stage of consideration by the British Parliament of the large question of the accession of this country to the European Communities."

Rising to address the House as an un-repentant anti-Common Marketeer, Lord Blyton said—"Time has proved that this Bill is now getting its Third Reading with no Amendments to it: giving away the sovereignty of Britain and Parliament's control over its economy to faceless men on the Continent who in the years ahead will tell us what we have to do. We have to sit back and swallow it all, as we shall have no power residing in this country to counter any proposal that is detrimental to our economy. We have to swallow two volumes of Treaties, 43 volumes of Community law and eight volumes of subordinate treaties, in none of which have we had a voice and which were made to suit the Six on the Continent and their economy.

But the most important factor, more important than the treaties, is the fact that the British people now recognise that the broad effect of the treaty arrangements is damaging to us, and that the enterprise is going wrong even before we get in."

Lord Blyton concluded—"in this Bill we are throwing over the Commonwealth and are likely to wreck the economy of New Zealand. We are repudiating the principles of the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement without any regard of the effect it will have on the sugar-producing countries. We are ignoring and putting into jeopardy 120,000 of our people who are dependent on the fishing industry of the nation . . . This is the beginning of the disintegration of the Commonwealth."

VOTES WITHOUT VOICES

Lord Greenwood of Rossendale suggested that though the Government had won a victory it has been a victory of votes without voices. He said—"During the whole Report stage only a sprinkling of noble Lords opposite intervened, and some of them merely to interject. The rest of the 150 silent but voting Peers manfully choked back the eloquent speeches that we saw trembling on their lips, swallowed bravely the closely reasoned arguments they did not feel it proper to deploy, and kept under firm control the high ideals which made them turn their backs on the past and tramp like Trappists into the Government Lobby."

Referring to the Government's conduct over the Bill and the failure to consult the electorate, Lord Greenwood said this "will have weakened many people's adherence to our traditional form of political expression. When the effects are fully felt, the present Government will have to accept the responsibility for whatever form the public's revulsion and frustration takes."

The Earl of Lauderdale claimed that the alternative to the Common

Market was the Industrial Free Trade Area which the EFTA non-applicants have secured. "Such would have left Parliament unscathed; such would have left our self-government intact; such would have left our housewives free of food levies to the farmers of Gaul; such could have given us monetary co-operation on the lines of the old European Payments Union; such, I believe, would better suit the natural growth of industrial trade in the West; and above all, I believe, such would best befit our geographical opportunity, as an island athwart the Baltic mouth and the Rhine delta, to develop the West-East "Ocean-span" pattern of our deep-water assets and set about intercepting Europe's inward movement of raw materials, and then speed them on part-processed as they go. It is true that a Free Trade Area would deny us participation in Community decisions; but even Commission sources admit to a quarter and maybe nearly a half being dishonoured, anyway."

Lord Shinwell left no-one in doubt of his views—"I dislike this Bill. I believe that the implementation of this Bill, if ever it is substantially implemented, will prove disastrous for this country."

GOVERNMENT'S MAJOR MISTAKE

"The Government's great blunder," said Lord Granville of Eye, "was their refusal, unlike the present attitude of Norway and Denmark, to consult the people. I am sure that if the electorate of Britain had been consulted they would have turned down our entry into the E.E.C. Public opinion would have been right, as it always is on any great issue that is put to it. This will be shown to have been the Government's major mistake, simply because they were afraid to trust the electorate."

Lord Wigg also declared his belief in the capacity of the British people to make a judgment," he said—"I am a passionate believer in the capacity of my fellow countrymen to meet challenges when they come and when they have been told the truth; down the ages they have never failed. They met the wrath of Napoleon single-handed, and the German hordes in the First World War; and we stood alone in the last war. Indeed, it can be said that our weakness stems from no dishonourable cause but from our ability and willingness to stand alone; and perhaps by standing alone we saved democracy for the world. These are bitter words and bitter thoughts, but today, in my judgment, I believe that we are a defeated country. We are accepting the terms of surrender, and terms of surrender no less obvious because they are not dictated in a train. This time they are dictated across the Telex from Brussels. It is grain today, it was beer yesterday; it is lorries the day after."

"To me," said Lord Davies of Leek "the Market campaign has been one of the most amazing campaigns. It has been fortunate enough to have 20 times the financing of the anti-Market campaigners. Under the umbrella of the European Movement, more than 20 organisations, mostly based on Chandos House, Buckingham Gate, have engaged in tireless propaganda; and, as I say, they have had about 20 times the finance the opposition has had. The Press, the B.B.C. and television have lined up on this without a study in depth. I do not think that this can be contradicted."

Winding up the debate for the Opposition, Lord Beswick said that it was a solemn occasion. "For centuries, century after century, with one short interruption, the British people have extended, strengthened, sought to make more democratic and more effective our Parliamentary institutions. In June, 1965, Parliament presented a humble Petition to Her Majesty the Queen in which it said:

"We rejoice that the principles of Parliamentary Government have been developed and strengthened through seven centuries of history."

This Bill does not simply halt the progress; it abruptly and crudely reverses it. It reverses that process with an unnecessary and unforgiveable crudeness."

WHAT HOPE FOR COMMONWEALTH SUGAR?

By RICHARD BODY, M.P.

Let us assume that the agreement reached at the Lancaster House Conference is valid and enforceable and that it has every one of the attributes that Mr. Rippon would persuade us that it has. Let us go further. Let it be without fault or fallacy, perfectly pure, immaculately conceived. What then does it do to help the developing countries that are dependant so much upon sugar.

The agreement is founded upon a premise, namely, the offer of associated status or a trading agreement. Any import of sugar depends upon one or other of these. Let us look at associated status first. This may be of some advantage to the countries in Africa. Fiji, Guyana and all the West Indies are in a different class of interest in that the United States has given broad enough hints that she does not wish to see any country on her side of the Atlantic absorbed into a European circle of commercial interest.

With associated status goes the requirement of mutual access. If Western Europe is to allow sugar and other primary products into her market, there must be preferences for her goods in exchange. Indeed, the story told by most associated countries so far is that the balance of commercial advantage goes down heavily in favour of exports from the full members of the Community. But these preferences, if extended to Fiji, Guyana and the West Indies, will damage U.S. trade and in self-defence Washington will do its utmost to persuade all the West Indies in particular to reject associated status. To this end she will out-bid Brussels and as Brussels always bids low, that will not be very difficult. If we think we can kick the Americans in the teeth on their side of the Atlantic we under-estimate their powers of retaliation.

Faced with such a choice, the countries of the West Indies will not become associated and we will forfeit the markets that have been ours for centuries.

Even the West India Committee, that worn out old dog asleep on the hearth over here, might then stir itself enough to recover its tongue

and let us hear one last weak and piteous howl as it dies its lachrymose death.

EXPANDING PRODUCTION

There remains the possibility of a trade agreement. But the Common Market is founded upon the principle of Community preference. Monsieur Pompidou has explained very carefully what is meant by this term, and all candidate countries have given the assurance that they share his understanding of what it means. It is that the full members must prefer to buy from within the Community than outside. If it then becomes necessary to import sugar, second preference will be given to associated members. Only if they both are unable to fill the needs of the Common Market will any sugar be allowed in from non-members. We know that France, Germany and even ourselves are going to expand production by a huge amount and according to the French, there will be room for no more than 600,000 tons from outside. Such a quantity could easily be supplied from these countries that became associated. A trade agreement therefore with the West Indies could be of no value.

How then will the European Common Market behave towards the West Indies? Yet what need have we to speculate when we can see the record for ourselves. To those developing countries of Surinam, Madagascar and the Congo that used to supply Western Europe with sugar, but have now been denied access, the Eurocrats have shown that within their frames are hearts made of stone. They quite literally drove into the ground the sugar industry of Surinam and the other states, despite their associated status with the European Economic Community.

Let us not forget the other facts on the record. The Common Market refused to join the International Sugar Agreement, the most elementary step possible to bring just a modicum of justice to those peoples scared by European protectionism.

DUMPING

The other fact is the dumping by them on the world market of huge quantities of sugar surplus to its domestic needs. The world market is only 12% of the whole and is therefore very sensitive to even small increases in supply. This action by the Common Market forced the world prices down to levels that were down to half of the cost of producing sugar by the most efficient grower. Moreover, they continued to increase their production of sugar in the knowledge that this dumping was driving to penury many thousands of people who were already among the poorest of the world. On sugar the European Common Market is frankly not to be trusted. This is not my judgment alone. I call as my witness Professor Dahrendorff, the member of the Commission of the European Economic Community concerned with trade with other countries, in a famous article in *Die Zeit* written a year ago, but only a very few weeks after the Lancaster House Conference.

He made the point that when you deal with the Common Market you must be careful about the use of words. The choice of them and

their interpretation is of the greatest significance when you are negotiating with the Community. He added "particularly over sugar imports."

Why did he give that example? Of all the instances possible why did he select sugar? It must have been in his mind at the time of writing that article, so soon after Lancaster House with all the kerfuffle about the meaning of *aura à coeur*. He did not just pluck it out of the air of imagination.

Those articles were the out-pourings of an anxious mind. About sugar imports he knew the significance of what he was saying. It is desperately important that the developing countries should understand that significance.

TECHNOLOGY, INFLATION AND THE BRITISH ECONOMY

In 1966 a National Commission in the U.S.A. issued a Report to President Johnson on the subject of "Technology and the American Economy covering the next Ten Years". Two of the main points from this report are worth repeating in the context of our present dilemma in the industrial and economic sphere.

(1) "It is the unanimously held conviction of the Commission that the most important condition for successful adjustment to technological change is an adequate level of total income and unemployment. We realise that this is not the end of economic policy, but we are confident it is the beginning."

(2) "The basic fact is that technology eliminates jobs, not work. It is the continuous obligation of economic policy to match increases in productive potential with increases in purchasing power and demand. Otherwise the potential created by technical progress runs to waste in idle capacity, unemployment and deprivation."

With six of the ten-year span which this report was intended to cover already gone, how does our present situation in Britain match up to these basic requirements? Clearly, we do not have the correct level of total income, as is shown by an increasing level of inflation, rising now to 7 per cent per annum. At the same time, unemployment continues at an unacceptable level, recent figures are, to say the least, disturbing. We have failed to make clear to our work force that technology eliminates jobs and not men, hence the fierce backlash which has arisen where jobs are threatened by new techniques. Nor have we attempted to consciously match productive potential with increases in purchasing power; rather, we have allowed demand to grow in a haphazard and uncontrolled manner. Money supply is currently rising at an annual rate of around 30 per cent while our gross domestic production is only around 3 per cent.

The recent trouble with the dock workers underlines the immense problems confronting industry as a result of technological change. Containerisation is no new phenomenon, yet neither Government, trades unions or employers have got to grips with what it means in terms of changes in employment. In 1967, the British Transport Docks Board

commissioned the international consultants, McKinsey & Company, Inc. to report their conclusions on the likely development of containers. Their report was published in June, 1967, and they made the following points:—

"If containerisation were adopted for all deep sea general cargo trade in this country, the productivity of each docker employed would be increased approximately twenty-fold, and the reduction in dockers engaged on handling general cargo could be as high as 90 per cent of the total employed using conventional methods."

"There would be a reduction in industry's transportation bill of some £200 million a year."

"For the Europe-North America trade there could be a 70 per cent reduction in ship requirements and, correspondingly in crews."

Thus, over five years ago, the present dilemma was foreseen, yet little has been done to take the necessary steps to remedy the situation. The fact that so many men employed in the docks can no longer be gainfully employed in the work in which they have previously been engaged is not the fault of the dockers, the employers or the trade unions concerned. The failure to get to grips with this problem arises in the wrong economic policies followed by successive governments which failed to take into account what is happening in capital-intensive operation, thereby allowing industrial relations to worsen.

Other industries are equally affected by technological change, electric power, iron and steel, construction, oil refining, shipping and ship-building to name only a few. If a solution is to be found, then it must be shown much more clearly that the end product of technological change is not loss of jobs and status, but a higher standard of living. A much enhanced scheme of training for new skills must be introduced as a matter of urgency. Fear of redundancy and lack of confidence in the future are two of the main deterrents to good labour relations.

Behind all this, however, lies the evil of continued inflation. The continued erosion of the purchasing power of money has falsified economic relations between all engaged in business and professional life, made us less competitive in overseas markets and created a sense of injustice and frustration among people. In a speech in the House of Commons on the Industrial Situation on 1st August, the Secretary of State for Employment, Mr. Maurice Macmillan said: "The main cause of most of our troubles, including those on the industrial scene, is inflation." He went on: "I believe that working together to defeat inflation will help the industrial relations situation; working together not negatively in restrictive policies, or simply trying to restrain money incomes, but working positively to achieve an increase in real incomes and to keep down prices, matching the rise in money incomes to a steady and regular increase in output and investment."

Few will disagree with Mr. Macmillan's summary of the needs of the present situation, but he went on to suggest that this is just what the Government are now doing. Unfortunately, there are few signs of this. Industrial unrest continues, increasing violence has been asso-

ciated with strikes and picketing, settlements reached have been well above the Government's target, and there has been no real assurance to those whose jobs are threatened that they can look forward with confidence to the future. This seems to indicate a failure to tackle the problems in the right way.

Faulty diagnosis as to the cause of disease leads to wrong remedies being applied. This frequently results in the patient's condition worsening rather than being cured. There is reason to think that the cause of the disease of inflation has been wrongly diagnosed, resulting in the situation in which the country finds itself steadily worsening. Inflation has been blamed on excessive pay increases, hence the attempt to effect a cure by curbing wage demands. This, in turn, leads to strikes and the severe curtailing of production which means less wealth for the nation as a whole. All too often, after a crippling strike, a settlement is made which is well above the original target. Blame is then firmly settled on the trades unions for being unreasonable in their demands, but the ordinary wage and salary earner is more concerned with his take-home pay, that is, after deductions have been made from his gross pay to allow for taxation and other levied contributions.

The official statistics clearly show that the average 'take-home' pay of all employees since 1960 rose at a rate which lagged behind their increasing productivity and the depreciation of the currency. Since the general level of prices rose at a faster rate than average 'take-home' pay, considerable doubt is thrown on the generally held theory that inflation is generated by excessive pay settlements. In fact, all the bargaining on the labour market over recent years has had the net effect of maintaining a remarkably stable ratio of the "primary" division between employers' profits and wage and salary earners income.

These facts emerge from a publication issued by the Economic Research Council in May, 1972.* The report also shows that there was increasingly severe taxation of employers' profits during the 1960s. As a proportion of pre-tax profits, taxes and levies increased from 14.1% to 44.2%, and profits (after tax) as a proportion of the total income from production decreased from 19.9% to 12.2%.

The study also shows that the total amount taken in taxation increased by about 100% between 1964 and 1970 whilst the gross domestic product at current factor prices increased by less than 50%. Although this increase in taxation was intended to reduce demand and halt inflation it did neither: on the contrary, it undermined confidence, inflation continued and unemployment increased. There was also a significance correlation between the decrease in the employers' share of total income (after tax) and the increase in unemployment. British companies big and small have thereby been deprived of the means of investment on which growth depends.

All this adds up to a rather different conclusion as to our present dilemma than those currently accepted. The progression has been a constantly increasing volume of money coming into circulation in no

way related to the growth of production. Having allowed this growing volume of pent-up purchasing power to intensify the pressure of demand on the currently available supply of goods and services, it is not surprising that prices rose and there was a marked erosion of the purchasing power of profits, wages, salaries and pensions. Savage increases in taxation switched vast sums from the private to the public sector. This did not reduce total demand but it left the private sector with a decreasing proportion of the national income.

To cut this Gordian knot the Government should aim to reduce taxation still further, particularly where this has an immediate effect on costs, thus halting the price spiral. This could be done by restoring the pre-war position of providing the capital requirements of the public sector out of authorised borrowing and not out of current tax revenue. At the same time, the aim of monetary policy should be to maintain liquidity of the monetary system at such a volume that the general price level is held reasonably constant.

Above all, it is essential for the authorities to make clear that we can have steadily rising living standards provided we increase the production of real wealth which alone makes this possible.

**EXCESSIVE TAXES LEAD TO 'STAG-FLATION' published by the Economic Research Council, 10 Upper Berkeley Street, London, W.1. (50p).*

NATIONALISM, INTER-NATIONALISM, AND SUPRA-NATIONALISM

By JIM BOURLET

I wonder how many people have felt, throughout all the debates about the 'E.E.C.', that the words 'Nationalism' and 'Internationalism' and 'Supranationalism' have been used many times without any clear understanding of their meaning?

'Nationalism' is presumably the simplest of these three to define, and to understand its implications and limitations. It is a policy by which a Nation—defined in the 'Oxford dictionary' as "A people or race distinguished by community of descent, language, history or political institutions"—seeks independence of action within its territory. It is a policy whereby individuals and groups accept policies decided by majority decision or elected authority, recognising these policies to be 'in the National interest'. It is through Nation states that we have built societies which enable men to feel both independent and at the same time, part of a community 'team'.

Groups of people who have learnt, over a long period to act as 'Nations' can continue to exist if they are large enough to provide themselves with adequate services and if they are not so large as to produce internal dissension. In Europe today about 30 such 'Nations' exist. Each is in its way a remarkable achievement, each has unique charac-

teristics, and each seeks to express the feelings of the individuals who compose them.

'Inter-Nationalism' and 'Supra-Nationalism' are surely best regarded as alternative method of solving—or attempting to solve—the differences between Nations; different ways of 'breaking down the barriers between Nations'.

'Supra-Nationalism' is the method whereby several Nations seek to combine as one larger Nation, with one Government, where common laws exist throughout the territories concerned. Both modern Italy and modern Germany are examples of 'Supra-Nationalism'. The old Colonial system—indeed the present-day Portuguese Colonial situation is another example in a different context. The U.S.A. as a union of Northern and Southern states; the union of East and West Pakistan; the union of East, West and Northern Nigeria; the union of Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and England, all are examples of 'Supra-Nationalist' States. It is the aim of the E.E.C. to create one large Nation from what are at present 6 or 9 Nations. 'Supra-Nationalism' provides opportunities for greater glory and power; opportunities for advancement for politicians who see their Nations as a power basis to serve their ambitions rather than as communities they have the good fortune to serve. Constituent communities find their areas prosperous or depressed depending on their luck in having natural resources or a central location. In time, feelings can rise to the point where the demand for 'local' autonomy can lead to civil war as in the U.S.A., Nigeria or Pakistan.

'Inter-Nationalism' is the alternative method whereby Nations seek to develop sets of rules by which to conduct their dealings one with another. This may be institutionalised as in the case of the United Nations, the European Free Trade Area or N.A.T.O. It may be only partly institutionalised, but based on custom and great goodwill such as the Commonwealth. Sometimes 'Inter-Nationalism' is simply a matter of a common respect for an international law text. Perhaps most significantly the philosophy of 'Inter-Nationalism' is seen at work in the conventions and subtle practices of international diplomacy.

The Inter-Nationalist does not seek to amalgamate Nations, but rather to constantly build up respect and understanding between Nations. He seeks to solve problems by way of a 'pact between equals' rather than accept the will of the stronger—which must prevail if a single governing authority were to be created.

Unfortunately it has been one of the more successful ploys of the 'marketeers' to confuse these issues. To be 'pro-market' is they say to be 'Inter-Nationalist'. In fact the 'Super-Nation' they seek to create would, if allowed to develop do great harm to 'Inter-Nationalism' in Europe and in their efforts to stir up 'external threats' to quell 'internal dissension' place very great strains on Inter-National relations throughout the world.

BRITAIN AND THE E.E.C. READERS' COMMENTARY

From Mr. Raymond Grumbar

The Bill which could change the whole Constitution of our country has now been forced through Parliament. The European Communities Bill was introduced and passed by very small majorities under the guillotine, yet it is expected to be morally binding on an electorate which has barely been properly consulted.

The Government seems to have been determined not to allow any amendment to the Bill in Committee, no doubt in order to avoid having a Report stage. In the Lords similar tactics appear to have been employed in order to avoid any amendments, which of course would have to go back for debate in the Commons. Surely the role of the Upper House must be as a revising chamber, especially in what must surely have been one of the major pieces of Constitutional Legislation ever to come before Parliament.

Neither the Treaty of Accession (which has never been debated) nor the Legislation can be said to have received the full-hearted consent of Parliament and the people. The Prime Minister would appear to have sacrificed everything—Britain's prosperity as well as her freedom—for his personal obsession to sign the Rome Treaty. For this he surely needs the support of the majority of the British people. We are however told that the people "do not understand".

The Referendum in Norway resulted in the electorate saying 'No,' so our Treaty of Accession does not enter into force. The votes in Parliament were surely taken on the basis that the four applicants would be joining. If they do not, then those votes must be invalid and the whole question of our joining should be reconsidered.

In the same way, the French Referendum specifically asked the voters to approve enlargement by the accession of Great Britain, Ireland, Norway and Denmark. If one is taken away, then this Referendum is also void. This is a fundamental issue on which the Prime Minister should listen to the voice of the people also. It is a political decision first, and an economic one second.

The Government's determination that its tight schedule for the Bill should not be threatened, raising the possibility that it might not have reached the Statute Book in time for the Prime Minister's journey to Paris for the Summit later this month is just not acceptable, in view of the strong division of opinion existing in the country on this whole issue.

London, W.C.1.

From Mr. James Towler

What is the current mood among those of us who have resolutely opposed British entry into the Common Market? One of gloom and despondency? Or simply one of sheer frustration? If this is, as I suspect, the prevailing feeling it is more than understandable.

Yet, I feel neither gloomy nor despondent, while my main frustration is that of not being able to play my correct role in this so called 'great debate', that of voting in a referendum. Indeed, I feel a sense of elation in that, having taken on the Government, a large slice of the Opposition and almost all the media, **we have won!** For, as I write, one overriding fact is abundantly clear. It is that come January 1, 1973, Britain will not be entering the Common Market with the "full-hearted consent" of Parliament, let alone the people.

For no matter what the Prime Minister and his apologists may say, the terms so clearly set down by Mr. Heath in his speech of 5 May, 1970 have not been met. It is we who oppose entry who have won a great victory. True we have not won all the battles. But this is not the first time that the British people have been deceived and let down by their elected representatives (with the honourable exception of those Members on both sides of the House who worked and spoke so valiantly for our cause), nor will it be the last.

But, in the long term, the Parliamentary battle is not so important as the one we have won, that of retaining the hard core of public opinion, and against all the odds.

But there is another significant factor in our favour. Our victory was won against the tide. Now there are signs that it has begun to ebb in our favour. Hardly a day passes without some item of news that endorses the validity of our case. Still larger lorries to pollute our already crowded roads, proposals to change the taste of our beer, and, all the time, increased prices in the shops—but just a foretaste of what is to come. The Norwegian people have voted to stay out of the E.E.C. This means that the matter may have to be referred to Parliament again at a time when the Labour Party—especially in the constituencies—is becoming united against Market entry and more and more Conservatives, having witnessed the pre-entry investment boom that never was, begin to realise that the great European adventure is based on "the challenge and opportunity" and very little else.

Indeed, such is the weakness of the case for Common Market entry, that the Government propaganda machine has all but lost its enthusiasm for the cause and, as phase two of the great brain washing campaign, treats the whole issue as a *fait accompli*.

The nation is in grave danger in embarking on a collision course that threatens the whole concept of democracy in Great Britain. For just as the people are losing faith in Parliament, so, too, would Parliament appear to be losing faith in the people they are elected to represent. How else can one explain the way they have passed the European Communities Bill when the mandate was "to negotiate—no more, no less."?

Even at this late date Members of Parliament would do well to heed the words of the distinguished Father of the House, Sir Robin Turton, M.P., when he said: "When the extent of the limitations of the power of Parliament is fully recognised there is going to be such a surge of opinion against E.E.C. entry that the nation will never forgive Parliamentarians of any Party who voted for entry."

Leeds 16.