WORKERS CAN EXPECT NOTHING FROM
THE SUMMIT CONFERENCES

Very soon the whole world will be watching with great interest the meetings of Messrs Khruschev and Eisenhower, first in Washington then in Moscow. Socialist Review is sure that the main single outcome of their conferences will be disappointed. Disappointment, that is, for those who expect or hope something will be done there to solve the problems of tension and to eliminate the danger of nuclear war.

Mr K and Mr E may really be the peace-lovers and pacemakers they say they are. Certainly one of the reasons they're coming together is because they have to try and make a show to the world that they are for peace. But what can we really expect them to achieve? Possibly they will agree to some compromise over Berlin. Perhaps the fighting in Laos will stop if it hasn't stopped by then, and there may even be a suspension of nuclear tests. But, with the basic issues which underlie international tension they are sure to get exactly nowhere.

So long as the world is divided into two mutually hostile camps there cannot be a durable peace. The fundamental cause of international tension and the occasional flare-ups of war in trouble spots is this very division. But Khruschev and Eisenhower base themselves on just such a division, on the continuing existence of the two blocs. They are not interested in talking about how the blocs can be abolished. They are not interested because the blocs can only be abolished together with class rule and their profit and privilege.

For this reason their agreements, if any, can only be temporary solutions. At best they can only cool the hottest points of dispute. They will not solve any fundamental problems.

A stable and secure peace will not be achieved until the working people of all countries insist on the breaking up of the two camps, and themselves carry it into effect. It will not be achieved by the leaders shaking hands over cups of coffee or glasses of vodka.

Cousins . . . . Gaitskell
LABOUR AND THE BOMB

When the delegates assemble at the Labour Party Annual Conference they will be asked to express an opinion on a policy on nuclear weapons. At present it seems that they will have to choose between two alternatives, which are coming to be known as the Gaitskell line and the Cousins line.

A slight odour

The Gaitskell line is that of the non-nuclear club. It is a policy which was adopted immediately after the sensational Municipal and General resolution, and before the conferences of the other major unions. We believe that for Socialists it is necessary to reject this policy out of hand.

Let us suppose that a Labour Government is elected. It announces that it will give up the H-bomb if all other countries, excepting the USA and the USSR, also agree to do so. What are the chances, nowadays, of such an agreement? Do Gaitskell and Bevan really believe that China, say, is going to agree? Or France, where even the Socialist Party was far from keen on the idea? It only needs one country to say ‘no’, and the whole plan collapses. And then we are left exactly where we are at present—no change at all. On the contrary, our well-meaning Labour leaders can then turn around and say: ‘You see, France (or China, or Peru, or Monaco—it doesn’t matter) won’t give up the bomb, so we have to keep it now!’

Socialist policy

Quite frankly, the whole business has a slight odour. But perhaps miracles can happen. Perhaps every country in the world will agree. Then what? We are still left with masses of nuclear weapons in the hands of the USA and USSR. We are left with American missile bases on British soil, American H-bomb carrying aircraft based on British territory. If this is to be the situation then what has the non-nuclear club achieved? What difference does it make to our fellow-workers in Eastern Europe if we threaten...
HOW TO FIGHT THE BOMB

The H-bomb casts its mushroom-shaped shadow across the world, creating the supreme problem of our time. Western Governments have openly stated their preparedness to drop the first H-bomb in a Third World War. What can they hope to achieve by this? In the past rulers claimed to be fighting to defend their people and country. But this excuse can no longer be used. Duncan Sandys, the Tory Minister, frankly declared the British Government's policy: "We decided not to defend the whole country, but only our bomber bases."

Since nuclear war would mean national suicide, why doesn't Britain opt out of the arms race? The answer lies in the nature of Capitalism. From the policeman wielding his truncheon on the picket-line to the soldier shooting natives in the colonies, Capitalism relies on force—it could not continue without it. More and more force, bigger and better weapons, only these can give a vestige of security to an ailing economic system.

But, better still, the nuclear arms race acts as a pep pill, warding off depression and stimulating the sluggish economy. More jobs, more money—a fragile prosperity. For example, in the United States the aircraft industry alone, which produces mainly military aeroplanes and missiles, employs more than a million people. "The profits are fat," wrote Bruce Rothwell in the News Chronicle (December 17, 1957): "There are many Wall Street brokers who deal only in the aircraft industry; and some now who only deal in missiles."

Creates jobs and keeps money

Yet, this missile-omania lacks even military justification. General Norstad made this clear when he told the US Senate in June, 1957: "I think we have that capability. I am speaking now of destroying anything that is of military significance in Russia at the present time." This being so, why go on piling up more missiles? Frustrating as it must be for our 20th Century Borgias, people can only be murdered once.

His view is echoed by Dr ARJ Grosch, a manager of International Business Machines Corporation, which produces components for missiles and space vehicles. He told a conference at the California Institute of Technology on March 20th:

We don't need better missiles to destroy each other—the ones we have will do the job adequately.
And there isn't any point in zooming off into outer space. We could spend the money better solving problems here at home—taking care of our overcrowded, underfed millions. If we did that, we wouldn't need to find new worlds to colonize.

We are planning to spend millions of dollars a year on new missiles and space probes. And I ask why? We are in a bad way, I'm afraid, when we try to solve our problem by mass killing—or by padding off to a bigger island in space.

Our missile program is the swan song of a dying civilization.

Another top-ranking executive, Dr Ridenour, general manager of Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, told the conference that the missile program was following America's "traditional economy of waste."

We turn in our cars before they are worn out, and our nation would be broke if we didn't. Our missile program fits into this system very well. We spend up missiles that never come back, and so we have to make more missiles.

This is fine. It creates jobs and keeps money in circulation.

In the not too distant future, man will be boarding the other fellow's satellites and destroying them. This modern man-made monster is built, and the economy is kept functioning at top speed.

These two high executives, each with first-hand experience of missile production, clearly show how economic forces—the fear of a slump—provides the basis of America's nuclear arms program when no rational justification can be given. It is sheer self-preservation that makes Capitalism produce H-bombs and missiles. Consequently, opposition to the H-bomb must not be divorced from the struggle for Socialism.

Some quaint people, however, fondly imagine that, by strong arguments and strong pressure, they can compel the Government to renounce the Bomb. These wishful-thinkers, who include many leaders of CND, fail to realise that the Government's nuclear policy is founded on deep class interests. The Government needs the Bomb to preserve their economic power and privileges. To expect them to ban the Bomb because of cogent arguments places a touching—and unfounded—faith in the art of persuasion. It is about as realistic as to expect the brewers to be convinced of temperance arguments and to lead a campaign against the evils of drink.

Labour to power! minus the bomb! This wishing to influence the Tory Government has many harmful effects. It results in an attempt to keep the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament within genteeel limits, not to offend the delicate sensibilities of our Rulers. It hinders, also, the most important task of CND, vital for its healthy existence, namely to link the Campaign with the Labour Movement. For it is only through the Labour Movement that the Bomb will ever be banned.

Trade unions must be got to oppose the Bomb. The large sum of money squandered on making nuclear weapons and the fabulous profits made by the Arms Barons adversely affect not only the workers' living conditions but his actual living. In defence, trade unions can mobilize their strength and, by blacking the H-bomb factories and sites, bring production to a halt.

The Labour Party has also got its part to play. No professing socialist government can have the Bomb because it does not only hope to keep its existence, namely to link the Campaign with the Labour Movement. For it is only through the Labour Movement that the Bomb will ever be banned.

The Labour Party must come out clearly against the Bomb, declaring it will ban it when in power. This step would arouse the Party workers from their present apathetic apathy and galvanize the whole Movement into an enthusiastic crusade behind the slogan:

DOWN WITH THE TORIES! DOWN WITH THE BOMB! LABOUR TO POWER! MINUS THE BOMB! BOOKS by M Millett

The Poor Man's Guide to the Stock Exchange. Published by Labour Research Department Publications. 60 pages, 6s.

IN THE foreword to this book, Jack Charleworth speaks of the Stock Exchange as a casino, but it is sharply differentiated from other forms of gambling in that it is far from being a mug's game. Undoubtedly, people can, and have, lost money on 'change, but no reputable prudence that the average punter (or investor) is much more likely to gain than to lose. The only difficulty is, that comparatively large amounts of money are necessary to start with. Even so, too, office workers frequently contrive to make a few pounds on the side, but then, the poor things aren't paid overtime anyway and have to go to work with clean collars.

This Guide to the Stock Exchange is a clear account of the history of the institution and of its day-to-day activities. Many of the peculiar terms used are explained, although the absence of an index reduces its value as a reference book. Both those who are studying economics for examinations and the socialist seeking to understand (or to undermine) the capitalist system can find much of value—how many people know, for example, that taxation is still spent on paying the interest on the money borrowed for Marlborough's wars against the French?

From the Socialist point of view, the book is descriptive rather than analytical. In any case, the finances of capitalism cannot be analysed without refer-
P Mansell discusses
LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS

THE PRELIMINARY agenda
for the Labour Party Con-
ference indicates a lack of
direct connection with the dis-
cussion at Conference. By the
time amendments and addi-
tional resolutions composit-
ed and the chairman has
exercised his (or her) right
to call upon to speak from the floor
in the intervals left by the platform
speakers, very little of the origi-
nal agenda may in fact be dis-

cussed.

But the resolutions, if they are
nothing more than a formal pro-

ouncement, year by year, of how opinion
is crystallising in the party. It is
one of the peculiarities of the party
that it itself offers few opportunities
for the voice of the rank and file to be heard
and even be regarded as impor-
tant enough to rate a mention in the National
Press. This year one issue above all stands
out among all those in- cluded in the agenda—nuke-
disarmament. It is not surprising
that the question should soon

On the 'change'

ence to the banking system which is
even more fundamental than
the Stock Exchange itself.

Our chosen book is the sixth, which exposes the various schemes for 'democratic' workers shares and shows how these schemes work out. I am not
surprised that the basic assumption of the money
in the workers' pockets is held.

In the description of take-
over bidding, there is no account

The gulf between the leadership
and the rank and file on this
question is all too apparent—it
is certainly specifically con-
nected in one of the resolutions.
It will be disastrous if discussion of
the question at Conference is
shunned by appeals to loyalty
and closing the ranks on the eve
of an Election. Whenever the
eventual outcome of the vote, how
the block votes of the big unions
are deployed, it is absolutely
essential that the mass opinion
of the Party should be clearly
heard.

No fewer than 140 of the

resolutions (i.e., those on

policy and not party administra-

tion) are devoted to disarmament.

Compared with this, no other

subject at present receives

time. Unemployment and redundancy

17, the National Health Service

and medical research, 24, pensions

and welfare payments 17, and

housing 21. On unemployment, the majority of the resolutions call

for limited ameliorative measures such as more vigorous action

by the governmen-t to attract industr-

y to the badly hit areas rather than

for the fundamental change of

nationalizing all industry under

the control of the working class,

which alone can banish unemploy-

ment from the lives of the

masses. Inflation is barely mentioned

in the resolutions, except in relation to

the question of costs, whereas

four of the five resolutions call for the

nationalization of the building industry as the

only standard of housing for the

workers. Very few of the unem-

ployment resolutions call for

cost cutting, even if at least half

his wages, the latter to be paid

by industry.

Still poverty

The resolutions on the Health

Service are mainly concerned

with relatively minor, though

useful reforms. There is little

echo of the fury of a few years

ago over prescription charges.

Most of the housing resolutions

call for the reversal of the Tory

Government's policies which have

hammered the housing pro-
grames of local authorities and

forced them into higher rents.
The Resolution on the "future

dominance of the working men'

but Islington S.W. calls for

a pledge from the party to repay

its savings to industry and re-

introduce rent control and

security of tenure.

The resolutions on pensions agree that payments must

help to dispel poverty and hardship which are

imposed on the groups in society

who could not avoid them. They

also recognize the needs of older

couples, widows and old age pensioners, and those

who have been taken by a partner

who certainly don' t have it so

good' under the Tory era of

Prosperity. Pledges are called

for that a Labour government will

raise old age pensions, allow

widows to retain their earnings,

and so on.

The so-called 're-thinking' in

the Labour Party symbolised by the production of the "Future

Labour Offers You" is not

allowed to go unchallenged.

Three resolutions on this, rather

easy-going proposition, appear on

page 35 under the title

'Socialism', as though Socialism

is incidental to the 'main theme'

and should not be considered in isolation from all

the other problems dealt with in the

Party. Here the grandiloquence of the party's Socialist principles,

instead of the reformist 'image'

that the present leadership have

asserted, is brought to the fore.

It is a question of the 'true'

opinion of the Party towards

the working class and people

back to the government.

Naturally in an operation of

this sort there is plenty of chance

for profit all round. That these

profits have come out of labour

there can be no doubt in any

socialist's mind. But what

could do with much more detail-

ated information than this. Does

the value adduced from the workers in the

firm involved or from in-

creased productivity of the work-

ing class?

Another point worth noting is

this: a take-over bid implies that

a firm of whose work he probably

knows nothing, save that he can

sell part of the business at a profit. He knows nothing about

the work of the firm, but

measures less but all the chartered

accountants and professional

generals in the land, and the

study men rush to his bidding.

So much for 'the skills of manage-

ment'. (This is actually

experienced in some respects, an

elected committee of workers

would have a much better under-

standing than any financier.

Could they not do a great deal

better, both for themselves and the community?)

John Phillips on

THE PRINTING STRIKE IS over. At least the

workers are working and union

officials and bosses are heaving a

breath of fresh air.

What a nightmare they

spoke they had. The workers,

asking for better hours and pay

to the tune of 25 per cent, man-

aged to get 81 per cent.

The fact that there would be a

compromise sooner or later was ob-

vious right from the start.

The result however was not

nearly as good as it could have been.

Why, for instance, didn't the printing unions campaign, or even

ask, for support from other

unions on such a vital issue as

the printing strike? Why, in

didn't they accept financial aid
even when it was offered? It is

known that the ten printing

unions spent over three million

pounds on strike pay to their

members. The fact that they went

so far without any hold-up

under the undertones of isolationism.

Why was no effort made to
gain support from outside their

unions? This support is not vital, but in some
cases it could act as a morale

raiser. In this instance the ones

who could have done with the

official pep up were the union

officials who were a long way

behind the men at every stage

One thing about the strike

which should be mentioned is the

part played by the women. Yet

attention is drawn at any
time to women on strike, due per-

haps to their traditionally con-

servative attitude when voting for

a government. Of the 370 thousand employed in the

printing, bookbinding and paper

grey industry one third are women,

which means that probably over

25 thousand have been engaged

in the strike. It is about time a

little more attention is paid to the

subject, particularly by the unions.

40 hour week

So what then is the outlook for

the future? The workers have got

an equivalent rise far in excess

of the CBI's 3 per cent last

year. But the price was rather

high, in that the workers will

have to cope with fully with the

employers in increasing efficiency,

etc., etc.

As to the 40 hour week there

is little doubt that it will be achi-

eved within the next few years,

although maybe not by the

printers, despite the setback

received this summer (because we

doubt the printers' hours will be

taken as a precedent in the near

future, as was the busmen's wage

rise).

BMC's

THE BMC strike at Oxford was

a question of trade union principle, not policy, and

although the victimization of a shop steward is nothing new it

always brings to the surface the fact that an inadequately

tiveative of the workers on the shop

floor, the union official or the

shop steward. It also brings to the

surface the attitude of the union

officials towards stewards they

choose to protect or ignore.

The case of Bro. Horrnan,

representative of BMC who was

charged on various pretences has

brought the AEU into disrepute.

Bro. Horrnan, a member of the

TGWU, was officially supported

by all unions in the factory ex-

cept the AEU, who have delayed

their decision to support or not to support in a way that makes a mockery of trade union principle and

solidarity.

To make matters worse the AEU has now been censured for their

behaviour, during the strike

accused the TGWU of not cooperating with the union in the factory. If the AEU spent more

time on defending workers' repre-

sentatives from various attacks by

the employers then they would

have less to fear from other

unions poaching their disgruntled members.)
S R is happy to reprint the following article from "OUTLOOK"

an Australian socialist review ""

H-BOMB — FACTS AND FIGURES

It has, over the past years, been difficult for a person without access to restricted military information to make an independent estimate of the likely consequences of nuclear warfare. We have had to rely on the public statements of military, political and scientific leaders. Of these, some see the war as an extension of the happenings at Hiroshima and Nagasaki and conclude that although there will be widespread devastation, civil defence is possible, the nations will survive and the world continue in acceptable fashion. Others conclude that no defence is possible, that the contending nations will be destroyed, and that the continued existence of human life may be put in jeopardy. It is high time that we, the subjects of this alarming debate, studied the matter and formed our own conclusions.

Sources of information

The facts are now coming to us through several channels. Civil defence organisations have increasingly pressed for, and have obtained, the relevant results from bomb tests. They have combined their information on the explosive power and fall-out of modern weapons to add to their estimating casualties from fire, and in the last war. The facts, and the conclusions drawn from them, are now laid out in manuals available to the general public. The most useful manual is the comprehensive, however, is contained in the testimonies of giant bombs tested before a bomb was dropped, given before a sub-committee of the US Congress in May 1957, which will be given in some detail. There are also now available books or compilations of facts published in the last few years by scientists accustomed to the labours of gathering information from the enormous body of scientific and technical journals. From these sources it is now entirely possible to form one's own conclusion on the probable results of a nuclear war.

• Need they be used?

It would be redundant to enquire whether the next major war is likely to be a nuclear war. Statesmen and military leaders have astonished us with statements of their intention; the military strategy of both the NATO and Warsaw Pact powers is based on the use of nuclear weapons. It is worth noting, however, the pressing military reasons for their use. Prof. P. M. S. Blackett, in the Lees Knowles Lectures on Military Science for 1957, calculated the number of H-bombs required to destroy the air area of 400 square miles, using different types of explosive. The relative numbers are: one for H-bombs; 50 for A-bombs; 100,000 for conventional high-explosives. They are several hundred times more expensive than uranium, for equal power. The natural uranium which is used as a tamper around an H-bomb core in the three-stage weapon is the cheapest explosive raw material known; it costs only £5,000 per megaton, and yields in addition large amounts of most damaging radioactive fall-out.

• 'Clean' or 'dirty'?

In assessing the effects of a nuclear war it is necessary to know the amount of both local and global fall-out which will be produced. This depends upon the ratio of 'clean' to 'dirty' bombs likely to be used, which is difficult to estimate from the public statements of leading men. For a considerable period spokesmen of the US Atomic Energy Commission defended the continuation of weapons testing by the argument that they were developing H-bombs with a comparable small fall-out, and were thus making possible a 'clean' war. This argument failed in September of last year, when Defence Secretary McElroy was being questioned by the Joint Atomic Energy Commission. When directly asked by Senator Russell 'Do we or do we not stockpile dirty bombs?' McElroy was obliged to answer 'Yes'. Indeed he went further and admitted that bombs were being withdrawn from the stockpile in order to make them dirtier. (They are known as 'tulips') The Russians on their part have never pretended that they would favour 'clean' bombs.

• How many?

One further point should be dealt with; are the stockpiles sufficient to support the size of attacks which we shall postulate in our calculation? Precise estimates cannot be made from public information; there is high authority, however, for saying that the stockpiles are now immense. As long ago as 1955 Dr. Lipp, a former consultant to the USAEC, said that the United States' stockpile then amounted to several tons of TNT for every inhabitant of our planet; we might add this as meaning five to fifteen thousand megatons. In January 1958 Congressman James Van Zandt, a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, stated that the United States had stockpiled material for the manufacture of 35,000 atomic weapons, and that the Soviet Union had an estimated stockpile of 10,000 such weapons; he did not mention an average power for the weapons. It seems that a nuclear war would at present involve the use of at least 10,000 bombs, while by 1965 to 1970 up to 100,000 megatons might be available.

• A single bomb on a single city

It is not necessary to recapitulate the effects of 1945 atomic bomb on Hiroshima; these are sufficiently well-known. It is worth noting, however, that such weapons are now available for tactical use at the discretion of a local commander, and can be fired from any of the atomic cannons now scattered about Europe. The relevant weapon for present day use against cities it the 10 megaton 'clean' H-bomb, or the 30 megaton 'dirty' three stage bomb, with an explosive power about a thousand times that of the early weapon. The British Home Office, in their civil defence manuals, have compiled a guide to the likely effect of such weapons on a British city. They estimate that a 10 megaton 'clean' bomb, detonated at a height of 6000 feet, would cause total destruction to a radius of 22 miles from the point beneath the explosion, and produce moderate to severe damage to a radius of 16 miles. Above ground installations of public utilities would be more or less severely damaged to a radius of eight miles, while the inner circle would have a covering of such heavy debris that no movement would be possible. People directly exposed to the heat flash would receive third degree burns (charring) up to a four mile radius. The heat flash lasts for up to half an minute and on a clear day will ignite combustible materials at distances of up to thirty miles. It appears that in these circumstances nothing can prevent a fire storm; burning fires from chimneys and ovens engulfing a whole area. A fire storm will then occur similar to those produced during the last war at Hamburg, Tokio and Hiroshima, but with a diameter of twenty miles. Were the bomb detonated at ground level, however, the inner debris would be so pulverised that it would not ignite, and there would be a clear area seven miles across in the centre of the fire.

Death by the million

Casualty estimates vary with the particular city and the warning and shelter available. (A rough rule of thumb is 20 megatons to the mega-corpses.) They are mainly due to heat flash, blast, and involvement in collapsed and burning buildings. In the central area the flash of gamma radiation is sufficient to kill through massed screening, while any survivors in shelters would be barred under rubble and exposed to suffocation and burning in the subsequent firestorm. For a similar air burst over Sydney at noon, 100,000 would die, those in the local civil defence organisation estimates that within a fourteen mile radius there would be one million dead and 400,000 injured, while within a
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seven mile radius there would be only 70,000 uninjured survivors.

A rough estimate

The Home Office consider it more likely that an enemy would use a megaton bomb, and burst it at ground level. This, for the same explosive power, would not result in the complete destruction by fire of some 20%, but would add enormous radioactive hazard from local fall-out. They estimate that such an explosion would contaminate a cigar-shaped area extending some 200 miles in a direction parallel to the fall-out, with 20 miles upwind and varying in width up to 40 miles. Unprotected people in this area for 36 hours after the burst would receive the following doses of radiation and the percentages shown would decline: 190 miles downwind, 300 roentgens; 5—10%: 160 miles, 500 r.; 50%: 140 miles, 800 r., 100%. Adequate shelter would much reduce these figures: it is estimated that at a height of only 10 feet of those within 140 miles would die. Applying this fall-out distance to the Sydney case, we find that a suitable wind could bring Newcastle, Orange or Canberra within the lethal area. Six suitably placed bombs might be expected to kill or injure at least a third of the Australian population.

Effect of one major raid

A number of studies have been made in the United States by the Rand Corporation, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and other bodies, on the fallout from a bombing campaign; most of the reports on these studies are classified. Evidence was given, however, in the 1957 Congressional hearings on fall-out by Dr. Kellog and Charles Shaffer, on a major study which they had conducted. This was an entirely realistic examination of the effects of a heavy attack on major targets in the United States, using manned bombers and allowing for the expected efficacy of air defence. It was supposed to result in the delivery of 250 nuclear and thermonuclear bombs, ranging in power from 5 to 20 megatons, on 144 areas of attack including cities, industrial targets and airfields. The total power dropped was 2,500 megatons, predominantly in the form of three-stage bombs detonated at ground level.

Which way the wind blows

The number of ground casualties may be calculated in the usual way, from a knowledge of population densities, types of buildings and the destructive power of the weapons. In order to estimate the later deaths, the observed known fall-out pattern from each bomb was plotted in accord with the weather conditions obtaining on the day of the supposed attack. Areas were then marked out on a map of the USA showing the radiation intensities one hour after the explosion. Knowing the populations in each area, the average shielding from the type of shelter available, and the rate of decay of fall-out activity it was then possible to calculate the dose received in the first 24 hours. From the knowledge of radiation sickness accumulated in Japan the severity of the sickness and the number of deaths over the next two months could be calculated. The results, based on 1950 population figures, are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Dead (millions)</th>
<th>Injured (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60th</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted to the 1958 population, by the 60th day there were 82 million dead, 24 million injured and 65 million uninjured, as a result of injuries sustained in the first 24 hours. The dosages received after 24 hours would produce further fatalities, while the survivors would be suffering from some radiation effects. It will be noted that as many died in the two months after the attack as were killed during it. This represents the immediate advantage to the attacker of using ground burst 'dirty' bombs.

Similar calculations have apparently been carried out for attacks on the USSR. General Gavin, the Chief of US Army Research and Development, testifying to a Senate subcommittee on the probable effects of a heavy attack, said: 'Current thinking is that, on the order of several hundred million deaths; that would be either way, depending on which way the wind blew.'

Casualties in a nuclear war

Let us consider the effects of a series of mutual attacks of the similar size to that quoted above. Let us begin by considering the effect on the USA, 5,000 on the USSR, and 2,500 on Europe. On the American figures this could be done by 750 successful aircraft sorties, which might require attempts by, at the most, 2,500 aircraft, a much smaller number than can be put into the air by the contending powers, even ignoring rocket delivery. Stockpiles are ample for this; the whole combatant could be assembled in one or two weeks.

Let us assume, as in the American study, that the bombs are predominantly area and blast at ground level. In this study, after the 60th day, half of the population was dead and a third of the survivors were injured. In the USSR, the dead was a quarter of the population in Europe larger, than in the USA. It would seem reasonable to apply the same casualty rate to all populations involved. There are 225 million people in the USSR, 425 million in Europe, 166 million in the USA and another 100 million in those neighbouring regions which are most likely to be heavily affected. Of these 916 million, then 220 million would die during the attack while in two months there would be a total of 450 million dead, 133 million injured and 333 million uninjured, due to the events of the first day.

For the 'survivors'

We should now consider the effect on the survivors of radiation received after the first day. This cannot be accurately determined but an estimate can be made from a simple calculation. The basis of this calculation is that the 'survivors', the Black C. Graves, has been since 1950 the Science Director of the Pacific Proving Grounds Activities, and since 1951 the Test Director of the Nevada Proving Grounds Activities of the Atomic Energy Commission. His fall-out calculations are likely to be correct. He stated that the radioactivity of one megaton of thermonuclear energy, one minute after the explosion, is comparable with that of many tons of radium. 'During the first 24 hours there would be a decrease by a factor of more than 6,000, but it has been estimated that this activity, if uniformly spread over an area of 10,000 square miles, would cause a radiation intensity after 24 hours of 2.7 roentgens per hour at a distance of three feet above the ground. Unprotected personnel in that area would receive more than 300 roentgens and suffer the effects of a small atomic bomb.'

Seven times too much

The total area of the countries involved in the attacks is about ten million square miles. If the products of 10,000 megatons of fission bombs are spread uniformly over this area they will produce an exposure to unprotected persons of more than 3,000 roentgens in the period starting 24 hours after the attack. This amount of radiation, if received at once, is about six times the lethal dose. If spread over a shorter period, however, the effect is to shorten life by about two to four days per roentgen. The survivors will have their life expectancy reduced by some 15 to 30 years.

Finally, we should consider the ways in which our calculation may have over- or underestimated the likely casualties. We shall have overestimated if the attack is less than described, but it is not likely—consider the number of 1,000 bomber raids staged in 1944-45 and the number of short range missiles now available in Europe. The assumption that each blast is independent of the others 24 hours is untrue, but unfortunately the worst areas will also be the most densely populated. Perhaps only half the bombs will be 'dirty'. In which case we may reduce the figures by 25%. And we have ignored the fact that not all of the fall-out is local; up to a third of it may go into the stratosphere to become global fall-out.

I myself consider the estimate to be a conservative one, if only because the attacks are comparatively small. With present techniques of delivery and present stockpiles they could be intensified to the times the size: in ten years they could be ten times the size. And in our calculations we have ignored the consequent deaths. For the survivors there will be misery of a sort not known since the Black Death, and the lesser, millions wandering in search of safety, hunger, food riots, mass epidemics, collapse of all the technical framework which supports our present life.

Conclusion

The conclusion seems inescapable. The likely consequence of a nuclear war is the immediate or delayed extinction of between a quarter and a third of the world's population, and the destruction of the civilisations of Europe, Russia and North America.

---


ROSA LUXEMBURG THE REVOLUTIONARY

The fate suffered by Rosa Luxemburg's memory in the forty years since her murder is a part of the fate of the international socialist movement. This mighty revolutionary, probably the greatest tribune of the twentieth century, has produced little in the way of a living legacy. Marx and Engels, had lived almost undisturbed in the byways of socialist research, dimly remembered, generally misrepresented, incapable of being accommodated within the turgid streams of social democracy and Stalinism. Even the miniscule group of revolutionaries who had admired her too turbulent a spirit to commit to their gallery of ditties.

The movement has yet to discover the significance of Rosa Luxemburg. When it does, it will be infinitely richer, until it does, it will be undermining its failure to measure up to its historic tasks.

Rosa Luxemburg has had her biographers. Paul Fröhlich's work is a classic of compendious writing. But until now, no one has attempted a critical appraisal of her life and work from the point of view of Western socialists, that is, in terms of the current tasks and the developed proletarian mass movement. No one has yet attempted to Luxemburg for guidance in present-day political activities.

New men old problems

This, Tony Cliff has now done in his critique of Rosa Luxemburg, published as nos. 2 and 3 of Socialism. His mission is to fasten on to the major problems facing the West European labour movement at the turn of the century by describing the political thinking of this great revolutionary and then to present her conclusions and solutions in a spirit of criticism and objective evaluation of contemporary writing. The reader sees the subject in historical perspex. Her magnificent achievements placed in context, her equally magnificent mistakes shown in perspective.

Sometimes the logic of ideas leads the author to ignore his subject, completely ignoring his subject to train a thought more lethal than hers. But even these broad sides merely serve to underline the major lesson of the book: that there is an amazingly strong similarity between the problems that faced our great-grandmothers, and those that we are facing; that the searing revolutionary energy and clairvoyance that enabled Rosa Luxemburg to cleave to the very heart of the proletariat revolution have made her the greatest teacher of our time, a never-ending source of inspiration to the isolated revolutionary socialist minorities of today.

Where we have a Strachey, Luxemburg's generation had a Bernstein. Both ex-Marxists, both proponents of brief capitalism, both a death blow to the limitation of their respective parties, both aspiring to a revolutionary, democratic role to trade unions which, in the long run, is bound to be self-destructive, and, ever so gently, into a socialist one; both, in a word, providing the intellectual fodder for reformism and class collaboration.

Luxemburg declared relentless war on these prophets of weakness. She exposed the analytical presuppositions of the theory of prosperity in the limitless and value, both ascribing a regulatory, "democratic" role to trade unions which, in the long run, is bound to be self-destructive, and, ever so gently, into a socialist one; both, in a word, providing the intellectual fodder for reformism and class collaboration.

Luxemburg declared relentless war on these prophets of weakness. She exposed the analytical presuppositions of the theory of prosperity in the limitless and value, both ascribing a regulatory, "democratic" role to trade unions which, in the long run, is bound to be self-destructive, and, ever so gently, into a socialist one; both, in a word, providing the intellectual fodder for reformism and class collaboration.

Luxemburg declared relentless war on these prophets of weakness. She exposed the analytical presuppositions of the theory of prosperity in the limitless and value, both ascribing a regulatory, "democratic" role to trade unions which, in the long run, is bound to be self-destructive, and, ever so gently, into a socialist one; both, in a word, providing the intellectual fodder for reformism and class collaboration.

Luxemburg declared relentless war on these prophets of weakness. She exposed the analytical presuppositions of the theory of prosperity in the limitless and value, both ascribing a regulatory, "democratic" role to trade unions which, in the long run, is bound to be self-destructive, and, ever so gently, into a socialist one; both, in a word, providing the intellectual fodder for reformism and class collaboration.
FEDERATION!

F. Dev Mulawa

The condition in the best paid industry, mining. In other occupations the conditions are even worse. In contrast the profits of the rich copper mining corporations are staggering. In 1955 the net profits of the four copper mining companies were £311 million. In 1955 they were £52 million. In Nyasaland the statutory minimum wage is 1.5 days a day, rising to 2s. for industrial labour. Again the report is revealing. 'In 1958 it was estimated that 170,000 men were abroad as migrant workers. Recruiting organisations function throughout Nyasaland.' (Para. 14). Besides these economic difficulties is the powerful hostility, whose members think themselves to be so civilised that they have no right to be in the South African villages, to be treated with a different skin, to be human. (Sir John Peel, a Tory M.P.).

Those Tories who talk so glibly of the greatness of Britain and the benevolence of the British Empire do not like to be reminded of the benevolence and greatness should be remembered by the people. It is the memory of Jalanwalla Bag in India, the Kikuyu massacre in Kenya, of the recent murders in Hola and Nkata Bay. It is also the memory of imprisonment and punishment of Gandhi and Nehru in India, Jomo Kenyatta in Kenya, Makarios in Cyprus and Dr. Banda in Nyasaland. This is the tradition that the oppressed people see it. This does not leave much hope for the Nyasalanders.

Losing allies.

But the danger also comes from the munitions manufacturers, wool- and woolen-wools of the European liberals. They are all too ready for time till it is too late. It is these liberals who talk about the ideal of racial partnership. For them, it is essential that this fiction of their imagination is kept alive by perpetuating the Federation, which they are getting. They are not so much concerned with the justice and urgency of the African cause as with the correct conduct and the standards which they never apply to adovocacy of racial supremacy in Africa.

Another danger is from the frightened, floating-vote-chasing leadership of the Labour Party. Their advocacy of the African cause is so time-worn as to be almost useless. It is time that they realised that polite fobs and threats cannot alter the position. The Labour Party is not a demonstration of socialist virtues. It has failed to put the African case clearly before its own rank and file members. It has done little to counteract mass chauvinism at home and in its roots in Fascist and Tory propaganda. It still talks in terms of giving a fair trial to the Federation. How can the Labour leadership be expected to realise that the Devlin Report has killed Federation as an agreed proposal? It should call for the release of prisoners, the burial of Federation, and independence for Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia where there is still peace. Time is running out fast in Africa. Labour is losing its natural allies.
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WHAT WE STAND FOR

The Socialist Review stands for nationalisation of heavy industry. Only the mass mobilisation of the working class in the industrial and transport sectors can overthrow capitalism and the government of South Africa.

The Socialist Review believes that only a racially conscious Non-white Government must be brought to power as part of the following programme:

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry. Only the mass mobilisation of the working class in the industrial and transport sectors can overthrow capitalism and the government of South Africa.
- Workers' control in all nationalised industries, a majority of workers' representatives on the boards of state-owned industries. Workers' representation on the boards of all industrial companies within the framework of a planned economy. In all state-owned industries, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and receiving the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.
- The establishment of workers' control over the planning and management of all private enterprises.
- The establishment of the right to strike and fair working conditions.
- The establishment of the right to paid work or full maintenance.
- The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, the abolition of all payments for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.
- The expansion of the housing programme by granting the right to the people to vote for local authorities and the right to requisition privately held land.
- The establishment of free education up to 18. Abolition of fees and grants. Comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants—without a means test—for all university students.
- Abolition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection to all workers whatever their race or colour. Abolition of all forms of color-bar and the expulsion of people of all races from political and economic life in all countries. The offer of technical and economic assistance to all countries that wish to be under-developed countries.
- The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British armed forces from South Africa.
- The abolition of the H-houses and forced removals and destruction. Britain to pave the way with unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb.
- A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington nor Moscow.
• Labour and the bomb from page 1

with a nuclear bomb labelled ‘Made in USA’ instead of ‘Made in Britain’. Does it make us any safer if the missile bases dotted over the countryside are ‘Not of British Manufacture’?

On the other hand we have the resolution of the TGWU, the Cousins line. Here we must say at once if it is a matter of choosing between two alternatives only, this or the Gatskell line, we unhesitatingly choose this. But at the same time we have to stress that it is not a unilateral policy, and not a Socialist policy. It contains some compromises, and leaves some questions unanswered or ambiguous, but it is a very important step forward.

NO APOLOGY

There is no need to apologise to our readers for not appearing during the printing strike. We are sure that they will join with us in congratulating the printworkers for their magnificent advance towards the forty-hour week. They have led the entire labour movement in this particular campaign.

AN APOLOGY

Apologies are due, however, for our non-appearance in mid-August. We hope our readers will appreciate that even editors and writers need to rest.

Editor

We absolutely agree with the TGWU in their demand that ‘nuclear bombs or rockets with nuclear warheads not to be used first by Great Britain or from our territory’. But we also think that they should not be used second, or third, either. In other words we claim that Great Britain should announce that she will never use these weapons of mass destruction.

We absolutely agree with ‘The continuation of the objection to setting up missile bases in Great Britain’ and that ‘the suspension of tests means a suspension of production’. These are important steps forward. But we also insist that missile bases already constructed be dismantled and that stocks of bombs already manufactured should be destroyed.

As Socialists our policy is to wash our hands completely and permanently of anything to do with nuclear weapons. Mr. Gaitskell has thrown out a challenge to us. He demands that we make our position clear on and not seek to evade the important question: What about NATO? And Mr. Gaitskell is quite right—we must make up our minds. For among those who favour nuclear disarmament there is a very definite lack of agreement. There are some who feel that Britain should unilaterally get rid of her H-bombs but stay a member of NATO and seek to influence from within. There are others who say, let us disarm unilaterally and leave it to NATO to decide what to do with us. If they want us disarmed, that’s all right; if they don’t, that’s all right too.

Ban the bomb withdraw from NATO

Our view is not the same as these. We agree with Mr. Gaitskell—you can’t have the cake and eat it. Britain’s position is not the same as that of Norway, who is a member of NATO without the bomb. And we don’t propose to leave it to the NATO ministers or generals to decide what to do with us after we disarm. Our position is that nuclear disarmament and withdrawal from NATO go hand in hand. Not only do we demand a general disarmament, but also we want to withdraw from NATO. We should say this without any embarrassment or hesitation, but clearly and from the rooftops. We realise completely the implications of our position and we are prepared to go through with it to the end.

There is a policy for Socialists on nuclear weapons. It is certainly not the Gaitskell line of a non-nuclear club. Nor is it the Cousins half-way line of a policy of unilateral disarmament and withdrawal from NATO. But as against Gaitskell we support wholeheartedly the TGWU as being an important move in the right direction.

---

**NOTTING HILL NOTEBOOK**

Dear Reader,

We are happy to be able to introduce you to a new feature—Notting Hill Notebook. This column will be written, and edited by members of the Coloured People’s Progressive Association of Notting Hill to whom we are acting as hosts. All views expressed in this column are those of the CPPA and all correspondence in connection with it should be addressed to: The Secretary, Coloured People’s Progressive Association, 14a Tavistock Crescent, London, W.11 (Tel.: BAYwater 3736).

---

**MR. GARNET GORDON**, the West Indies Commissioner, received a delegation of the Coloured People’s Progressive Association on Thursday, August 13th. Mr. McDonald Moses, Public Relations Officer, led the discussions and was supported by Mr. Frances Ezzezeco, Welfare Officer and Treasurer, and Mr. C. C. Byfield, Chairman.

**A meeting**

The meeting lasted three hours and many important social problems were reviewed. In a report to the general meeting, it was stated that the Commissioner showed keen interest and understanding of the numerous proposals put forward by the delegations. Naturally, he could not commit himself on any of the issues expressed but undertook to submit reports to the Authorities in Britain and the West Indies in due course.

**The subjects**

Among the subjects raised was the apparent lack of urgency on the part of the police in pursuing the investigations of the murder case of Kelsoe Cochrane. The Commissioner was told that there is a growing apprehension among the coloured population over the matter. In particular, there is the well-founded fear that if the criminal or criminals were not brought to justice, it would encourage misguided people to do even more.

**Immigrants**

Apart from other problems, the Commissioner was told that there is a large number of immigrants who have never experienced any difficulties in Britain. They are always treated with respect and kindness.

---

**MISSING CLUE**

There is no part of the United Kingdom where congestion is more serious than it is in Glasgow”, said Tony MP Mr. J. Nixon Brownie, addressing the Town and Country Planning Association in Glasgow, earlier this year.

"Half the houses in Glasgow have only one or two rooms and over 400,000 people are living in them", he went on. "30,000 citizens are living at more than four to a room and 80,000 at more than three to a room. Over 100,000 Glasgow families have no separate sanitary facilities inside the house and over 150,000 families have no fixed bath in their homes."

"The position has now been reached where every year 2,000 houses in these areas either actually collapse or have to be closed, not necessarily because the living conditions in them are unsanitary or unhealthy, but because the properties concerned have become a physical danger to their occupants."

"What Mr. Nixon Brownie did not say was that Glasgow’s housing problems are the result of decades of private landlordism.

---
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**A GUEST**

Mr. Jorn Svensson from the University of Lund, Sweden, are rather interested in the colour problem, especially in developments in Britain in this respect. He was rather pleased of the opportunity to get further information on these questions and was for grateful for C.P.P.A.’s help and hospitality.

---

**Keep in touch**

He was made an honorary member of the Association and he pledged to do all he could to help, and urged that he be kept in touch.