TIME TO MOVE, LABOUR!

Now is the time, Labour. The Tories are split, isolated and losing their following. They dare not bait the Movement more—so Thorneycroft is dropped. But they dare not lose the pound—so deflation goes on, hidden by a concession here, a promise there and, everywhere, a wellfed sermon on sacrifices. So narrow is their horizon, so short-lived their hopes, that every change of tack to suit every failing breeze becomes a battle on "principle." To each "principle"—a disciple; to each tack—a split; to each split—more isolation, more floundering, more unpopularity. They are weak, dead weak.

Now is the time, Labour; time to hound them out. Not merely, as decided by the Parliamentary Party to "press the Government to change the program of Parliamentary business when the House reassembles on January 21 so that the circumstances leading to the unprecedented resignation of all three Treasury Ministers can be debated" (Times, January 8); not merely to pace through the intricacies of the Parliamentary gavotte; but to hound them out. Now is the time to campaign with everything we have—mass meetings, mass demonstrations, mass marches.

The people are ready. Already they have gone far beyond official Labour policy in defence of peace, and broken Bevan's Brighton rules on what constitutes strength. What have the Labour leaders done to fight the missile bases? Nothing. Absolutely nothing. Why haven't they endorsed the action of the Aberdeen workers who blacked all work on missile bases in their area? Why haven't they spread such action throughout the country? Why haven't they used our industrial strength to save us from the poison of Tory politics?

The people are ready. What better evidence than the bye-election results? Labour is not getting the support it could. Again, what better evidence than the bye-election results? Now is the time, Labour.

Unemployment and peace—two of the greatest issues—are moving the workers into battle. If the Labour leadership refuse to break from their Parliamentary manoeuvres and into the streets and picket lines, they will at best be left behind and isolated by their supporters; at worst they will have demoralized the ranks and helped the Tories keep their withered fingers on the reins of Government. Labour must move for peace—boycott the missile bases as the first step in blacking all work on war production. Labour must defend our jobs—work or full maintenance for all; open bosses' books to redundant workers.
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THE SCOTTISH MINERS
By Lawrence Daly

This radical tradition in the Scottish coalfields is a powerful one, stretching from Alexander McDonald, through Keir Hardie and Bob Smillie to Abe Moffat. It has been expressed not only in the character of successive leaders but also in the consistent spirit of the rank and file, often exceeding that of the leaders themselves, though not always equal to it. But the unceasing struggle to exaggerate the strength of that tradition today or to rely upon its automatic continuation to the present generation. Its presence is felt in the repeated election of Communists to many official posts, in the paradoxical, yet inescapable, outbreaks of unofficial strikes against the same leaders! It would be easy to applaud the strike, and as signs of revolt against Coal Board bureaucrats and trade-union "bosses". But this would be an over simplified picture, ignoring some disquieting features in the situation.

An examination of these features requires certain conclusions to be drawn regarding the relations between the miners and the Coal Board, the Coal Board and the NUM, and the rank and file and the NUM leaders.

The miner's position is direct contact with Coal Board officials on the production job—where most disputes arise. Beyond colliery level he can confront the "Big Shot" with "big salaries" in "big cars". The union has its closest contact with the Board at this level, whether between the working officials on both sides, wherein many of the disputes are resolved, by men who can understand and have personal conditions in which the dispute arose.

No contact

The rank and file has merely an occasional contact with the trade union leadership; a few of them with the local trade union committee at monthly branch meetings; or their representatives with the union delegate (secretary in England) when there is a personal or group grievance to be taken up with the union. Elaborate negotiating machinery was established in 1947 to deal with every kind of dispute or claim. But, for all but a limited number, cases unresolved at colliery level that men often wait months for a settlement. The man in the colliery, a few weeks longer, or even months, may pass before the retrospective payment is made. (Payments have been made by the Board, but the coal not received and the result is an unofficial strike. The men are then exhorted to "abide by the machinery", "obide to the procedure", "carry on union policy". This is known as the "gramophone record" speech and is often cynically rejected. They know that Coal Board officials, when they have made a decision, see that it is carried out and are not concerned with what happens to the money.

1. Introduction

LAWRENCE DALY who wrote the article reprinted here from the Socialist Review, is a Delegate of the 10,000-strong General branch of the T.U.C., and is a former Chairman of the Scottish NUM Youth Committee. We are reprinting his article here not because we agree with it—we don't—but because it represents a genuine struggle. Seems to be objective, seeming to say "let's face facts, comrades" it by-passes the most crucial issues facing the Scottish miners. It says: "I am not going to be blinded by the constant fire of industrial unrest; that unofficial strikes are bad as such—a result of self-interest—and should be curbed. It does not show that the class struggle in the coal industry is a militant and that the unofficial striker is a front-line fighter in the battle for workers' control of the mines; that nationalization as we know it is a prop to the old order and that the struggle is for the establishment of rational exploitation.

We need not go on. We have here two very adequate answers to Lawrence Daly. One is from GRAHAM ACOTT, a trade unionist, a worker at work; the other is from JAMES D. YOUNG who, while not having had direct experience of mining, has an intimate knowledge of the Scottish Labour movement, and can turn round points the point of view which every militant socialist must adopt and fight for; in so doing, they represent the standpoint of the SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Needless to say, comments, criticism and argument are invited.—Editor.

2. A Miner's Policy for Mines

By Graham Acott, Ramsgate

LAWRENCE DALY's article poses many questions which I feel he has not answered but that need to be answered. To me, his theme seems to be: we must discipline our members, especially the higher paid contract worker. But is this really the answer that is needed? Let us consider first why the most active group in the pits is the contract worker. I assure Lawrence Daly that he is not overestimating the task of disciplining them to stand alone. But why do they act in this way? Under the new wages structure the day workers' wages are negotiated and agreed upon. But the contract workers, who are employed at pit level, either in favour of the men by the Union, or to their detriment by the management, but contract workers' wages are negotiated at pit level by the local union branch, and are therefore easier to alter. There are many items which cannot be priced in a contract and payment is made by mutual agreement. This enables the Board, when they wish to make an immediate saving on the man's pay, to employ a higher paid contract worker, which is the primary reason why they are that group of miners most often taking 'unconstitutional' action, and it must be that there is a set of hot-heads who think of nobody but themselves. It can be argued that the miners have negotiating machinery which they don't use. Is this one of the reasons?—ask any miner what he thinks of it. Lawrence Daly gives the answer in his article. He shows quite clearly how the machinery is used to delay the men's claims until, eventually, they are dropped, or the men take strike action. If this is a common occurrence, is it not human nature for the men to say: we strike first, to show we mean business?

The Socialist Program

What then is needed to rectify the troubles now experienced in the coalfields, and bring about true rationalization? 1. Control of the Miners—In other words, the thing lacking in all nationalized industries, workers' control. The man on the job should not only have a say in how things are run, but should control it through a workers' committee. This would help end the frustration now felt by the miners, and help convince them it is their industry.

2. Stop running the pits on a profit basis—it is quite ridiculous that we are running a limited budget at the colliery where I employed, large quantities of coal are lost because of the old, worn-out machinery in use at the time. It would be a great help to the coal to be sold.

3. Stop private industry living on mining—there are too many firms with monopolies of the essential machinery and equipment needed by the pits: these must be nationalized as part of the mining industry. There are too many firms getting coal at cut prices: there are too many investors living off compensation payments.

4. I think, therefore, that as Socialists we should be trying to find out why men act as they do, and try to work out a program to overcome their problems, so helping them forward. This would be more useful than condemning certain sections of the actions (we can read that sort of article in any capitalist paper), thereby helping the employers in their efforts to turn one group against the other.

3. Letters

Dear Comrades,

As one who has recently contributed to your paper and who hopes to do so frequently, I must protest about Ernie Roberts to the post of Assistant General Secretary of the AEU (SOCIALIST REVIEW, December).

Such an article does little to raise the prestige of the paper and can only be described as a smear. Yet I doubt suggesting for one moment that the opinions expressed in it were those of the Editorial Board; but, since it was published without comment, workers buying the paper could easily gain that impression.

I am writing to You Ernie Roberts, as the writer of the article, but enough to know that at present, anyway, Ernie's views are decidedly towards the Left. If he moves over to the Right, as well he may, however, I am sure that you wish to criticise is naive or prepares to move. Even then, the parg, rather than adopted by the writer should be avoided.

Let me be quite frank. The alternatives to Ernie Roberts as the Assistant General Secretary of the AEU were candidates who could certainly make no claim to being of the Left. I know that Ernie's election has been hailed by
3. Unofficial Strikes — a blow for workers control

By James D. Young

Although I haven’t any first-hand knowledge of the mining industry, I fail to see how Lawrence Daly can "explain away" 699 unofficial strikes in the Scottish coalfields during the last few months of 1957 and the remarkable lack of militancy of a small minority of highly paid piece-workers. (1)

Moreover I should not have thought that "selfish, irresponsible leaders" would have the nerve to stage a strike as a protest against bad working conditions, as happened in the Allora-Alva area two or three years ago. Perhaps the main reason why the appeals of the Scottish Socialist union leaders to unofficial strikers often fail on deep rural areas is because "there are two few union leaders of the old type, carrying authority, leading men, and commanding respect on both sides of the management line. (2)

Though I am quite prepared to believe that highly paid workers will use "unofficial" strike action to enforce demands for higher pay, just as Lawrence Daly’s union leaders put in for percentage wage claims, I have watched too many so-called unofficial strikes to know that their basic cause is not the desire for higher wages. Unofficial strikes are often, though not always, a reflection of workers’ disgust over the attempts of the Labour leaders to confine the class struggle to the goings-on of committees of conciliation and arbitration and productivity councils. (3)

Unofficial strikes are sometimes trying to lift working class politics out of the slums and shibboleths of capitalistic party politics. (4)

Hence the demands of unofficial strikers for a measure of workers’ control over the conditions that govern their working lives. Hence the demand for a "rank and file" miners’ movement like the historic Stag and Colliery, Ayrshire, for local wage negotiations. "We are finding," writes a rank and file miner, "that any approach to the manager at this college is like giving someone a ‘No’ and ‘Take it to the agent’s level’ attitude." Hence the warning that if "the attitude of the National Coal Board does not alter then the miners accept the responsibility of any action by the men employed who are subject to the policy pursued." (5)

Yet the employers are able to give the workers palliatives during periods of "prolonged overtime" by the "bureaucracy going: a bureaucracy which the capitalist class uses to buy off trade union leaders and to increase ‘carerms’ for the Labour movement and the inevitability of contradictions of capitalism, the employers cannot freeze social relations in industry. Then lies the key to an understanding of official and unofficial strikes.

Class consciousness vs. obedience

I am afraid Lawrence Daly thinks that a trade union’s strength comes from the rank and file’s blind obedience to the controllers of the bureaucratic apparatus. A trade union is, according to the Webb’s, "a continuous association of wage earning men for the purpose of representing and defending the conditions of their working lives." Therefore a trade union derives its real strength and power from the militancy and class consciousness of its members. That is not to say that every unofficial strike is "good" and every official strike is "bad." Only Scottish calvinists and social democrats moralize about "selfish, irresponsible, official and unofficial strikers." Daly misses the point at the facts. An official sympathetic strike of dockers or railwaymen against the handling of black goods really strengthens the Labour movement. On the other hand, an unofficial strike against the employment of coloured workers (provided they are employed at trade union rates) weakens the Labour movement.

Speaking generally, unofficial strikes do not occur before trade unionists have explored every official avenue to remedy their grievances. (6) Official strikes which never occur before trade unionists have explored every official avenue to remedy their grievances. (7) Official strikes which never occur before trade unionists have explored every official avenue to remedy their grievances. (8) Official strikes which never occur before trade unionists have explored every official avenue to remedy their grievances. (9) Official strikes which never occur before trade unionists have explored every official avenue to remedy their grievances. (10)

In conclusion may I say that the article made on me a very bad impression indeed. To include Ernie’s enemies’ views on “professional martyrdom” in the section on "Ernie’s enemies" is to suggest that the writer himself shared these views. As one who has been victimized by these enemies I can only say that I have been made angry by their attacks, and I have not been unable at times to show the abuse. Ernie has arrived; surely our job is to help keep him facing Left? M. Jones’ article can well have the opposite effect.

Eric S. HEFFER

The Editorial Board agrees with every word of Comrade Heffer’s criticisms and apologizes to readers for having let Comrade Jones “Profile” through without intervention.—Editor.

Liverpool

(1) When I interviewed Mr. John Woods, the Scottish Secretary of NUR, he had told me that they had given up the attempt to count the number of unofficial strikes in the Scottish coalfields. Moreover, he had been inclined to feel that most of the unofficial strikers are not English miners, but he also asked if I had come along “to dig up some more mud in the union.”

(2) Manchester Guardian, Sept. 12, 1957: What causes Strikes?

(3) The Scottish Miner, April, 1956: A Report.

Let the Tories beware! They have once again set the pattern for all the rest. If this is how they treat their constituents in this case, they have the upper hand for the moment, and have said in effect—Damn the agreements! We are not having them. But they, and the capitalist class in general, should not be surprised if the workers tear a leaf out of their book.

Whilst the immediate prospect of victory in the Health Service strike does not seem very bright, one important factor to be borne in mind is that another set of workers is experiencing something they long pretended did not exist—the blackout. The black- tism of fire cannot fail to strengthen the organized workers.
WHILE THE FLOOD OF duplicated advice from Transport House shows no sign of abating, some valuable work is being done in the London area. An informal meeting was held at the end of last year to establish liaison and plan joint activity for the future. It was agreed to hold day-schools at, say, two-weekly intervals; each section taking turns to play host, and the subjects for discussion to be linked by a single theme. This modest start may provide the basis for a North London District Committee, and this basis will be strengthened if, as is hoped, other sections are represented at the next meeting.

We hear from the Movement for Colonial Freedom that of the day-schools they have organized in conjunction with Labour Parties, by far the most successful are those that were held at Youth Sections—another indication of the increasing volume of interest and activity: it is probably reflected in the fact that a move was to be made to co-opt Kath Sheridan of St. Pancras to the Youth sub-committee of the London Labour Party. Of course, this is no substitute for proper elections, but it does represent, in the light of the past, a real advance, and one to be welcomed.

Meanwhile, as reported before (Young Socialist, Dec., 1957) the London Labour Party are holding week-end schools on the subjects of the 1958 Policy Statements, before they are published; the first of these is to be held on February 8th at Beatrice Webb House, and Dr Horace King MP, a co-opted member of the NEC Education sub-committee, and apparently a noted wit, will speak on 'Education—what next?' Comrades attending it must make it quite certain that they want to see in the Policy Statement:

Free State education up to 18.
Abolition of fee-paying schools.
Comprehensive schools.
Adequate maintenance grants—without a means test—for all university students.

Alan Williams, National Youth Officer is also billed to appear.

* as we go to press.

In the December Young Socialist we printed the opening of our new pamphlet, The Fight for Socialism? by Michael Kidron, in which he examined the workings of capitalism, and showed how accumulation occurs at the expense of the workers.

\section*{The Fight for Socialism - 2}

\textit{That was in 1956. Last year the same process went on, and this year, and next will see it continue. Every year more and more profits are ploughed back into industry; every year the industrial machine becomes bigger and more productive. The more productive it becomes, the greater the quantity of goods that has to be sold in order that the process of accumulation can go on. During the first phase of consumption, say after a war, when a lot of old machines have to be replaced and consumer goods are scarce, there is no trouble in disposing of the goods. Investments that immediately lead to greater output can find markets; those that take a longer time to start production, like steel mills that need five years or so to build, have no immediate effect on the quantity of goods to be sold. Eventually, however, a market must be found for the increased production, and this is where capitalism breaks down.}

A shoe manufacturer, for example, must sell all his shoes before he can cover the outlay (wages, raw materials, etc.) spent on their production and also buy the new machines and raw materials needed for expanding production. By the time he has cleared his output he must expand his sales further and so on indefinitely. The same is true of all capitalist firms. The machinery firm will expand production of machinery for the shoe manufacturer, the mining company will extract more iron-ore for the machinery firm and the other capitalists will follow suit (some more, some less) as long as the shoe manufacturer can find a market. When the shoe manufacturer has grown so big that he can't find a market everything crashes into a slump.}

\textit{shoemaker, isn't a capitalist always a market? In Britain, manual and professional workers receive enough in wages and salaries to buy about two-thirds of the total national product. The capitalists take up about half of the rest on their high standard of living (taxes take a share of both these items) and the rest goes in... [continued next page]}

\section*{FIGHT FOR PEACE!}

PEACE is the crucial issue of our time: we have seen in the past few weeks where the Tories stand. Macmillan's self-satisfied ignorance of H-bombs overhead, the blind decision to plant a string of rocket bases along the East of Scotland, the snarling refusal to hear the murmur of popular anger and fear, means mortgaging our lives to the Americans at a price that hasn't even been discussed.

The fight for peace can unite every section of the movement, every section of the population in a huge campaign to sweep the Tories out.

But for this, we have to be clear in aim, and uncompromising in presenting it: scrap the bases! No Tory tests! No Bombs for Britain! No NATO arms! Bevan'sCalled in Parliament are not enough. Our Party is hamstrung by the decision made at Brighton to reject unilateral disarmament. We must take things into our own hands. Denounce the Tories' suicide pact: pull our leadership from the sidelines of history.

In this the Aberdeen Youth Section points the way. Every Section in the country should follow their initiative; send to them for petition forms—help them in their fight for peace. This is the first step—let us take it. Then to blacking base-building; then to the streets to strike the Tories out and replace them with a government we can force to dismantle the armour dragging us to destruction.

Peace is the crucial issue of our time; this is where we stand. ... within its shade we'll live or die.' The Red Flag or the mushroom cloud. There is no other choice.

\section*{ABERDEEN YOUTH SECTION PETITION}

TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND.

We, the undersigned electors, wish to present the following petition.

"We are gravely concerned at the Government's intention to set up medium range ballistic weapon ranges in the United Kingdom.

"We are the more concerned because it is assumed that these bases will be in the East of Scotland, but we feel that their presence in any part of the country is not only undesirable but a direct incitement to attack."

"The decision does nothing to ease world tension. Britain should join with the Scandinavian Countries in refusing to allow the setting up of these offensive bases on her territory."

"Britain can yet lead the world by changing the pattern of her investments from weapons of war to allow for the improvement of the standard of living of her own people and the people of the Colonies."

We therefore humbly ask that you reconsider your decision to establish such bases.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
Name & Address \\
1 & 2 \\
3 & 4 \\
5 & 6 \\
7 & 8 \\
9 & 10 \\
\end{tabular}

Return to the Aberdeen Labour Party Youth Section, 22, Gallowgate, Aberdeen.
FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM continued

Investment. But eventually these investments produce still more goods and still the manual and professional workers and the capitalists use up only 85 per cent of the product in current living expenses.

Another 15 per cent has to find some other market. If it can’t be sold, i.e., if the capitalist can’t sell the goods he produces and make a profit, he won’t produce. Production stops in one industry, workers are locked out, they buy less and other capitalists, finding their markets dwindling, stop producing. Other workers and shrink the market for yet other capitalists. This is a rough picture of a slump such as we had during the thirties. It shows a world of unemployment and misery just because capitalism produces too much. The crisis of capitalism is a crisis of overproduction.

Capitalist “Solutions” to Overproduction

Compelled by competition to keep wages down as much as possible, the workers are forced to do more work (to their own disadvantage, that of the unions) because that would reduce the funds left for accumulation, and, eventually, would mean that he loses to his competitors. But the fact remains that wages have been rising and that we don’t live in a state of perpetual slump. Why not? Can capitalism solve its problems?

Imperialism: Once, surplus production was unloaded on the colonies. The 15 percent of Britain’s national income was shipped to India. Australia, Africa. The same is happening today with two crucial differences: now the productive forces of Britain and the other capitalist countries are so much bigger than they were a hundred years ago that they could absorb any colonial and colonial markets and still not get rid of their problem (in 1950 Britain produced roughly 9 times as much as in 1850). Secondly, the backward countries themselves have started to industrialize. Their own capitalistic economies are taking shape all around them. In order to progress at all, they find it imperative to cut themselves loose from the better-equipped imperialist powers. For them the struggle for national liberation is a condition of existence: for the capitalists in the imperialist countries it means that outlets for surplus capital are getting smaller and smaller.

Riding the Slump: Another method of getting rid of the surplus stocks and accumulation creates more get rid of surplus capital is to let the slump take its full course. Stop producing here, destroy stocks there and then, once again, the ball of accumulation will start rolling. This too has become dangerous, too dangerous to risk. It could mean a slide down the whole economic system without a problem. Workers could be thrown on to the streets to starve with- out risk for the capitalist class. After all, labor organizations were still not organized in those days. To-day, however, things are different. Workers’ solidarity is a force to be reckoned with: we have learned the power of collective action. During the depression immediately preceding the first World War, British capitalism (like its European counterpart) had a revolution staring it in the face. The Great War saved the situation by stepping up production. The post-war slump led to the 1919-20 and 1920-21, the glorious waves of the class rearguard action—the 1926 General Strike. The slump of the thirties also rocked the capitalist boat dangerously. Again the capitalists saved their property by destroying the whole cycle of production, and leaving full employment. Slumps are dangerous for the ruling class—they can mean a Socialist Revolution. Anything, anything but a slump!

Stagnation and Surplus Capacity: What is the capitalist answer to a slump? He must replace every fraction of a segment and so “keep the workers happy.” For some time this can be done by preventing the introduction of labour-saving devices or their use. In Britain to-day we have full employment, but we also have a mass of idle resources. Hundreds of millions of pounds have been invested in the motor industry over the last few years, automa- tion has been introduced, and yet the output of cars has barely risen at all. Of course, the Tories’ credit squeeze is to blame in part, but the lack of markets is the major reason for this accumula- tion of surplus capacity.

War: But shifting economic progress is not a complete answer to a slump. The war must be disposed of, can be kept under control, but it cannot be eliminated altogether, otherwise profits would not be made and accumulation would not go on. There is only one way the capitalists can get rid of their surpluses, accumulate and escape the dangers of unemployment at one and the same time—by running a war economy.

In the fiscal year 1957-58 about £1,440 million is to be spent directly on the ‘defence’ budget in Britain; what the indirect expenditure on planes, ships, roads, etc., will be, one cannot tell. Of course we are made to believe that the armaments budget is an unemployment of the capitalists. But the capitalists produce more goods and accumulate more, but they will have to pay for the war. If we are to believe the capitalists, the war brings about a new boom and will help to produce more goods and accumulate more. But we know better. The war is a bottomless pit; a chair can be used time without number, a shelf—only once. The capitalist only accumulates to the value of his machines in time of war. Even in ‘peace-time’ the Koreans, Cypriots, Syrians, Egyptians, Malaya, Algerians and army training grounds get rid of quite a lot of them.

To be continued

The Movement

ROSALUXEMBOURG Revolutionary, Humanist

On January 15, 1919, Rosa Luxemburg, the great socialist revolutionary, Marxist thinker and working class leader, was brutally battered to death. Her murderers were Prussian officers encouraged by the reactionary right-wing, Social- democratic government of Ebert and Noske.

Ignored almost completely by the socialist press ever since, Rosa Luxemburg is one of the finest figures in the history of the fight for socialism. Armed with an uncompromising, unbending will, she had yet the most sensitive, warm and generous soul; her intellect corroded the class enemy, her culture encon- nered, education reached her friends.

Some small infatuation of her wealth of spirit can be gained from the following letter, written from Breslau prison—one of the many she knew because of her militant opposition to war—to a friend on March 24, 1918.

Breslau, March 24, 1918.

My dear Sonichka,

It is such a terribly long time since I last wrote, but you have been often in my mind... One thing after another seems to take away my wish to write... if we could only be together, strolling through the countryside and talking of whatever might come into our heads—but, there is no chance of it at present. My petition for release was read down, the assembly of a detailed description of my incorrigible wickedness; a request for a brief furlough had no better fate. I shall have to stay here by myself, any attempt to escape is useless. I will try, Sondyacha, when a long time passes without my having any news from you, I always get the impression that in your loneliness—anxiety, miserable and even desperate—you must be as helpless as a leaf driven before the wind. The idea makes me very unhappy. But just think, spring has come again, the days are growing longer and so light; there must already be a great deal to see and to listen to in the country. Go out as much as you can; the sky is now so interesting and so variegated with the clouds restless chasing one another, the chalky soil, where none of the crops have yet begun to show, must be lovely in the changing lights. Feast your eyes on it all, so that I can see it through you.

That is the only thing of which one never tires, the only thing which perpetually retains the charm of novelty and remains inviolably faithful. For my sake, too, you positively must go to the Botanical Gardens, so that you can tell me all about them.

Something exceedingly strange is happening this spring. The birds have come north four to six weeks earlier than usual. The nightingale is singing here on April 25th, whereas it is not due till the end of April, was heard laughing as early as March 15th; the golden oriole, which is sometimes called the ‘Whitan bird,’ and which is never seen till May, was already sitting in its gabled note in the grey sky before dawn. Either way. I can hear them all from a distance when they sing in the grounds of the lunatic asylum. I can’t think what the meaning of this premonition is, but it sometimes whether the influence of the lunatic asylum is respon- sible for the early return of the particular spot. Do go to the Botanical Gardens, Sonichka, towards noon when the sun is shining brightly, and let me know all you can hear. Over and above the issue of the battle of Cambrai, this really seems to me the most important thing in the world.

The pictures you have sent me are lovely. Needless to say a word about the Rembrandt. As for the Titian, I was even more moved by the horse than by the rider; I should not have thought it possible to depict so much power, so much majesty, in a animal. But the most beautiful of all is Bartolomeo Venetian’s ‘Portrait of a Lady.’ I knew nothing of the work of this artist before. It is a treasure of true feeling and a treasure of an exquisite expression of the mysterious charm of expression! In a vague sort of way the ‘Lady’ reminds me of ‘Mona Lisa.’ Your pictures have brought a touch of joy exactly to my prison cell.

Of course you must keep Hans Dieffenbach’s book. It grieves me that all his books should not have come into our hands, but I would rather have given them to you than to any- one. Did the Shakespeare reach you in good time? What news from Karl, and when do you expect to see him again? Give him a thousand greetings from me. Good night. My spirits up; enjoy the spring; when the next one comes, we shall all enjoy it together. Best love. Happy Easter!

Love, too, to the children.

Your,
Rosi.
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Evolve or be extinct.
Is the Labour Movement at present as strong as we suppose? Can it claim any great victories over the past year through our own, independent activities? These are two of the many questions posed in this article by MARY KLOPPER, writing from Aberdeen. We invite readers to join the discussion by writing to our FORUM pages: or better still, by expressing their views and following the example of many members of the Aberdeen Branch of the Plumbers’ Union, who have “blackened” all work on rocket launching sites in the area. Their action is the kernel of a real socialist program for peace, which Comrade Klopper finds so sorely lacking — Editor.

QUESTIONS FOR THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

By MARY KLOPPER

Suez, the H-bomb and now, rocket bases were the only issues on which the trade unionists found themselves in a staff. Only the Hambled down company to enjoy some success or a rational hope of positive results. Now it looks as if one colonial issue — Cyprus — may soon be added to this list and there will certainly be many non-socialists to help in resisting the advance of white supremacy planned for the Central African Federation in 1957. Some may dispute my contention with regard to the recent postponement of the defeat of unilateral disarmament and the clothing of Bevan at Brighton. But I believe the politicians and papers of all kinds, the refusal of the Scandinavians and case bases, the plans for a great campaign in 1955 and growing resistance to the sit-in rocket bases in Scotland are surely grounds for rational hope of imposing some modification on current Western policy.

Strength with Allies

It is the pattern of events in this field, repeated in others, which has worried me into trying to write this. Having rejected the Labour Movement, basing its policy on a “40” analysis, which achieves such results. Its contrary, they have been achieved when the Labour Movement has happened to fight on the same issues as the government in our political life. On Suez a large “liberal” element inside the ruling class, being driven by Gov- ernment action and so we had half the capitalist press and all sorts of people who are normally inactive or actively anti-socialist on our side and, even so, we must recognize that the movement had run out of bases which are admitted into the orthodox armory accepted by the leadership, and rightly we have failed if it had not been for international factors such as the American attitude. The pacifists, serious Christians and the Stalinists were also with us on Suez and are NATO weapons in nuclear weapons campaign. Indeed, many of them accept the policy of unilateral disarmament which was defeated at Brighton and so go further than Labour’s official policy of banning merely the tests.

New Allies

Now on rocket bases a new ally is available — Scottish nationalism. The reported appearance of Labour MPs on a Nationalist platform in Glasgow and the “Scottish” orientation of statements by MPs and the Scottish Labour Party Executive suggest that such an alliance is developing.

Many elements in the ruling class have joined in attacking the Government over Cyprus on the strength of the socialist policy of immediate withdrawal from bases by self-determination as an alternative, but envisage a long period of control from Britain leading to an undefined peaceful solution.

I am not arguing that we should not make alliances but I am suggesting that we should use them consciously and selectively, that we should have our own distinctive socialist policy and limit common platforms to ground that it would be a more effective economic base if it was recognized self-determination. And there are many serious opponents of white settler policies for Central Africa who do not accept the socialist policy of immediate withdrawal from bases by self-determination as an alternative, but envisage a long period of control from Britain leading to an undefined peaceful solution.

Scottland Moves for Peace

The leaders of the Scottish Labour Party have unanimously called for a wide campaign against the rocket-launching sites planned for the north-east coast of Scotland. In a resolution which they have sent to the Party’s national executive, the twenty members of the Scottish Executive Council speak of “out deep perturbation in Scotland.”

The resolution says: “We deplore the attempts to lay Scottish opinion by suggesting that some of our pressing economic problems would be solved by building bases in Scotland.

We call for a national campaign to force Government to reconsider the position.”

This resolution was passed at a specially summoned meeting of the Executive.

William Harbottle M.S.S.P., Scottish Secretary of the Labour Party, said at a press conference in Glasgow on December 28th: “More and more resolutions are arriving by post from trade-unions and Constituency Labour Parties backing our stand.”

The Association of Locomotive Men and Engineers in Glasgow protested against the bases coming to Scotland. They also passed a resolution calling for the abolition of H-bombs and atomic weapons.

After a stormy debate in the Falkirk council chamber, the Labour-controlled Burgh Council sent a letter to the Prime Minister calling for an end to nuclear war preparations. The five Tory Members of the Council defended the Government’s proposals to build bases for rocket warheads on the North-East coast of Scotland.

Other Labour-controlled Burgh Councils will pass similar resolutions within the next two weeks. Several prominent Labour Members and councillors have called for a campaign against this nuclear madness.
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issues on which the policies of our allies overlap with our own. This would naturally lead to such alliances being limited in duration and purpose.

If we accept the view that a nuclear war will destroy civilization and possibly the human race it will obviously also destroy the material base for socialism and the best alliances would be justified on such an issue. But surely we should have more to our policy than a common fear of destruction and this raises two vital questions:

Capitalism vs. peace

1. Do the operations of the capitalist system of themselves lead to war and constitute the cause of war in the modern world? If we adhere to this traditional view it does not mean that we must cease to hope and work for the abandonment of capitalism and that capitalism along with our civilization. It does mean that we must recognize that the destruction of war will remain, and it certainly raises doubts about the Stalinist policies of premature peaceful coexistence. If we are to have peace, that is to say, in the future, we must recognize the necessity of capitalism having been disposed of.

What is our attitude to the USSR’s manufacture of H-bombs and rockets and her manifest intention of using them if attacked? Have we thought that we are asking more of Britain — unilateral nuclear disarmament — than we ask of supposed socialists in Russia?

On the colonial questions we must ask ourselves whether self-determination means anything without the withdrawal of foreign military forces and bases and whether white supremacy can be stayed off or even slowed down by allowing the continuation of a system in which is the creation of imperialism.

We must quickly make up our minds whether there is any special case for resisting rocket bases, the British Government has any more or less right to sit them in Aberdeenshire than in say, Sussex? On this will depend the shape and significance of the campaign on this issue.

Good wishes

When we have answered these questions we may find the common ground on which we can stand together. If the Marxists or liberals or pacifists narrrower but more solid than at present. If our followers are convinced, the state them clearly and consistently we shall be able to combine our efforts for immediate aims, great on the great, with the fundamental task of bringing a little nearer a socialist world which I still believe is the only way to eliminate war as distinct from merely a particularly weapon however developed.

I wish Socialist Review a very good year because it is providing an excellent forum for debating the sort of question I have raised; I hope readers will offer some answers.
SIX YEARS AT THE TORY RULE have cost the workers of Britain plenty, and nowhere is this more apparent than in the rent books of workers who live in council houses. Subsidised mortgages and sky-high interest rates on munici-
pal housing projects have made Tory policies more expensive in terms of pounds, shillings and pence.

When the Labour Government left office in 1951, the average weekly
rating was £3.05 per cent, and it takes but a simple arithmetic sum to show what this means to local councils and their tenants: for a house costing £2,000 the interest over a 60-year period (the normal length of time for loan repayment) on mortgages (at 4 per cent) would be £223.25; in weekly terms it was 14s 11d. on the tenant’s rent. Even then, the Labour Government understood the basic error in making a subsidy from Exchequer funds to help pay the interest charges on loans raised to build council houses. A subsidy worked out at an average of £900 over the 60-year period during which interest was being paid.

The real effect of this subsidy was to knock 6s 4d a week off the loan charges and leave the tenant (or the Coun-
cillor) with the cost of borrowing the cash to build the house.

In the past six years the position has changed for the worse—
as another piece of simple arithmetic shows. To build a £2,000 house now, a local council needs to pay interest at the rate of 6½ per cent for 60 years. This means interest charges of £6,254—
—£3,929 more than under the Labour Government. It also means higher rents for tenants. With the present sky-
high rents and weekly interest charges on a tenant of a £2,000 house is £15 5s. 2d. more than when Labour was in office. But this is not all: by lend-
ing housing subsidies (except in special cases), the Tories have taken away the heart of the scheme by limiting the amount of their tenants to meet interest charges. The total result is that the cost of a £2,000 house has jumped £2,254 a week because of Tory juggling with housing finances.

To be heavily underscored at this point is the fact that neither the local council, ratepayer or council tenant gets a thing extra for this additional £2,254 a week. In short, it is the finance capitalists—commonly called moneylenders—who benefit at the expense of the working class.

What is Labour’s answer to this high rent policy of the Tories? The hous-
ing Minister, Mr. G. A. Redpath, at the 1956 Labour Party Conference, said, among many other things, that the next Labour Government will make money available to the housing purposes at ‘reason-
able rates of interest’ and pay housing subsidies ‘as may be required.’ This policy means the Government is pledged to get back to the 1951 position, but even so, this is not good enough. In-
stead the Labour Government should be pledged to provide interest-
free loans for municipal housing pur-
poses, to provide a fund to remove the load on local councils and their tenants and at the same time weaken the power of the finance capitalists who are at present rich at the expense of workers living in council houses.
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HOUING . . . . . . IN 1984 ?

A HAPPY NEW YEAR to you all and please to remember that 1984 is only twenty-seven Christmas away.

A high interest rate on the use of the Tarot pack. Laplace transforms and straightforward chauvinism we have been fortunate in obtaining a facsimile transmission of a page of Harris’s for that year and various abstracts follow.

"BOTH HOUSES assembled in the great hall at 1945 E. Atlantic Station, and knelt in prayer with the Central Bank with 2245 days until the Graduate Missile Force played 'God Save the Queen.' The cheeks of Mr. M. Kidron (Lab., Motherwell) were observed to be well flushed."

’During a natural internment in the debates, the Lord President of the Council demonstrated a new preparation (Solvay, price two shillings and threepence, of all chemists) for the more efficient whitening of the teeth."

‘Miss P. Hornsby-Smith, the Home Secretary, opened a debate on the Bill for the provision of a Committee for Provision of Houses for the Midlands, said that in this the Government had a problem of unparalleled magnitude."

'Since the unfortunate destruction of the City of Birmingham and its environs ten years ago in the course of a forced landing by an aircraft carrying a nuclear weapon, the Govern-
ment had initiated an almost continuous series of committees to determine the cause of the accident, the person responsible for the payment of compensation, and the correct order of priorities in rebuilding."

'The record of the opposition in this business had been lamentable. They had taken every conceivable opportunity to delay the work of the various commissions by insisting that their own proposals to rehouse all units of population should be given precedence over the Government's carefully thought-out scheme to re-establish business in the area. The Government was doing as much as it could as quickly as it could. She was pleased to announce a forthcoming payment of the instalments on the compensation to the manufacturers of the district. (Pro-
longed Government cheers and Opposition interjections of 'What about the Houses?')"

'She had just heard the Opposition repeat one of their favourite parrot cries. She knew that in the forthcoming debate they would raise another and accuse the Government of being responsible for the accident. Nobody regretted the whole affair more than the Americans, but whilst the United States Adminis-
tration was perhaps beginning to come round to the viewpoint of the British Government, the strong views of Congress could not be altogether discounted and in any case it could not be conclusively shown that the aircraft which caused the accident was American. She appealed to Members not to say anything that might disturb the traditional friendship of the Anglo-
Saxon peoples."

'Those Birmingham householders who have proved their claims to compensation were already residing in a holiday camp at South Uist. If some of the Honourable Members opposite were not careful they would be sent to the same. As the Home Secretary has repeatedly said, the ancient liberties of the House of Commons must not be allowed to degenerate into licence."

'After the traditional protest by the Leader of the Opposi-
tion about the large number of uniformed officials in the Noses Lobby the debate concluded."'

Here the transmission ends.

The lessons to be drawn from it are various, but perhaps the most important of them is that if Conservative govern-
ments are to remain in power they can be trusted to take an Elder Brother’s care of us all.

MICHAEL MILLET

WHAT WE STAND FOR

The Socialist Review stands for international Socialism. Only the mass mobilisation of the working class can win the political arena to lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism. The Socialist Review believes that the working class must be brought to power on the lines of the fol-

owing programme:

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banking system and the transport and compensation payments based on a means test. Re-
nationalisation of all denationalised industries without compen-
sation.—The nationalised industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.

- Workers’ control in all nationalised industries. The majority of workers’ representa-
tives on all national and area boards, subject to periodic election, immediate recall and receiving the average skilled trade wage.

- The inclusion of workers’ representatives on the boards of all private firms employing more than 100 workers. All workers’ representatives to have free access to all documents.

- The establishment of workers’ councils with full power to deal with all questions concerning the industrial workforce.

- The establishment of the national service for full main-
tenance.

- The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, linked to a realistic cost-of-living index, the abolition of all payments for the National Health Ser-
vice and the development of an industrial health service.

- The expansion of the nationalised industries and the giving interest free loans to local authorities and the right to re-

- Free education up to 18. Abolition of fee pay-
ing schools. For comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants.—without a means test—for all university students.

- Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protec-
tion to all workers irrespective of their country of origin. Fre-
don of migration for all workers to and from Britain.

- Freedom from political and economic oppression to all colonies. The offer of tech-

- The unification of an in-

- The abolition of conscrip-
tion and the withdrawal of all British troops from over-

- A Socialist foreign policy independent of both Washing-

ton and Moscow.