HOW TO FIGHT THE BOMB

No socialist can fail to sympathise with the determination and courage of the Norfolk anti-nuclear base marchers. Their initial treatment by the police and Press demonstrated how the bosses regard any opposition, how the Tories can show their fangs, until they regard the Com- position to laugh off their duffled-coated opposition as harmless crackpots.

Nonetheless, the Swaffham events also suggest, though it may sound paradoxical, that the martyrdom may sometimes be easier than a less heroic approach to a complicated and overwhelming problem.

However, after two years of this policy and tremendous expenditure, a reasonable guess has it that Britain is now the possess- sor of no less than five H-bombs.

Besides, the Establishment mind has become bent with doubts and second thoughts. The British Navy, which was to be almost completely done away with, is slowly emerging once again (the Far Eastern fleet, for example). National Service is dying very slowly, and the conven- tional regular army and air force (soon to be reinforced with the new TSR-2) are still recognisable.
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Firstly, it must be emphasised that if the Labour leadership has given any sign of even a faintly radical opposition to Tory “Defence” policy, all the marches would have been either unnecessary or absorbed in a general anti-Tory movement. Unfortunately, Gaitskell, Bevan and Co. have been even more adamant supporters of the Tory line on Defence than the Tories themselves.

Their cowardice is the more ludicrous when it is realised that the ruling class itself has reached an impasse in its “Defence” policy. The 1957 White Paper stated clearly that the day of conventional weapons was done, and that the Great Deterrent (like God, it cannot be mentioned by its real name) was all that was needed to maintain Britain’s ancient glory.

The compilers of the White Paper were impressed with the fact that Britain was unable to keep pace “conventionally” with the two super-Powers. But Tolstoy was determined to have its means of H-bomb retaliation whatever the cost.

They chose, then, absolute commitment to a nuclear Third World War.

And why not? Imperial Britain needs force today primarily for Colonial wars and “Police actions” against the sullen and rebellious populations in the remnants of Empire. The H- bomb is needed for such subre- rattling. All that is needed is an army of conservative-minded troops, carrying old-fashioned rifles and machine-guns and using conventional means of mass destruction.

Then why the fuss and the shower of White Papers and the enormous outlay on a battery of armaments far beyond the capa- bilities of a second-rate power? The real use of the Great Deter- rent seems to have been to deter the Transatlantic Allies from doing too hard a bargain, to give some vestige of independence to Britain’s Colonial policy whenever it ran counter to American design and no help could be expected from that quarter, to gain a better deal on the siting and control of American rocket bases on British soil, and finally to serve as a counter in the exchange of tech- nical secrets.

Empire versus inter-Allied rela- tions. What a thorny problem for the impoverished British capitalist class. They can neither decide on a single line nor find the resources for a dual policy. Contradictory Government state- ments, fuzzy editorials in The Times all show that the rulers have reached an impossible position with their own policy.

And Parliamentary Labour, despite a statement early last year of lip-service opposition, has done nothing but endorse Government contradictions.

Yet, despite the sorry picture presented by the “leadership” it should be quite clear: the only force capable of stopping an H- bomb war or rocket-strike building is the organised Labour Move- ment. Once the workers move into action, they can do this with or without the blessing of these official leaders. Once the mass of workers are consciously behind an anti-nuclear or anti-war cam- paign, it is surprisingly easy to disrupt any military adventure or act of war, surprisingly easy to prevent a military plane from taking off, or stop a troop train, or dismantle a rocket site. But again, this can only be done if individual action is backed up by mass sympathy, mass support, mass action, and is directly understandable to the mass of workers.

Furthermore, any propagandizing for a radical opposition can only come—if it is to be effective—from within the Labour Move- ment, on a level and around issues immediately understandable to the people it is aimed at.

Measured by these criteria, by their appeal to workers, by their ability to win the active support of workers against an imperialist war policy, by their ability to win passive resisters or any group which hopes to stop an H-bomb war by marching before concrete mixers, to Aldermaston or Downing Street, are of doubtful effect.

The great tragedy of direct action marching is not only that...
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UNEMPLOYMENT—TIME TO ACT
writes ERIC HEFFER

THOSE in the Labour move- ment who predicted that the days of wide-scale unemployment were over for ever have obviously been proved wrong. Month by month the total of workless grows, and we have the gloomy forecast by the Minister of Labour (when recently in America) that the Spring of 1959 will see unemployment at its height.

One of the worst-hit areas of the country is the industrial North, particularly Lancashire (the cotton towns plus the Mer- seyside). Harold Wilson has cor- rectly said that the cotton towns are “bleeding to death.” All the government can offer is a sort of clausula-plast, and that of very poor quality.

Let me quote some compara- tive figures which show the ex- tent of the workless.

On October 13 the following position existed:
Northern Ireland 37,963
Wales 38,942
Scotland 85,818
North-East England 95,572

Altogether within a 60-mile radius of Manchester there were unemployed at that date 160,000 workers. This fact emphasizes one important thing. That this unemployment is not the type due to change-over of job or even seasonal factors, but is unem- ployment developing in the heavy basic industries, which can only mean that we are now entering a classic capitalist slump.

In Britain as in America in- creasing mechanization may temporarily hold back the demand for extra labour until further expansion can get under way.—The Times leader, New Year’s Day.

Let me quote some figures given by Harold Wilson at the recent Conference on the problem called by the Lancashire Federa- tion of Trades Councils. He broke down the total and gave us the situation town by town.

contd. page 8
The Solution to the Mining Crisis, writes Stan Newens is a PLANNED SOCIALIST ECONOMY

From 1941 till early in 1958, the notion of surplus coal being produced was practically unheard of. On the contrary, particularly since nationalization in 1947, there has been a systematic policy of reducing the reason capital has been poured in, wages have risen and miners have been capelled and bullied all with the object of bridging ever-threatening deficit in fuel supplies.

Only eighteen months ago, Sir James Bowmont, Chairman of the National Coal Board, was complaining bitterly about losses of less than half a million tons of coal as the result of increased absenteeism following the ending of the weekly attendance bonus system. American coal was being imported at a heavy loss and the drive to introduce modern loading machinery on the widest possible scale was in full swing. Saturday shifts were being worked and even in January, 1958, Sir James Bowmont said that the Coal Board was still aiming to fulfil the Government estimate of 300 million tons of coal or its equivalent per annum needed by 1965 (Carles Timaeus: Reynolds News, January 2nd, 1958). Until recently this import drive was so great that 14 million tons of coal leaving a gap of 76 million tons to be bridged by other fuels.

Threat

Today, however, one year later, the situation is importantly different. It is no longer output to 300 million tons which is the chief concern, but cutting it to 200 million in 1959.

In a bid to achieve this, 36 pits are being closed and even on Coal Board estimates, 4,000 men will be sacked without hope of reemployment in the next twelve months of this year. Furthermore, since this will reduce output by only 3 million tons of the 9 million tons which need to be cut, the word of Danocles hangs threatening over the heads of many others. Even in highly productive areas, rumours are circulating about the possibility of further closures or partial closures.

Lower production

The situation arises from two main causes: in the first place the current trade recession in all industries and in the second place the long term process of the replacement of coal by other forms of power.

The index of industrial production published by the Economist shows that production in 1958 has been at a lower level than in the previous year. This drop in production has led coal-using industries quite seriously and has reduced their need for fuel. Thus, for example, production of British anthracites in the third quarter for 1958 was 12 per cent lower than in the same months of the years before (Economist, November 29, 1958). Production of steel ingots and castings in November, 1958, was down by approximately 18 per cent on the same month of 1957. Obviously they needed less coal.

Simultaneously, however, there has been a swing against coal in favour of oil and other fuels. Thus, while the iron and steel industry used 18.6 per cent less coal in the first months of 1958 than in the equivalent period of 1957, it used 9.5 per cent more oil (ibid.).

Oil prices

A similar movement occurred in engineering, food, drinks and tobacco, chemicals, textiles and clothing, cement, paper and printing, china and glass, and other trades. Overall consumption of coal by these industries dropped by 9.6 per cent while oil consumption rose by 19.9 per cent.

In fact this trend which has been taking shape for several years resulted in Britain buying more than a million tons of fuel oil during October—a level never before reached, representing about a third as much again as in October, 1957.

One of the most powerful reasons for this change has been lower oil prices. As the Economist, June 21, stated: ‘In the South of England at any point reasonably near a port and distant from the coal fields, fuel oil has now become a cheaper fuel than most grades of coal if some allowance is made for its higher thermal value. Some measures of convenience and efficiency in use and some quantity discounts allowed to large oil consumers which may be supplemented by special rebates...”

Present policies

This is so, however, in the case of numerous oil-burning electricity generating stations—except in one case where oil is supplied directly at a constant price as its coal equivalent. The truth is that the Central Electricity Board is tied by less favourable contracts concluded with the oil companies under Government guarantee some six or seven years ago when the Ministry of Fuel and Power planned to save 8 to 9 million tons of coal per annum by means of alternating.

The conversion of eleven stations to date and the further three planned during 1959 is especially hard on the coal industry since they are one of the PCB’s best customers for small coal which is the most difficult type of fuel to dispose of. Demand for power is expected to be affected by the NUM this policy has not been changed.

Besides these reasons for the swing against coal, growing efficiency in the use of fuel, clean air regulations, the increased production of nuclear energy and railway modernization are all playing a considerable part in the coal industry’s difficulties and are likely to continue to do so in the future.

Therefore, the mining industry’s problems are likely to be prolonged and increased as the years pass, even if without the advantage of a major upsurge.

Present policies pursued by the National Coal Board should finally have dispelled all illusions that the nationalized structure of the industry is any guarantee of the miners’ welfare. As a comparison with conditions on the nationalized railways show too clearly, the improvement in the miners’ conditions has been fundamentally the result of the coal famine—not of nationalization.

Capitalist adjutant

This is not to say that nationalization has been a complete failure, for the old coal-owners would have closed down unprofitable pits years ago instead of subsidizing them with the more profitable collieries. Without nationalization, coal would have been scarce and expensive that British steel and consequently British engineering would have been crippled.

However, from the socialistic point of view, nationalization can be said merely to have converted the coal industry into an adjunct of private capitalist industry, ministering to its needs and supplying it with a basic requirement without which its profits could not possibly have been maintained. Furthermore, it is being increasingly forced to conduct its operations according to the deceptive capitalist considerations of profit.

As Sir James Bowmont wrote in The Times of December 11: "The policy of not laying off even the last ton served the nation’s purpose at the time. We are well aware that it is no longer necessary. There must be a complete change of emphasis. We can now concentrate on competitive efficiency.

This merely reflects the policy stated by Sir Ian Horobin in the House of Commons on December 3 that people would no longer buy coal at any price. “The industry was no longer a monopoly and it must consider its competitive position” (The Times report, December 4, 1958).

In other words, price and not output are the criterion of the NCB’s policy in the future.

The hierarchy

Such a policy is anything but socialist. If the NCB appears to be making a profit or cut losses at the cost of throwing thousands of workers out of employment even in a depression, they represent a larger drain on the state social services, this profit is no mark of success. After all, the NCB could have cut all its losses by closing down all unprofitable pits in the past, but the country would have been crippled as the result.

This is not to say there is little room for improvement in NCB operations from the financial point of view. The very structure of the hierarchy which controls the industry is very unwieldy and too many of the people who opposed nationalization have found, years later, that their contribution to the industry is insignificant.

As far as sales policy is concerned, it is often deliberately and adventurously. An example which recently came to my notice was of how the Coal Board’s tender to supply a large customer with fuel was higher than all their coal books, in which of course they were themselves customers of the NCB.

If the problems of the converging of the coal-to-plentiful supplies of small coal into large fuel has also been unsatisfactory. Methods of converting the small into briquettes is still little more than in the experimental stage. In the pits themselves much more large coal could be produced if less blasting took place, but this would of course necessitate a reduction in the amount of coal which a filler is supposed to produce each shift. Any suggestion of this kind, however, normally receives scant consideration.
MINES contd

The smaller coal itself would be in much higher demand if households were to possible slow combustion stoves in which it can be burned. However, no attempt has been made to encourage the sale of these stoves, some of which are more economical than open fires, even in states with oil burning convectors heaters.

In the long run, however, something more basic than a sadder NCB policy is required. The coal industry itself should be part of an integrated fuel service which would require the development of a national fuel policy. The production and use of coal could then be planned: only that which is needed would be produced or imported and all that which was produced or imported would be needed.

Fuel policy

Oil would only be used in the place of coal where it was to the advantage of the community as a whole, and not solely today, solely because it is the most convenient of private, capitalist, sectional interests. Pit closures could be foreseen years ahead, and planned for instead of being carried out as part of a permanent policy.

Of course, a national fuel policy could only work effectively in reality within a planned economy as a whole. Then light industry could be introduced to provide alternative employment for men displaced by pit closures. The oil industry, the textiles and output of coal-using industries would not be subject to the vagaries of a market so susceptible to recession and slump.

The building of a planned economy is the only solution to the problem, however, as the result of the extension of nationalization (including the nationalization of coal distribution which accounts for 47 per cent of coal prices in the London area, for example). A planned economy is only possible if all large-scale production is completely within the hands of the community and not subject to private profit considerations.

This means a drastic change in the nature of present Labour Party policies which do not envisage anything more advanced than reforms based upon a capitalist system.

Socialist demands

Here the miners themselves must help. Not for many years have the militant trade unionists within the industry been more needed of fight NCB policies and the supine acceptance of these by the Labour movement. However, they must realize that industrial militancy alone is not enough.

In the long run the only secure lies in the building of a socialist society, and it is through the Labour Party that we can work for this. Therefore, it is the duty of all militant miners who wish to create a brighter future for themselves and their fellow workers to play their part not only in the tremendously important lodges and branches, but also in the Labour Party meetings. It is here that they can demand a genuine socialist policy which is ultimately the only lasting solution to the economic problems of today.

PETER BERKELEY ON

DEFENCE OF MINERS

DOCK LABOUR SCHEME IN DANGER

WORKERS displaced by the closure, and in the employment figures, whilst the most conservative estimate in relation to the current closure reveals that at least half of the 2,800 men displaced will be thrown out of work when the closures are complete.

Of course, the Government will say that these 1,400 men will be able to find other jobs in other industries, starting a new life elsewhere and that there is no reason for anyone to be turbed, but leaving out the problem of finding new jobs in the increasingly difficult labour market, consider the problem of what such a mass unemployment.

Firstly, the vast majority of the men working in these pits are approaching fifty years of age, some of course, are widower and are at a time of life when they are more or less settled in their aims and ideas. Additionally, quite a number of them are the owners of the homes in which they live and have no desire to sell up and wander off elsewhere in an endeavour to seek fresh employment. So intense is the feeling of man against man, that throughout the whole area, the ministers of religion are offering up prayers to circumvent the imminent closures.

New approach needed

From a practical point of view, however, it seems almost im- possible to allow whole villages to become abandoned and permitted to fall into decay simply because the whole industry has been mis-managed in the past. Of course a small pit won't pay its way if it is run by men armed with the type of coal concerned and if it has to provide the salaries of the armed forces of the bureaucratic blue-cards that huddle upon its operation, and compensation to the hordes of owner-miners. A new and more enlightened approach is more than necessary if such pits are to succeed, with a completely different method of calculating the financial aspects of the National Coal Board's accounts.

These, of course, will not be forthcoming under the present Government, who, with an axe to grind, have no desire to assist in the success of socialist enterprises.

In the meantime, lodge meetings are being called throughout the coalfields to consider future action even to the extent of a recommendation for strike action. It is to be hoped that whatever the decision of the men concerned, workers everywhere will support them to the full, both morally and financially, for one thing must be remembered, these men are being victimised for no truly valid reason, except perhaps that they are too ardent in their belief of trade unionism.

Direct labour

There is a story current in Tooley Street today, which if it is true, could well be one of the most devastating betrayals of the workers by their so-called leaders, that could possibly be envisaged. I present it exactly as it was given to me.

One of the more potent examples of sharp practice during the last Docks Strike, was the attempt upon the part of the Trade Union Officials to bring in an agreement with the Ministry, to introduce a resolution in respect of perishable goods into the National Docks Scheme.

Almost a week before it was presented to the men in Tooley Street, it wascirculated to the other areas up and down the country, in the hope that those men, not being directly concerned with strikers in London, would accept the resolution in sufficient numbers to make it binding upon them.

Unfortunately for the machine of the Minister and his myrmidons, the dockers throughout London and elsewhere were more than a match for them and with the realisation of the full implication of the resolution, turned it down flat, with the result that it was put to the men in Tooley Street in a final effort to break the existing atmosphere of the current and future strikes.

In Tooley Street of course, and at such a time, the presentation was soundly rebuffed, and it was this, since it was at a Public Meeting where the catches embodied in the resolution were not only a mere threat, but all and sundry. What the resolution said in effect was that, upon the occasion of a stoppage, the local Minister should be in a position to declare what constituted a permissible strike, in a manner such that his resolution he would issue a certificate which must entail its being worked by the employer or worker, or failing this, would enable the employer to use "black labour" without incurring any penalty or trade-union, and the Dock Labour Scheme.

Resolution rejected

It is obvious to anyone exactly what the effect of such a resolution was to be, that it was to become an integral part of the Dock Labour Scheme more as a means of possible to allay the spirit of direct action of the workers, the greatest weapon possessed by the worker would disappear, whilst the Scheme itself would become non-existent, through the introduction of registered labour. One can readily understand why dockers everywhere, even those not concerned with the strike, threw out such a resolution in no uncertain manner.

Unfortunately, however, the Minister has not lost sight of the fact that such a resolution introduced as an amendment to the National Dock Labour Scheme could effectively hamper strike action by the dockers or at least, the closed-shop bias of registration, allowing the employer to bring in "black labour" and, if he so chose, pick and choose the men he wanted, where if your face didn't fit or you were a trade unionist, you just didn't go to work.

contd. on page 6
40 Years to the death of

ROSALUXEMBURG

by TONY CLIFF

Rosa Luxemburg was born in the small Polish town of Zamosc on March 5th, 1871. From early youth she was active in the Socialist movement. She joined the revolutionary party "Proletariat" which was founded in 1882, some 21 years before the Russian Social-Democratic Party (Bolsheviks and Mensheviks) came into being. From the beginning "Proletariat" was, in principles and program, many steps ahead of the revolutionary movement in Russia. While the Russian revolutionary movement was still resisting acts of individual terrorism carried out by a few heroic intellectuals. "Proletariat" was organizing and leading thousands of workers on strike. In 1886, however, the "Proletariat" was liquidated by the execution of four of its leaders, experienced elders of international socialism. Support for the national movement in Poland had the weight of long tradition behind it: Marx and Engels, too, had made it an important plank in their policies. Undaunted by all this, Rosa Luxemburg struck out at the PPS, accusing it of clear nationalist tendencies and a prussianism to diverting the workers from the path of class struggle; and she dared to take a different position to the old masters and oppose the slogan of independence for Poland. (For an elaboration of Rosa Luxemburg's position—on the national question, see Chapter VI.) Her adversaries heaped abuse on her, some of the most virulent of which were the marx and engels, Wilhelm Liebknecht, going so far as to accuse her of being an agent of the Tartar secret police. But she with the increasing parliamentary representation of the German Socialist Party, moved away from revolution and fierce struggle to those who were already proclaiming pragmatism, or reformism as they termed it. The main spokesman of this moment was Eduard Berenstein, a disciple of Engels. Between 1894 and 1898 he wrote a series of articles in "Die Neue Zeit" on "Problems of Socialism," and more openly attacking the principles of Marxism. A long and bitter division broke out. Rosa Luxemburg, who had just entered the German Labour movement immediately sprang to the defence of Marxism. Brilliantly, and with magnificent eloquence, she attacked the spreading cancer of reformism in her booklet, "Social Reform or Social Revolution." (For an elaboration of Rosa Luxemburg's criticism or Reformism, see Chapter II.)

On the national question

Soon after, in 1899, the French "Socialist" Millier entered the stage, followed by a speaking capitalist. Rosa Luxemburg followed this experiment closely and analysed it in a series of articles and pamphlets. She spoke at the time in France, and in 1907 a series of meetings were arranged in Germany. The Popular Front in France in the 'thirties, and the post-Second World War coalition of the left which this country, it is clear that the lessons drawn by Rosa Luxemburg are not of historical interest alone.

In 1903-4 Rosa Luxemburg indulged in a polemic with Lenin, in which she discussed the question of the life of the Party and the activity of the mass of workers (see Chapter VI), and on the conception of Party structure and the relationship between the Party and the masses. In 1904, after "insulting the Kaiser" she was sentenced to three months' imprisonment, of which she served a month.

In 1905, with the outbreak of the First World War, she wrote a series of articles and pamphlets for the French party, in which she defended the Party and the activity of the mass of workers. In 1906, after the "insulting the Kaiser" she was sentenced to three months' imprisonment, of which she served a month. Her life was lived up the dictum: "At the beginning of the deed." And although she was in bad health at the time, she worked hard. During the revolution she had been split into two main trends, a reformist and a revolutionary one, with the former growing in strength. Germany had enjoyed continuous prosperity since the slump in 1873. The workers' standard of living had improved uninterruptedly, if slowly; trade unions and co-operatives grew stronger. On this background, the bureaucracy of these movements, together

the imprisonment of 23 others for long terms of hard labour, and the banishment of about two hundred more. Only small circles were saved from the wreck, and it was one of those that Rosa Luxemburg joined at the age of 16. By 1899 the police had caught up with her, and she had to leave Poland, her comrades thinking she could do more useful work abroad than in prison. She went to Switzerland, to Zurich, which was the most important centre of Polish and Russian emigration. There she entered the University, where she studied natural sciences, mathematics and economics. She took an active part in the local Labour movement and in the intense intellectual life of the revolutionary emigrants.

Theoretical leader

Hardly more than a couple of years later, Rosa Luxemburg was already regarded as the theoretical leader of the revolutionary socialist party of Poland. She became the main contributor to the Party paper, "Sprawa Robotnica," published in Paris. In 1894 the name of the party was changed to the Social-Democratic Party of the Kingdom of Poland; shortly after, Lithuania was added to the list. Rosa continued to be the theoretical leader of the Party (the SDKP) till the end of her life. In August, 1893, she represented the party at the Congress of the Socialist International. There, a young woman of 22, she had to contend with well-known veterans of another Polish Party, the Polish Socialist Party (PPS), whose main plank was the independence of Poland and which claimed the recognition of all the

stocks to her point.

Against reformism

Intellectually she grew by leaps and bounds. She was drawn into the mainstream of the international Labour movement, Germany, where she made her way in 1896. She started writing astoundingly, and after a time became one of the main contributors to the most important Marxist theoretical journals of the time, "Die Neue Zeit." Independently in judgment and criticism, even the tremendous prestige of Karl Kautsky, its editor, "the Pope of Marxism" as he was used to be called, did not deflect her from her considered opinions once she had become convinced.

Rosa Luxemburg entered heart and soul into the German Labour movement. She was a regular contributor to a number of socialist papers, and she addressed many mass meetings and took part energetically in all the tasks the movement called upon her to perform. Throughout her speeches and articles were original creative works, in which she appealed to reason not emotion and in which she always opened up to her readers a wider and grander horizon than they had hitherto known. The movement in Germany was split into two main trends, a reformist and a revolutionary one, with the former growing in strength. Germany had enjoyed continuous prosperity since the slump in 1873. The workers' standard of living had improved uninterruptedly, if slowly; trade unions and co-operatives grew stronger. On this background, the bureaucracy of these movements, together

In 1907 Rosa Luxemburg, who had been a leader of the proletariat based on the passivity.*

Life of action

However, to think, write and speak about the revolution was not enough. In 1905, when she was in bad health at the time, she had been split into two main trends, a reformist and a revolutionary one, with the former growing in strength. Germany had enjoyed continuous prosperity since the slump in 1873. The workers' standard of living had improved uninterruptedly, if slowly; trade unions and co-operatives grew stronger. On this background, the bureaucracy of these movements, together

was held meeting. After months of preparation, but Rosa Luxemburg was there to appear. After the meeting she was arrested and kept in solitary confinement for a time. After her release in 1907, she returned to Paris, and then to Poland, where she was arrested and imprisoned for some time in 1908. She was released in 1909, but returned to Paris. She spoke at the time in France, and in 1907 a series of meetings were arranged in Germany. The Popular Front in France in the 'thirties, and the post-Second World War coalition of the left which this country, it is clear that the lessons drawn by Rosa Luxemburg are not of historical interest alone.
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In 1913 Rosa Luxemburg was an important left-wing member of the International Council of the most important of the trenchancy period, the "Capital." She was a master of verbal radio drama, and political and psychological effect. She was a master of verbal radio drama, and political and psychological effect. She was a master of verbal radio drama, and political and psychological effect.

On February 21st, 1919, Rosa Luxemburg was murdered at the age of 46. Her entire life illustrated this dictum: "At the beginning of the deed." And although she was in bad health at the time, she worked hard. During the revolution she had been split into two main trends, a reformist and a revolutionary one, with the former growing in strength. Germany had enjoyed continuous prosperity since the slump in 1873. The workers' standard of living had improved uninterruptedly, if slowly; trade unions and co-operatives grew stronger. On this background, the bureaucracy of these movements, together

In 1913 Rosa Luxemburg was an important left-wing member of the International Council of the most important of the trenchancy period, the "Capital." She was a master of verbal radio drama, and political and psychological effect. She was a master of verbal radio drama, and political and psychological effect. She was a master of verbal radio drama, and political and psychological effect.
DOCUMENT - CYPRUS - Orders to Kill

A very interesting document has come into our hands, one that should remove any trace of complacency regarding the actions of British imperialism in Cyprus. For organised brutality and terror on the part of the British occupation authorities, this cold-blooded printed card — republished in full below — takes a lot of beating — Editor.

INSTRUCTIONS TO INDIVIDUALS FOR OPENING FIRE IN CYPRUS

Issued by Chief of Staff to Director of Operations

1. INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY.

Before you use force it is always your duty to assess the situation confronting you and to decide what degree of force is necessary.

(a) To defend yourself, your comrades, families, Police and all peaceable inhabitants against illegal attacks by the enemy.

(b) To protect against serious damage all Government property, e.g., buildings, installations, vehicles and equipment.

(c) To disperse a riotous mob that you honestly believe will cause serious injury to life and property if not forcibly prevented.

(d) To arrest persons committing acts of violence, or whom you honestly believe have done so, or are about to do so, and to prevent their escape.

2. WHEN YOU SHOULD FIRE.

It is your duty to shoot if that is the only way:

(a) To defend yourself, your comrades, families, Police and all peaceable inhabitants against illegal attacks by the enemy.

(b) To protect against serious damage all Government property, e.g., buildings, installations, vehicles and equipment.

(c) To disperse a riotous mob that you honestly believe will cause serious injury to life and property if not forcibly prevented.

(d) To arrest persons committing acts of violence, or whom you honestly believe have done so, or are about to do so, and to prevent their escape.

3. WHAT YOU SHOULD NOT FIRE.

(a) If it is obvious that you can achieve your object by other means do not shoot.

(b) If you are a member of a party under the order of a superior, do not fire until he orders you to do so.

4. HOW TO FIRE.

(a) Always fire aimed shots.

(b) Aim at the part of the body you are least likely to miss, i.e., the chest.

(c) Never fire warning shots over people's heads.

5. SENTRIES AND PIQUETES.

(a) If you or the persons or place you are guarding are attacked with guns or explosives open fire at once.

(b) If you think you are about to be attacked in any way challenge loudly, bring your weapon to the aim and call out the guard. If the person challenged halts and does not get a member of the guard to investigate he should use his weapon against all attackers.

6. ESCORTS.

(a) If, you, your driver, passengers or vehicles are attacked with arms or explosives, open fire at once and tell the driver to keep going and get away.

(b) If you are only stunned, tell your driver to keep going and get away. Don't fire unless the stunning is so serious that you really believe the vehicle may be stopped altogether and that you, the driver or your passengers, will be seriously injured.

(c) If your vehicle is obstructed by a road block try to remove it. If you are then attacked with arms or explosives, open fire.

(d) Always be on the alert with your weapon at the ready.

7. INDIVIDUAL SELF-DEFENCE.

(a) If you are attacked with arms or explosives shoot the attackers at once, wherever you are.

(b) Don't join in brawls. Always avoid trouble if you can.

8. REPORTS.

You must always report any incident to the nearest Police or Military Post.

(a) Location.

(b) Details.

(c) Method of attack.

(d) Description of assailants.

(e) When applicable, number of rounds fired and results.

CS/1060/A/Dec. 33.
IN YOUR LAST ISSUE “Tramp Navy” dealt with Direct Labour and gave us the impression that all building members were 100 per cent for it and are ready at the “drop of a hat” to sell this policy. Far from it. As a member of the National Labour Party and one who has worked on Direct Labour sites I have found no deal of sympathy on this vital subject which is, in my opinion, due to lack of leadership from above, in fact, despite the site workers’ control at all levels on these projects.

At the last two London Labour Party Conferences when Direct Labour was discussed not one of the Building Unions joined the debate. We had the fantastic situation of the AEU and the EC of the London Labour Party, set on the platform twiddling their thumbs.

Lack of leadership

Again in July last at an ASW stewards’ meeting at Denison House the comments made on Direct Labour were not encouraging. The realisation of our industry by an official of the ASW based on his meagre experiences on one Direct Labour site would call for a garland of primroses from a graveyard. The inertia and lack of leadership in our movement is like a cancer and we must cut it out.

Upon entering into the service of the LCC I was immediately surprised by the lack of organisation upon the building site, only ensuring any semblance of organisation, this being the labourers’ section. I immediately set myself the task of organising the section and this was achieved very quickly.

The first approach was then made to the general foreman over wages a struggle against the Socialist-controlled Council, and it was only by the threat of really serious trouble upon the site that the witch-hunting was finally stopped. It was found very hard to obtain even the things hitherto considered normal, i.e., safety and health regulations.

The stewards know that this attitude towards organisation is not one encouraged by the LCC, but one carried out by a parasitical clique of general foremen.

What is the remedy to bad industrial relations? The representatives of the men believe that the heads of the LCC Department responsible for industrial relations should make it clear to general foremen and other petty officials that it will cost the Statutory Instruments without the men having to force them to carry them out.

Chronic wastage

WASTAGE OF MATERIALS is a problem that again can be solved by correct supervision. I have seen site materials reduced on the previous upon the sites only to be fit for the rubbish heap a few weeks later. Shovels and wheelbarrows are left at night not cleaned of cement and concrete, and to clean them a hammer must be used, doing tremendous damage.

This also applies to mechanical mixers. Waste of bricks and cement is colossal upon these sites. I have observed the burning of eighteen gallons of emulsion paint, this having perished through being stored in a damp place. This is a chronic wastage of the public’s money, and immediate steps must be taken by the LCC to remedy the situation.

The remedy

From this time there was a succession of transfers of the men’s stewards to other sites. I was struggling to maintain the Trade Union organisation upon the site, knowing all the time that I was working against a powerful enemy in the Socialist-controlled Council, and it was only by the threat of really serious trouble upon the site that the witch-hunting was finally stopped. It was found very hard to obtain even the things hitherto considered normal, i.e., safety and health regulations.

TheUnemployed

There is a minimum below which these stocks cannot be reduced without seriously dislocating output. As consumption has remained stationary or has decreased to the same extent as stocks the restocking of inventories may stimulate the economy during the spring

Exports stagnate

Secondly, the decline in exports during the first half of 1958 increased unemployment. However, between September and November exports were 3 per cent above the level of the previous eight months. In November exports were 1/4 per cent above the November, 1957, level. This is only a temporary increase because as demand fell, firms were able to shorten their delivery dates and do more business on a smaller scale, in order to obtain outstanding export orders. The world commodity market has not been depressed for the last 18 months and as yet there is no sign of any revival. British exports are unable to continue their increase except to the USA. As there is no sign of any major American boom which would compensate British exports for the world-wide recession in trade. British exports are likely to stagnate.

Although there is no immediate danger of a major slump, there is little hope that unemployment will return to the previous 1 per cent level.

The investment boom of 1954-58 has now ended. It is predicted that investment will be 12 per cent in private industry—25 per cent in the building industry in 1959. This will be slightly offset by Government investment but there will still be considerable unemployment in private industries.

Jobs disappear

Furthermore, past investment has added about 10 per cent to the productive capacity of the manufacturing industries. It was estimated by Andrew Shonfield (Observer, August 17, 1958) that this increased capacity has made redundant 900,000 of the nine million people employed in the manufacturing industry.

ECONOMICS

DOLE QUOTES UNLIMITED by John Crutchley

SALARY REGULATIONS are only partially carried out on some sites and practically ignored on others, and it is worth noting the only Labour Party that was responsible in large measure for bringing them under the Statutory Book. It is then ironic that now Labour Party support is being handed back to the men that the Labour-controlled Council to make them carry out these regulations.

The men’s stewards know that the chief officials of the LCC intend (on the surface, anyway) good industrial relations to exist and also that they want the regulations on safety and welfare to be carried out. The people that constantly thwart their efforts are petty officials and general foremen. I say the chief officials must take a firm line; if the men are to be sacked for inefficiency, this should also apply to petty officials.

In conclusion I would call for a more vigorous leadership by Trades Union officials and members in selling Direct Labour and Nationalisation of our industry with workers’ control at all levels. This would answer that problem posed by Comrade Griffiths, MP, of “Bigness becoming remotaenes in a nationalised industry.”
More than 100 of the 428 resolutions on the agenda of last year’s Labour Party conference opposed the manufacture, use, and testing of nuclear weapons. Yet this determination by the Labour movement is to be more than a revulsion from the horrors of nuclear war; it is the solemn realization that it should be embodied in a realistic Socialist foreign policy. Similarly, the weakness of the Nuclear Disarmament Campaign is that it repudiates atomic weapons for Britain but advances no alternative acceptable to the non-pacifist majority of the country.

We have reached a point at which it is most essential to establish a sound, simple “anti-nuclear” foreign policy and to secure widespread support for it.

Important contributions have been made in the VFS pamphlet A Policy for Summit Talks, by Komil Zilliacus and Claude Bourdet (New Reasoner, 4 and 5) and by other Socialists. These proposals, however, contain certain shortcomings which require the urgent attention of the Left.

Actively neutral

It seems generally agreed among Left-wingers that Britain must reject nuclear power politics. A Labour Government which had contracted out of the nuclear arms race would use its independent policy to affect a settlement of relations between the two nuclear powers at the conference table, which would bring the “cold war” to an end.

Komil Zilliacus fails, however, to appreciate how deep and complex are the antagonisms and suspicions dividing the great nuclear powers. He stresses the policy of British “dismengagement” as a means of affecting the strategic interests of the United States and Western Europe so that it will ultimately be obliged to put its foreign policy into reverse and accept nuclear and conventional disarmament and comprehensive regional security treaties. He supposes that the USSR will feel sufficiently confident in the strength and influence of a “dismengaged” Britain as to lower its guard and come to the conference table genuinely prepared to negotiate such fundamental agreements with the United States.

It is not easy to accept these suppositions. There is a certain other-worldliness about them. The more immediate problem whether the policy of “dismengagement” and “neutrality” is not in need of further development and elaboration. Whether our Socialist foreign policy is to be successful emphasis needs to be put not so much on an “actively neutral” principle as in balancing between the two power blocs, but rather on the building up, over a period, of a “third force” of anti-nuclear countries powerful enough to compel nuclear disarmament. This is hinted at in the VFS pamphlet: “We should put our weight behind the campaign at the United Nations to ban the nuclear bomb of the world, and wage a ‘peace campaign’ . . . against all those . . . who continued to abstractly mislead the world for ending the Cold War.” Claude Bourdet develops the idea more fully.

Compensations of War!

Former German inmates of concentration camps received compensation amounting to more than £45 for each year they suffered. While the commandant of the Sachsenhausen camp was paid £50, and a former S.S. doctor at Buchenwald nearly £2,500. Much of this was paid as a special grant to help him set up a new practice.

A State secretary who served loyally under Hitler receives a monthly pension of £225; a day released from years in concentration camps only £37. Former political prisoners who served a total of 99,220 years in camps and priso ns have received in all rather less than £4,500,000; this year alone the Federal Government will spend about £115m. in pensions to dismissed officials and former professional soldiers.

One only force

There is only one force which can achieve the nuclear disarmament of the two super-giants, and that is humanity organized on a world scale. A British Labour Government, together with other European states, can help attempt to associate a number of States and national and international organizations among which some common understanding could be achieved on the objects of foreign policy in the nuclear age.

The forms of association would depend on circumstances, but certainly the United Nations Organization would begin to measure up to its ideals, instead of being so largely a cockpit for the contending atomic powers and their satellites.

Such an association would include:

(1) The established “uncommitted” countries, i.e., those that have not yet decided what line of foreign policy to follow.

(2) The colonies and other underdeveloped areas, where the interests of the British are satisfied.

DOLLE—end

The only Government measure to increase production—the lifting of the exchange restrictions—will not substantially increase employment. It will only bring extra profit to the so-called “producers” (good goods industries, TV’s, cars, etc.), which anyway have a lot of spare production capacity at the moment.

The experience of the American depression shows that even after trade has recovered full employment is always the last thing to show an upward turn. Unemployment is the real source. Whether or rather the real thing at its present level for the first few months of 1959. The seasonal increase in the spring may bring a slight decrease in unemployment but it appears that there will be no return to full employment in 1959.

ERIK HEFFER

from page 8

The above measures are obviously only a minimum programme, which will hardly rally all sections of the movement for action. One thing is clear: in order to get such a minimum programme through, a real fight will need to be conducted inside the Trade Unions. The unemployed must never again be allowed to struggle on their own or be forced to a sectional struggle. The question is a matter for the entire movement, and all sections must be involved.

Chinese wall

The final, in fact, only, real solution is the establishment of a socialist Britain integrated in a socialist Europe, working for a socialist world. We cannot hope to solve the problem of the world without international competition or even under-consumption by building a “Chinese Wall” around ourselves. The problem of unemployment is the most pressing one before us today. Unless we are able to put a stop to this action, the field will be left clear for reaction, as the events in Nottingham and Notting Hill proved.

Of those of us who have influence in our trade union trades that influence, in particular, in the coming months. Ensure that these proposals are acted upon. In the case of the solutions urged upon the agenda of forthcoming Union conferences, and ensure that they are then placed on the agenda of the TUC. Let us end the period of periodicity as far as the official machinery is concerned (the rank-and-file in many industries of late have proved their fighting spirit), and let 1959 be the year which can be looked back upon as the year which commenced the destruction of capitalism in Britain. To those who rely on a Labour Government solving the problem, let me point out past experience. Personification of the TUC and the organized strength of the worker. The point is that strength must be got now, and that the trade unions even if the TUC ensures that we shall have a better future before us.
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its exponents tend to appear exotic and outside the every-day life of the workers and their movements. Even if they are championing appeals, not as it should, something which is not too obvious and not to ordinary life.

Effective marches against sites or centres of Government, or effective action among workers to block the building of rocket sites or any experiment that the Government can only make sense and achieve their ends when the workers themselves are on the march and actively opposed. A third way—justly and actively in anti-H bomb and anti-Tory opposition. It is, unfortunately, a fact of present life that workers are not only apathetic on the question of rocket sites and nuclear power plants but unemployed, often only too willing to work on well-paid sites.

ERIC HEFFER ON UNEMPLOYMENT

From page 8
He also emphasized that as well as unemployment, short-time working is widespread. His figures were as follows:

Out of Short-Time
Manchester 8,000
Stockport 1,000
Wigan 1,000
Warrington 1,160
Rochdale 1 in 10 unemployed
Salford 1,750
Halifax 450
Hyde 550
Let me add the position in the Merseyside area.

On the Merseyside area.

The City of Liverpool. Of these 1,151 were youths between the ages of 15 years and 18 years, and over 264 of these had been unemployed for over six weeks, some of them in fact over three months.

The propaganda aims of the passive resisters, although they receive a nation-wide coverage, tend to fall on indifferent ears. Even agitating within the Labour Movement, the sophistication and the sophistication level of general political action in industry (as we ourselves were guilty) is often too low. Not too long ago still ignores the fact that the British workers although they are on the march, not as it should, that they are, most of their present battles on economic and job issues.

A single H - bomb is an urgent threat to humanity. But there are no short cuts to a solution. The threat of British involvement in a nuclear war can only be stopped by the overturn of British capitalism, and the first step to that would be to organise a popular movement to mount an anti-Tory offensive in which the workers actively participate. That, therefore, must begin on a level the workers understand and support.

That level is to support, even with the small resources of militancy or radicalism, any genuine real manifestation of discontent on every front among the workers in the Nationalised and Labour Party which will tend to drive the Party as such into opposition and a head-on conflict with the Tories on a socialist policy.

But it is surely a little unfair to expect the workers, who have won the struggles they have undertaken only by mass action and organisation, to respond to the call of those who seek to oppose war plans and shame the silent Opposition. It is true they lack the individual conscience.

Despite the best intentions of the marchers and the demonstration, the least possible publicity for a day-by-day agitation for the ousting of the Tory Government and supporting it, if necessary, to withdraw from NATO and dump the H-bomb, is still the best guarantee against H-bomb warfare.

those in Yorkshire are also particularly active and indicate that at least the Trades Councils are aware of the seriousness of the situation.

This, of course, is understood and but a first step in a broader and stronger campaign. Appeals to Government departments, interviews with the Prime Minister and the Cabinet, are useful to keep the spotlight on the problem, but now definite action is required, action which brings a real struggle, which brings forward the return of the Labour Government.

In my opinion such a strategy is basically false, firstly because the Labour leadership offers no real alternative and secondly because mass unemployment is a fact then the possibility of a quick revival becomes increasingly remote.

Developing struggle

In the developing struggle, the Trades Councils movement has played quite a positive role. On the Merseyside, the Trades Council Consultative Committee, supported by the NFBTO and the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions called a conference on the problem last June and recently sent a deputation to all the Heads of Government departments. They have also fully acquainted the TUC with the serious position to be done.

The Lancashire Federation of Trades Councils called a conference last November and in December it developed its activities to solve the problem. At the meeting many delegates felt that much more must be done and after a discussion the EC of the Federation were asked to set a date when contingents of workers from employed and unemployed should lobby the MPs in the Houses of Commons and demonstrate in the City of London. It was felt that each town and city in the Federation area could contribute its quota of lobbyists, therefore make the demonstration wide-spread and effective. (Other Trades Councils such as

WHAT WE STAND FOR

The SOCIALIST REVIEW stands for international socialism. Only a mass mobilisation of the working class in the industrial and political arena can avoid the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a socialist society.

The SOCIALIST REVIEW believes that the fight for a Labour Government must be brought to power.

The complete nationalisation of the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments based on a means test. Re-nationalisation of all denationalised industries without compensation.

The nationalised industries to be run on a co-operative basis as part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.

Workers' control on all nationalised industries, i.e., a majority of workers' representatives on all nationalised industries' area boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and retaining the average scale of skilled wage ruling in the industry.

The establishment of workers' control on all private enterprises within the framework of a planned economy. In all industries, the workers to be subject to frequent election, immediate recall and receiving the average scale of skilled wage ruling in the industry.

The establishment of the right of workers' committees to control hiring, firing and working conditions.

The establishment of the right to work or full maintenance.

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 Service and the development of an industrial health service.

The expansion of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities and the expropriation of privately held land.

Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fee paying schools. Further education fees abolished in secondary 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 recognition to all workers whatever their country of origin. Freedom of migration to workers to and from Britain.

Freedom from political espionage by all nations and all colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to the people of the under-developed countries.

The unification of an independent Ireland.

The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from over-seas and the disarming of all weapons of mass destruction.

A Socialist foreign policy independent of both Washington and Moscow.