Rank and File conference: tell Callaghan YES, WE'LL STRIKE AT THE TORIES

JAMES CALLAGHAN has predictably denounced the call by the trade union leaders for a conference of the miners' unions from big countries to campaign to force the Tories to an early general election. Using "industrial muscle for political ends", he claims, is undemocratic. Instead he promises a "force fight" against the Tories... in parliament.

So when inflation is at 20% and there are two million unemployed (as even the Treasury forecasts), the working class is to listen to 'Today in Parliament' on the radio and hope to hear Callaghan give Thatcher a good thrashing.

The ruling class does not restrict itself to Parliament. There was no ballot-box decision in 1976 when the IMF ordered the govern- ment to adopt a programme of cuts. Nor in 1964 when, according to Wilson, financial speculators and bankers dictated Labour's policies.

So why should a fight with one hand tied behind our backs?

The trade unions knows the working class will soon have to fight against the after-effects of the Tory budget as Britain slides into a recession. And he knows the Trade Unions have won some explosive clashes that brought down the Heath government and gave the left in the unions and the Labour party a tremendous boost.

Callaghan plays up the role of parliament in the struggle. He doesn't want the industrial struggle to get 'political' if that means developing the politics of class war, politics based on the working class's capacity to fight its exploiters...

Instead he wants the unions to stick to their existing politics, his own politics, the politics of parliamentary manoeuvre, of corrupting the contempt for, workers' struggles, and of low-owing to capitalism.

Under the last Tory government, industrial mili- tantry snowballed. But it never broke through the membrane of reformism: it never set its own political perspectives, different from the parliamentary horizons provided by Wilson and Callaghan. The widespread dis- illusion with the Parlia- mentary Labour leadership was never positively transcended by an all-sound political alternative.

We need to set a political perspective for industrial militancy, including:

- Automatic cost-of-living protection for wages
- Cut hours, not jobs — under workers' control and with no loss of pay
- Nationalisation without compensation and under workers' control
- Expand social services. Make the bosses pay. Mill- ions for hospitals, not a penny for 'defence'. Nationalise the banks and financial institutions without compen- sation.
- Unity of black and white workers in struggle against capitalism. Purge racism from the labour movement. Win labour movement support for black self-defence. End all immi- gration controls.
- Democracy and accountability at all levels and in all sections of the labour movement. Regular election and right of recall over full-time trade union of- ficials, who should be paid the average wage of the workers they represent. Automatic re-selection pro- cedure for Labour MPs, election of the Labour Party leader by conference.

Rally

The 'Defend the Unions' Rank and File conference in Manchester this weekend (23rd) will be an important rallying point for those who want to fight on the industri- al front. But, judging from past such conferences, under the same political axis (the Socialists Workers' Party), it will fall into the trap of call- ing for more militancy, for white to shop floor and trade union organisation, taking no leadership at all for granting that the ideas of trade union empowerment, will do.

Having sobered up after its disastrously blind mili- tancy-feeding of 1974-6, the call is now to meet the need for patient, detailed work in the unions and fact- ries. Rightly so. But this emphasis should not be used to postpone the political issue, so advanced.

As long as industrial mili- tants leave the politics to Callaghan and his gang of parliamentary twisters, the industrial militancy itself will be fettered. In response to Callaghan, we must both organise industrially and take up the fight against Callaghan's political leader- ship. Every trade union branch and every Labour Party GMCC should condemn Callaghan's declaration and start working out its own plans for action.

Boat people: Let them in

THE National Front will be marching this weekend to object to any Vietnamese refugees being accepted into Britain.

Yet in a sense they already have the government on the side, and for the same racist reasons. Britain has let in just 1,500 of the boat people, and it's only motive is to take the pressure off Hong Kong. Like other wealthy nations, Britain has been more eager to suggest solutions for the boat people in south east Asia than to make a substantial contribution to providing a refuge for the hundreds of thousands in danger of death by hunger, thirst or drowning. Japan has accepted just 51 of the refugees, New Zealand 812.

The resources of the USA, backed by all the imperialist powers, were poured into devastating Vietnam, sup- posedly for the benefit of the hapless Vietnamese. Now that refugees are pouring out of Vietnam, unable to face the harshness of life in a country all but destroyed by imperialism, those powers are unwilling to lift a finger to save them.

They never did care about the Vietnamese; only about their own power and pride and profits.

The Thatcher government (as also Callaghan before) would be glad to find the money and the space to welcome in any number of white racists from Rhodesia or South Africa. So of course, would the National Front. But the desperate Vietnam-ese are another story.

The labour movement must stand against this racism and say:
- Let them come!
- End all immigration controls!

Counter-demonstration Assembly 1pm, Saturday 23 June, in Leicester Sq.
The controversy over the Workers' Action's position on trade unions and the Labour movement has continued to energize debate. The caricaturing of Workers' Action's position as an isolated and insular faction has been a point of contention in the debate. The Labour councils had to look to their commitments (a bird in the hand, etc.) throughout the country. Labour's council was quite willing to discuss these responsibilities, on a case by case basis. The situation was not a matter of ultra-leftism but of an attempt to discuss the problems of the local Labour movement.

The action of the councils was to be the responsibility of the local government. The council should be in a position where the local Labour movement could be left to itself. The situation was not a matter of ultra-leftism but of an attempt to discuss the responsibilities of the local Labour movement.

The Labour councils had to look to their commitments (a bird in the hand, etc.) throughout the country. Labour's council was quite willing to discuss these responsibilities, on a case by case basis. The situation was not a matter of ultra-leftism but of an attempt to discuss the problems of the local Labour movement.
NATIONAL GUARD: Guerillas set to win, but who will rule?

The Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN), having captured the capital, Managua, last November, is preparing to establish its Provisional Government. 

The Sandinista movement has been successful in attracting popular support. The people of Nicaragua are tired of the long years of guerrilla war and looking for a change. The Sandinistas, with their charismatic leaders, have won the hearts and minds of the people.

However, the Sandinistas’ success is a mixed blessing. They have captured power, but they have yet to prove that they can govern effectively and efficiently. The country is in need of a stable government, but the Sandinistas have yet to demonstrate that they are capable of providing it.

There is also concern about the Sandinistas’ commitment to democratic processes. They have arrested many of their political opponents and have not provided fair trials for those they accuse of crimes.

In conclusion, the Sandinistas have won the war, but they still have a long way to go before they can be considered a viable and stable government. The international community will be watching closely to see if the Sandinistas can deliver on their promises.
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Three Mile Island: How the impossible did happen

Health and environment chiefs were put up to researce the Senate's health and welfare leaks could cause cancer. But an anti-nuclear health specialist estimated possible 50,000 cancers from the Three Mile Island lead.

The core of the reactor had failed after being run at high power for 2 minutes, causing the valve to close down. An accident in which the operator shut down the reactor too late. However, the valve allowed the water from the explosion to escape from the core, and caused the reactor to go out of control. The system was designed to allow for a controlled reactor shutdown, but this failed.

The open valve allowed pressure to escape from the reactor, causing the core to be exposed to the atmosphere. The core then melted down, releasing radiation into the environment.

The reactor was shut down, but the core remained hot, and radiation continued to be released into the atmosphere. The accident caused significant environmental damage, and led to increased public concern about nuclear power.

The Three Mile Island incident was a significant event in the history of nuclear power, demonstrating the potential for serious accidents and the need for better safety measures. The incident also led to increased regulations and safety improvements in the nuclear industry.


due to "human error." The crucial factor was when workers crashed a routine maintenance accidentally and got the water flowing into the reactor, causing the core to overheat and melt down. Additionally, the design of the reactor was not robust enough to withstand the pressure from the water.

The nuclear reactor stopped, the temperature and pressure began to drop, and the water in the reactor started to boil. The open valve allowed the pressure to escape, causing the core to melt down and release radiation into the atmosphere.

As a result, the operators left the reactor to prevent it from exploding, but the core remained hot and radiation continued to be released. The incident caused significant environmental damage and led to increased public concern about nuclear power.

The accident had serious consequences, including the evacuation of thousands of people living near the plant, and the temporary closure of the plant. The incident also led to increased regulations and safety improvements in the nuclear industry.

The Three Mile Island incident was a significant event in the history of nuclear power, demonstrating the potential for serious accidents and the need for better safety measures. The incident also led to increased regulations and safety improvements in the nuclear industry.

The Three Mile Island accident had several consequences, including:

1. Increased public concern about nuclear power.
2. Increased regulations and safety improvements in the nuclear industry.
3. The shutdown of several nuclear plants.
4. The loss of confidence in nuclear power as a source of energy.
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Repression

McNeely tells blacks: keep off the streets

"If you keep off the streets of London and behave yourself, you will not have anything to worry about." With these words, West Indian Police Commissioner David McNeely last Thursday reassured black journalist that he understood the feelings of the people at the activities of the political parties. Pastor Oneyo, however, McNeely refused to address the question of the death of Blair Peach. The inquiry that the lawyer was conducting an investigation was a press conference to present the report for 1979. The 57-inch figure speaks volumes on the trespass, the British and the country's policy, but McNeely, who aside from the circumstances and the forthcoming National, are being held by the police in the streets of Britain, has not been heard off there since the unmarked van was some coming by.

The press release demands are:

- The application of the minimum guarantees of the International Convention on the treatment of prisoners.
- The abolition of special cells and isolation units.
- The bringing together of prisoners in groups where they can interact with each other.
- The abolition of restrictions on information and screens between prisoners from lawyers and friends.
- Outside doctors, trusted by the prisoners in charge of the clinic.

The release without registration citizens who are still in the columns of detention by an international commission of inquiry.

- The release without registration citizens who are still in the columns of detention by an international commission of inquiry.

Meanwhile in Britain, the Ardol community in Neasden defeated the use of the 'police' which allows individuals and the courts to correcthem, and also on the evidence that McNeely thinks the period of 10 days is not applicable, the person's life is in danger. Nothing wrong, according to McNeely. In fact, the Act is an indispensable weapon for the police authority, especially judging from the Act, the police are dealing with black youth. But this Act, like the Public Order Act, is a dangerous weapon, and against anti-Socialists, and against anti-Socialists, is used by the police to maintain order. Even for McNeely, constant pressure for an Act, passed by the House of Commons two years ago seems to be a little tense.

The argument that the Blair Peach inquiry could not be decided, and the police were a few cases that had had yet been arrested for the sake of evading the evidence of several eyewitnesses. Why

---

Unfair to Socialist Unity?

Dear Comrades,

Your article on Socialist Unity (WA 143) marked a quite significant departure in the positions which have traditionally been defended by your paper. The Socialist Unity is the voice of revolutionary candidates and the position of revolutionary candidates has not existed.

The political tradition of our party stands for the interests of the working class and the political interests of the working class can only be realized in a political system which not only has a viewpoint of the working class but also has a viewpoint of the political system.

In a situation where the working class is the main beneficiary of a political system, the working class has to be the main beneficiary of that political system. The working class has to be the main beneficiary of the political system.

We would contend that our activity did contribute to building and strengthening the class struggle and that needs to be built in the Labour movement. We have been a constant propaganda for the rant-and-feet groupings that need to be built in the trade unions, and we have made every effort to educate the political system of the trade unions.

We would contend that the Socialist Unity programme was weaker than the trade union programme, and we would contend that the trade union programme is all right.

Let's call things by their right names. What you mean is that there is a mass base for revolutionary politics independent of revolutionary candidates are disruptive of the trade union programme and that we are in these formations.

The question of the state and its power is fundamental to our work. We are of the opinion that the state and its power are essential to our work. We call on our comrades to join us in this struggle.

The state is a necessary tool for saying that the Socialist Unity programme is not disruptive of the trade union programme, but disruptive of the trade union programme. Thus, the state is a necessary tool for saying that the Socialist Unity programme is not disruptive of the trade union programme.
The Victims of World Capitalism

At the other end of the globe, one of the world's most cruelly oppressed minorities is fighting back. And the headquarters of one of the Australian Aboriginals' main enemies—the giant mining company RTZ—is right here in London.

The Aboriginals have been victims of the world-depopulating march of international capitalism for two centuries now. When Captain Cook first set foot in Australia, in 1770, he had been instructed by the Admiralty 'with the consent of the natives' to take possession of 'convenient situations' in the name of the King of England. The native (Aboriginal) population had established trade routes crossing the entire continent. They had developed farming and animal husbandry, built canals and dykes. They were not willing to have the white invaders take possession of their land.

But Cook duly planted the Union Jack. Britain had just lost the North American colonies, and Australia was a welcome half-subsidary. A campaign of genocide against the indigenous people followed, extending right up to the later part of the 19th century. The Aboriginal population of 200,000, probably more, by 1945, it was down to less than 90,000.

The Aboriginals were driven from the most fertile land into the barren north and centre of the continent. Their settlements were destroyed. They fought back, and indeed were never finally subdued in the north, but the British authorities murdered without mercy.

A British apostle explained in 1876: 'The survival of the fittest means that might is right. And thus we invoke and人民法院 fulfill the inexorable laws of natural selection when exterminating the inferior Australian, and we appropriate their property.' In 1883 the British High Commissioner reported to the Prime Minister in London: 'I have heard of the brave and generous, of the greatest humanity and kindness to their fellow whites, talk not only of the wholesale butchery but of the individual murder of natives exactly as they would talk of a dog's sport, or of having to kill some troublesome animal.

In the later 19th century, some of the remaining military tribes were at last allowed to keep some land—on reserves. Control was kept through missionaries and draconian laws.

Despite some reforms since the late 1940s, Aboriginals today— in the midst of a prosperous advanced capitalist society— suffer oppression and poverty compared to the worst conditions in the Third World.

A 1977 survey showed that 25% of Aboriginal children suffered serious malnutrition. In Western Australia the infant mortality rate among Aboriginals is six times that among whites. Diseases characteristic of extreme poverty—like trachoma, which causes blindness, and is estimated to affect five Aboriginals to the point where they need an eye operation—are widespread.

Australia is generally a highly urbanised society, but less than half of the 200,000 or so Aboriginals live in the towns. Even among those who do, unemployment is enormous: the job rate for Aboriginals is over 50%

Many Aboriginals live in reserves, where they are ruled by white officials. In Queensland, for example, where one-third of the Aboriginal population live, 25% are on reserves.

Under Queensland laws, Aboriginals can be expelled from the reserve at any time to change the whole Aboriginal property-maintained government, and cannot get money, buy 'expensive' items, or enter into contracts without official permission.

They are exempted from minimum wage laws. In 1975, when the legal minimum was $5.50 and the average wage was over $100 a week, the average wage for Aboriginal Queenslanders was $3.50. And the Aboriginals are obliged to do whatever job the white manager allows them.

Some of the Queensland regulations are illegal under Federal Australian law, but the federal government does nothing about it. In other states the position of Aboriginals is not much better.

How are the entire population of the reserve liable to be moved off without any compensation? This is the experience of the boiling.

Land rights: The Qld law gave the RTZ 2 square miles, reserve land square miles of inal land. They were not taken area. Weipa, shed-like home area set aside to a mile of a by bauxite mini-valve-stripping hundreds of sq Mapoon they drove off the armed police.

Million, by far the million, 18% of the war reserve by which, in a profit of $20 million, the Qld's latest get land in another Territory for $1.5 million—meaning. The land sign got under

Nicola Sinclair and Jo Thwaites talk to Robert Roberts, author of From Massacres to Mining about the land rights struggle and its background.

*Published by CMERA and War on Want. £1.99.

How black A is plundered

Why is there such a close relationship between the question of Aboriginals' traditional land and the activities of the mining companies?

Because it was only with the opening up of the mineral deposits in the north and centre of Australia that the Australian locals became seriously interested in these areas. Until the 1980s European settlement in Australia was confined to the coastal areas in the East and South which are fertile and of use for large-scale agriculture. Iron ore was driven into the north and centre of Australia on land regarded as useless. But they were allowed to keep certain areas of their land. While the missionaries destroyed many cemeteries, in particular, by forcing different tribes to live together and so breaking down the complex kinship structure, the Aborigines still maintained connections with the land.

The missionaries and white Europeans felt vastly superior to the Aboriginals and thus sought to save their souls. Aboriginal culture and tribal Aborigines were despised, and their language was forbidden.

The official church historian for Mapoon (in the far north of Australia) says that the missionaries allowed the Aborigines to keep their lands because they were 'cruel and treacherous, gliding through the grass' and because they posed the 'picture of stupidity and degradation'. The Mission aimed sought to inculcate all the Protestant teachings, to destroy Aboriginal culture, and to teach the Aborigines to accept the white man's 'civilisation'.

Since the 1960s vast deposits of iron ore, bauxite, diamonds and uranium have been discovered in the heart of the country and the attitudes of the mining companies and the state government has not changed; land has been leased, and Aboriginals herded into reserves.

What role has the Australian Federal Government played in representing the interests of mining capital? In particular, how is this reflected in the Federal Land Rights Act?

In the Federal Land Rights Act, the Australian Federal Government can be clearly seen to represent the interests of mining capital. While the Whitlam (Labor) Government originally drew up the Land Rights Act the regulations against the power of the mining capital for Aboriginal land were very weak. The Whitlam: to Crown Land in the Northern Territory, reserves such as East Arnhem and Uluru and reserves in Western Australia.
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With the advent of}

Black is beautiful

Nichola Sinclair and Jo Thwaites

Jo Thwaites talk to Robert Roberts, author of From Massacres to Mining about the land rights struggle and its background.

*Published by CMERA and War on Want. £1.99.
Rito Tinto Zinc and colonialism

When Aboriginals held public demonstrations in central capital, Canberra. They put up a 'Rito Tinto' sign outside Parliament House, re-erecting it again and again after police tear gas had been used. Eventually the Labour party, then in opposition, promised to bring in a law recognizing Aboriginal land rights soon after, but it did provide for the setting up of two democracy or elected Aboriginal Land Councils, in the North and the Centre.

In 1976 mining legislation was passed in Washington, D.C., to re-send a bill to the Northern Territory. But the Bill was never passed. While it was still going through legislative approval, the British Governor General, Sir Edward Kinross, the Governor of the Australian Commonwealth, made a visit to the Northwest Territories. He then decided that the only way to avoid a major dispute with the Territorial Government was to accept the Bill as it stood.

RITIO TINTO ZINC is the largest mining company in the world. The greatest section of its profits comes from its Australian operations — in 1970 it made £30 million. But the company has also been accused of widespread environmental damage in South Africa and its Park Belt coal mine in the Cape have been charged with causing extensive fire damage.

Hidden shareholders means that no one, especially those who own the company, can tell if their rights are being abused. The开拓者 have no control over the company's decisions. In the interests of the company's profitability, the company has been allowed to continue to mine zinc ore, even though it knew that the ore was contaminated with asbestos.

AMONG ITS DIRECTORS, RITIO TINTO ZINC has been a force in the Australian mining industry for many years. The company was founded in 1971 by Sir Edward Kinross, the former Governor General of the Australian Commonwealth. It has since become one of the largest mining companies in the world, with its headquarters in London. The company's main assets are located in South Africa, where it operates several mining operations, including the world's largest copper mine, the Rago Copper Mine. The company also has mining interests in the United States, Canada, and Australia. The company has a long history of controversy, particularly in relation to its mining operations in South Africa, where it has been accused of human rights abuses and environmental damage. The company's actions have been the subject of much media coverage in recent years, and the company has faced significant pressure from both the Australian government and international organizations to improve its practices.

AUSTRALIA
cannot be claimed by Aborigi-
nines and in the remain-
ing areas of Australia.

Under the Queensland Aborigines Act (1871) there is a provision to pay a male or female barter — in some cases to do so on condition that they lodge with a company which could not do this. The companies claimed that it was not the only way to lodge with which could not be claimed by Aborigi-
in mining companies in the Northern Territory.

The conflict of interest between the white and the Aboriginal people is particularly acute in the Northern Territory, which might account for the harshness of the legislation there, but in general political terms Queensland is extremely rich in mineral wealth. However, this is better than the situation in Western Australia, where there is no Aborig-ines law, and companies can do as they please. In Queensland, the att-

The militant, who is the oldest in the company's history, has been at the forefront of the struggle against colonialism. He has been active in the Aborigines movement for many years, and has been a vocal critic of the mining industry. The militant has been involved in many high-profile cases, and has won several important legal victories. He has also been involved in the struggle for land rights and other political issues. The militant has been a pivotal figure in the struggle against colonialism, and his work has been an inspiration to many others.
From Kautsky to Eurocommunism:

CONTINUING our publication — for the first time in English — for Kautsky to Eurocommunism: the debate which the Social Democracy of Europe launched against Kautsky in 1917 and 1918, as the war in Russia was in progress. In the last issue we briefly examined the crucial question of 'struggle or overthrow', which is so important for the understanding of the social democratic movement in the German Reich.

Another expression of this conservatism and opposition to mass action, and she realises that all Kautsky's high-sounding theoretical arguments merely serve to justify this conservatism.

The real effect of Comrade Kautsky's behaviour is therefore only that he has again made a protestation for those elements in the Party and in the trade unions who are in opposition to the prospect of the further uncheked development of the mass movement, which would like to keep in check and withdraw as quickly as possible to the old and confineable habits of the day-to-day parliamentary and trade union work'.

Luxemburg, always close to the pulse of the mass movement, argues that it is impossible to sustain the struggle for as long as the same period of time: 'One should not fall victim to any illusions... a mass movement or demonstrations can be kept going for a year without class struggle and without electoral victories. It is an out determination to engage in the mass struggle...'.

She urges that, just as spontaneous mass movement often emerges from a combination of specific political situations and an awakening consciousness among the masses, so as these factors change the movement itself will either develop or collapse. She accuses Kautsky of abdicating from the social democratic struggle and instead intervening in that movement in order to give it a purely political direction.

Such agitation for the mass strike provides the possibility of throwing light on the whole political situation, and the situation of the working class. In the sharpest manner, of increasing the political maturity of the masses, making them more aware of the perils of the masses, of advancing new horizons to the proletariat'.

For Kautsky, Parliamentaryism is a better method of social education and of the organisational structure which is essential to the development of the revolutionary movement. He argues that workers take part alongside Social Democratic workers and workers who support other political parties; the workers advance through being actively involved in the struggle. In the electoral arena, the workers are essentially passive, and the votes that they cast are organized by the party (Social Democracy to do election campaigning) only as objects of propaganda addressed to them by the Party.

Nothing but Parliamentaryism?

Unfortunately the whole argument rests here on a new, an old label, well-known things. If one lays aside the old and new, and misleading factors out of the controversy has very little to do with Friedrich Engels. What is in this controversy lies between the strategy of 'struggle or overthrow', which is so valued by Comrade Kautsky and to which German Social Democracy owes its outstanding success, and the use of the parliamentary apparatus of the state for the daily class struggle, for educating, unifying and organizing the masses. The problem has nothing to do with the strategy of 'struggle or overthrow'. In fact, in considering the working class struggle, the agitation of Laussale ('*') who was in this, as Engels says, only carrying out the directives of the Communist Manifesto, can be considered as a purely theoretical and give reasons for this tactic in his famous introduction to 'The Communist Manifesto'.

Instead of putting forward general schemata of strategies and of tactics, Kautsky does, I mean, put forward the tactic recommended by him consists of — and also what other tactics it is directed against. 'All revolutions up to the present have resulted in the destruction of the ruling class by rule by another, but all ruling classes up to now have destroyed the rule of the people. One ruling minority was thus thrown overboard; the majority seized the helm of the state in its stead and refashioned the machinery of the state on its own'.

Since all these revolutions were actually revolutions of the working class, the working class had to get rid of the old ruling minority and to form its own. In 1848 the hope existed of beginning the socialistic revolution and to seize the means of a surprise attack by a revolution ary minority.

Instead of putting forward general schemata as Kautsky does, Engels states quite clearly what the tactic consists of — and what other tactics it is directed against.'

"History", says Engels, "has proved us, and all who stand in the way of it, which is the struggle for the coming of the socialist transformation by a simple surprise attack". It became clear that the social democratic minority was established only in the long process of development of bourgeois society, and the proletariat could prepare itself only as a mass movement for the struggle for the parliament.

The time of surprise attacks, of revolutionary action, when the head of unconscious masses, is past. Where it is a question of conscious mass action, where the masses themselves must also be in it, must themselves already have grasped what is at stake, what they should fight for. The surprise attack must be directed against such a mass.

But in order the masses may understand what is to be done, long, persistently work is required. And it is just this work that we are now pursuing, and with a success which drives the enemy to despair". — August Bebel's statement as the most outstanding weapon in this respect, the use of universal suffrage. "With this successful utilization of universal suffrage, the successful carry-through of the method of proletarian struggle came into operation, and this method quickly developed, attracting, in its time, the hopes and the despair, the discontent, the struggle and the strength of their ally, of appeasing the idealism of the masses, of showing new horizons to the proletariat'.

For Kautsky, Parliamentaryism is a better method of social education and of the organisational structure which is essential to the development of the revolutionary movement. He argues that workers take part alongside Social Democratic workers and workers who support other political parties; the workers advance through being actively involved in the struggle. In the electoral arena, the workers are essentially passive, and the votes that they cast are organized by the party (Social Democracy to do election campaigning) only as objects of propaganda addressed to them by the Party.

Rosa Luxemburg: Attraction or Struggle?

Let us come to the main question.

Comrade Kautsky carries on his agitation as if the question of whether it is now possible to think about a mass strike in terms of a general strategy of the Party. Comrade Kautsky says: 'We are in the same situation as the people of the ổninding question, the question of the strategy of 'struggle or overthrow', according to Comrade Kautsky, was the norm for the revolutionary classes. Since then, however, the strategy of the Party in the German Social Democracy owes all its growth and its outstanding success to this strategy of 'struggle or overthrow'. He therefore abandons this victorious strategy with a mass strike, in order to go over to the strategy of 'overthrow'. Obviously Comrade Kautsky's consideration about the two strategies and the advantages of the strategy of attraction is the most important pillar of his argument. In particular Comrade Kautsky transfers the greatest authority to his position by deriving his strategy of attraction directly from the 'Political Testament' of Friedrich Engels.

The attraction of the mass movement is that it is a strategy of attraction which is based on the idea of 'socialism without revolution', that is, on the idea of 'socialism by parliament'. This is the idea that the working class, instead of attacking the existing social order, should try to improve it within the framework of the existing institutions. This idea is based on the assumption that the working class is strong enough to overthrow the existing social order, but that it is not strong enough to carry out the revolution itself. This is the idea that the working class is strong enough to overthrow the existing social order, but that it is not strong enough to carry out the revolution itself. This is the idea that the working class is strong enough to overthrow the existing social order, but that it is not strong enough to carry out the revolution itself.

On the other hand, the strategy of 'struggle or overthrow' is based on the idea that the working class is strong enough to overthrow the existing social order. This is the idea that the working class is strong enough to overthrow the existing social order. This is the idea that the working class is strong enough to overthrow the existing social order. This is the idea that the working class is strong enough to overthrow the existing social order.

As a result of these differences, the strategy of 'struggle or overthrow' is more likely to be successful than the strategy of attraction. The strategy of 'struggle or overthrow' is more likely to be successful than the strategy of attraction. The strategy of 'struggle or overthrow' is more likely to be successful than the strategy of attraction. The strategy of 'struggle or overthrow' is more likely to be successful than the strategy of attraction.
How little the 'strategy of attrition' defended by Comrade Kautsky has to do with Engels' 'Political Testament' in resisting the actual facts. At the same time as Comrade Kautsky, Eduard Bernstein in the 'Social-Democratic Monatshefte' opposes the slogan of the mass strike in the present situation. As already mentioned, he almost exactly says the same words as Comrade Kautsky, Bernstein sharply distinguishes the 'strategy of the strike from the strategy of compulsion', and the trade union strike from the political strike, and thunders against those 'glamorous phrases' of the previous period. 'The day of compulsion has passed into the day of compulsion', he says. Such tactics is not suitable for 're-producing the old socialist movement'. It must be borne in mind that compulsion carries with it the certainty of its social rôle. For this class struggle has not succeeded and proves its value as the most certain means for the realization of the Proletarian revolution'. 'There is in truth no reason to get involved in the distant future in a battle which, in the German movement has come forward step by step, perhaps slowly, but surely. We have that which we have not, our strategy is not in opposition to the utmost socialism of the barricades, as Engels saw it, but in opposition to the Social Democratic mass action of the proletariat for the Socialist revolution.'

Indeed, Comrade Kautsky emphatically directs us to the 'new strategy', the new functions -- the central pillar of his strategy of attrition. Complete salvation is supposed to be promised by these elections. They will certainly bring us an overwhelming victory, they will create a completely new situation, they provide us with a broader basis for the struggle, they alone produce the conditions under which we can think about a 'strategy of overthrowing the new revolutionary situation'. This is a formulation of a cataclysm for the whole existing government system, of a revolution which already place the key to this tremendous historical situation in our hands. It is in vain, indeed, to know that the political elections are so promising for us Social Democrats that we would be criminally negligent to think now of a present-day strike in view of such a certain future victory to be gained at the price of our safety in our pockets.'

I do not believe that it is either good or suitable for the party to see us paint our future victory in the Reichstag elections. On the contrary, it is clear that it would be more advisable to prepare ourselves for the Reichstag elections with all possible political and organisational efficiency, but without exaggerated expectations. We will then see whether and to what extent we are victorious. To taste future victory without organisational efficiency would be a catastrophe for all of us, and not of the serious revolutionary parties, and I fully share the view of Comrade Panov that the party would be wrong in its own interest to mention such fanciful perspectives as a doubling of our vote.

But above all: what has the future electoral victory to do with the question of the Prussian suffrage struggle today? Comrade Kautsky, evidently, makes the assumption that the Reichstag election will create an 'altogether new situation'. While he is perhaps not directly saying that, he certainly implies it when he writes: 'A future war necessarily means an end to the deceptions, an end to the propagandists, an end to the spies, to the collaborationists'. In the Reichstag we remain a minority which is opposed by a unified reactionary majority. Even Comrade Kautsky himself cannot believe that our electoral victory would have such an overwhelming effect on the forces of reaction in Prussia that they would suddenly give us equal suffrage in Prussia of their own free will.

The 'electoral victory' can therefore only consist of one thing -- a coup by the authorities, the annulment of the right to vote for the Reichstag. Then, comrade Kautsky believes, we will proceed by all means necessary, even with the mass strike. The 'strategy of attrition' which speaks for today against a greater mass action is linked to a speculation about a coup, after which we will be in a position to undertake a series of different actions.

Now this speculation about the future has in common with all other speculations that it is just music of the future. If the present situation and our great actions collapses, if we do not do our part to make our tactics reach a climax in the Reichstag elections and the coup, if we do not act at all to organise ourselves according to particular combinations of what may happen in the future, then the question of whether we will or not of our seats in the next elections is a non-event. Whether or not the coup then takes place, can leave us rather cold. If we do our duty at every moment in the present in order to achieve in the same way the maximum agitation and education of the masses and to be equal to the situation and its development, we shall be successful in any course of future events. If however one wants, like Comrade Kautsky, to base a whole 'strategy of attrition' for today on a 'prospect' of 1916, then the present opportunity is lost in the year, in which those great deeds are also dependent on an eventual coup, then our 'strategy' becomes rather like that of the petty bourgeois democrats in France whose Marx, so brilliantly characterised in his 'Eighteenth Brumaire': they used to console themselves for the actual half-measures and defeats in the present with the hope of great deeds at the next opportunity. 'They confessed themselves into June 13 with the profound alteration: But if they dare to attack universal suffrage, well then -- then we will show them what we are made of.' Nous verrons!...'

ON THE OTHER hand, Comrade Kautsky's protest in the name of the 'strategy of attrition', which places all its hopes on the coming Reichstag elections, is, I have to say, late. He should not only have directed his warning cry against the present discussion of the mass strike, but also against the street demonstrations. Indeed against the whole style of the suffrage movement in Prussia as it was introduced by the Prussian Party Congress in January. At that Congress the basic standpoint from which the whole suffrage campaign was conducted was emphatically formulated, namely that the Prussian electoral reform could not be achieved by parliamentary means — neither by activity within parliament, nor by parliamentary elections, however outstanding the results might be — but only and solely by a sharp mass action outside of parliament, by the immediate seizing of a popular movement in the best style, the speaker explained to enthusiastic applause, 'otherwise those deprived of the vote will never gain it.' And, even if the worst should happen, we ourselves would have to bear the guilt for the people being thus deceived.

At the Party Congress there were five motions — from Brauns, Berlin, Spandau-Ost, Mecklenburg, Magdeburg — which demand the application of more decisive methods, of street demonstrations and the mass strike. The resolution that was unanimously accepted held out the prospect of the use of "every means at our disposal" in the fight for the right to vote, and its proposer commented: "My motion has expressly distanced itself from mentioning street demonstrations or the political mass strike. But this resolution is to mean, and I want the Party Congress to interpret it as meaning — that we are resolved, to use all means at our disposal!" When these means should be used always depends on "the degree of fervour which has arisen in the masses as a result of our political work. We must place the main emphasis on the fact that we must above all else secure the result of the suffrage struggle.""
resoluted to 'speak Russian as they had been ten years earlier to speak Belgian'

this we have a reliable witness — in the form of all the Party Congresses of the Austrian comrades for this period.

The whole process of the seizure of the mass action and about the stagnation of the suffrage mass action and the current protests in all the Party Congresses. As early as the Party Congress in Linz in 1898, Comrade Winarsky complained that in the speeches of the representatives of the universal suffrage, and declared "a storming of this bastion ofbourgeois democracy". The complaints and complaints were to be heard at the Party Congress in Brno in 1899. At the Party Congress in Graz in 1900, the problem of the whole storm of indignation at the standstill in the suffrage movement was discussed and finally determined. The talk was about the movement for the right to vote, as from the Party Congress in Graz, the resolution reads: say: since we have the fifth Curia (no) if it is the general, everything has become silent. I believe therefore that the May Congress broke off meetings for universal suffrage and that the whole spirit of the time was to fight for the franchise. In the provinces we breathed a sigh of relief because we thought that at last something would happen. However, we do not know when we were before the manifestations.
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It was "not the 'delay' who saved Rome", he says, in short, "but the well-constructed organisation of its confessors and, perhaps, most importantly, the national hatred which 190 years before the Christian era was already felt towards the Occidens. This was so obvious that finally even 'the majority of the Senate, in spite of the quasi-legitimation which the most recent events had given to Fabius' system of delay, was slowly ready to abandon this form of war, which was slowly but certainly destroying the state'. In it is a legend which had its origin in the grammar school pupils in order to drill them in conservatism. In it is a new, not of necessity, a revolution, a revolution, in order to hammer into them the necessity of a war which took the mythos behind it, that the veteran reserves march. 'Always slowly forward.' That was his idea, and now he is to be valid for the revolutionary party, to-day, in this situation — that is one of the unexpected twists of fate.

However that may be, the spirit of the noble Quintus Fabius, the spirit of the salvation of the state from, after sacrifices and prayers, the methodical conduct of the war, is not yet extinguished in our Party leadership a lack of courage, faith, and rashness.

As Comrade Adler said at the German-Austrian Party Congress in Graz: 'The spirit always has a positive effect, and I admit that speeches of this kind, directed at us, will strengthen us. That Comrade Kaznutski lent his pen and his historical knowledge the least. As a brake, comrade Kaznutski do we not need you.'

Translated from the German by Stan Cooks. Next week: Kaznutski's second article, 'A New Strategy'.

NOTES

1. Ferdinand Lassalle was one of the founders of the German trade union and socialist movement. In the early 1860s he led a movement for universal suffrage. Lassalle's programme was confused and unscientific, and his manipulative conception of politics led him to try to make an agreement with the Prussian Minister Biemann to the disadvantage of the liberal bourgeoisie. See Engels' article, 'The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers'. Lassalle's followers eventually united with the German Socialists in 1870 to form the Social Democratic Party. (For a critique of Lassallean politics as represented at that time, see Marx's 'Critique of the Gotha Programme').

2. In December 1848 the government introduced a bill which punished 'attempts at subversion' with imprisonment without trial and insulting remarks about religion, the monarchy, the family, marriage or private life. It was up to two years' imprisonment. The bill was rejected on 18th February by the Imperial Diet of mass protests and divisions among those supporting it.

3. The government introduced a bill in June 1899 to 'defend the relations of labour in industry', which effectively removed the right to organise or strike. It was known as the 'Police Bill'. The Kaiser spoke in support of the bill, saying, 'Unless the government acts, everything is lost'. One cannot expect an improvement until the Social Democratic leaders are taken from the Reichstag and shut. We need a law which is being a Social Democratic law has been to be carried to the imperial Diet. The bill was not passed by the Reichstag and the Social Democratic Party in November 1899 because of the strong socialist movement.

4. Despite the 'Subversion Bill' mentioned above, as Engels 'Testament' was published in 1917.

5. Eduard Bernstein was the foremost representative of the 'revisionists' tendency in German Social Democracy, which he had established the right to hold outdoor meetings and demonstrations.

6. The Centre Party was a Catholic confessional party founded in the 1870s which had a large following in the Catholic areas of the country. It was strongly opposed to Prussian domination of the country. The Centre Party had some support among Catholic workers, many of whom were in Catholic unions, particularly in the Rhineland.

7. The Revolution. i.e. the German Revolution of 1848.
Iran: 
A constitution for autocracy

IRAN'S Ayatollah Khomeini has demanded for his Constituent Assembly to pull together the new Constitution. The Assembly will be summoned only after 75% of the electorate has cast their votes (but how is not clear). The new Constitution, proposed by Khomeini, will be submitted only to a Constituent Assembly. If it is rejected, the election will be repeated.

In effect, Khomeini is shortening the process of putting a constitution in the same way that he did with his referendum on the so-called 'Islamic Republic': people have to vote for it, or Khomeini, or voting against and being a 'defender of the suppressed'.

Since before the Iranian Revolution, Khomeini had promised a Constituent Assembly, but no one has seen it that promise come true.

The Khomeini Constitution is another example of the lies we are being told about Khomeini's famous Constitution. It is a violation of the freedom of political organizations and opposition parties, who will be suppressed actually.

General elections have voted in the president. All 'political, social or religious groups must be based on the spirit and ethos of Islam', and a Supervisory Council, dominated by Muslim leaders, is empowered to veto any change in the Constitution.

The constitution also refutes the right of self determination of the people of the world. The resistance to Khomeini's drive to tyranny is deemed astered. He is not allowed to be a challenger or a critic to Khomeini, or voting against and being a 'defender of the suppressed'.

This, as before, is a clear manifestation of the Khomeini's promises.

Islington council votes but the fight's not over

On 5th June, NALGO conference, Behind the bluster

The conference of the National Association of Local Government Officers (NALGO) took place last week. June 1st-6th. It came at the aftermath of the Tory government's victory, with the budget coinciding with Day 2 of the conference and with local government white collar pay claim still to be negotiated. There was a great deal of discussion as to the way of organizing for the fight that is already under way.

General Secretary Geoff Griffiths referred to the Budget as 'despicable, mean, diabolical and direct attack on the working people of this country'. Having that battle and fight until we have local government pay claim upon us this week'.

Support was promised for branches taking action to back redundancies, and 'the very hot summer' was promised to be a period of 'profound and fundamental discontent'. The threat of unemployment caused by new technology and the need to fight this threat was also mentioned.

And any national leadership for the fight was only going to be effectively directed in various ways, and the target for the strike (already planned) and strike pay has been increased.

Labour activists debate the cuts

Stoke strikes escalate

After nine weeks on strike, workers at William Boulton's Engineering in Stoke-on-Trent have been joined by workers at William Boulton's in Burton and Northallerton. The total strike now involves 550 workers who walked out after six months of discussions with management on live pay and conditions. At the time when the workers were called out. William Boulton's are one of the largest and most profitable companies in the United Kingdom.

On 2nd June, workers at William Boulton's in Burton announced their intention to strike after William Boulton's in Burton announced their intention to strike. The strike was called by the National Union of Freight,主动性 and Cable Workers and the National Union of Local Government Officers at Boulton's.

The strike in the Boulton's factory involves 450 workers. The strike is in response to the company's decision to impose new terms and conditions on workers, which include cuts in wages and benefits.

The union is calling for a 5% increase in wages and benefits, as well as an end to the company's policy of outsourcing work. The strike has now entered its second week, with workers continuing to strike in an attempt to force the company to meet their demands.

On 2nd June, workers at William Boulton's in Burton announced their intention to strike after the company announced its decision to impose new terms and conditions on workers, which include cuts in wages and benefits.

The strike is in response to the company's decision to impose new terms and conditions on workers, which include cuts in wages and benefits. The strike has now entered its second week, with workers continuing to strike in an attempt to force the company to meet their demands.