

# SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

**FORTNIGHTLY**  
for the  
**Industrial Militant —**  
for  
**International**  
**Socialism**

9th YEAR No 2

MID-JANUARY, 1959

SIXPENCE

## HOW TO FIGHT THE BOMB

No socialist can fail to sympathise with the sentiments and courage of the Norfolk anti-rocket 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 regain the composure to laugh off their duffle-coated opposition as harmless crackpots.

Nonetheless, the Swaffham events also suggest, though it may sound paradoxical, that 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 possessor of no less than five H-bombs.

Besides, the Establishment mind has become beset 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 conventional regular army and air force (soon to be reinforced with the new TSR-2) are still recognisable.

decide on a single line nor find the resources for a dual policy. Contradictory Government statements, 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-site building is the organised Labour Movement. 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-bomb or anti-war campaign, 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 disorganise a rocket site. **But again, this can only be done if individual action is backed up by mass sympathy, mass support, mass movement, 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 Movement, 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, the Swaffham 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

*contd. page 8*

<b>ROSA LUXEMBURG</b>	<b>pages 4 &amp; 5</b>
<b>CRISIS IN MINING</b>	<b>pages 2 &amp; 3</b>
<b>DISCUSSION—Foreign Policy</b>	<b>page 7</b>
<b>T.U. COMMENTARY</b>	<b>page 3</b>

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 apace "conventionally" with the two super-Powers. But Torydom 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 useless for such sabre-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 terror.

Then why the fuss and the shower of White Papers and the enormous outlay on a battery of armaments far beyond the capabilities of a second-rate power? The real use of the Great Deterrent seems to have been to deter the Transatlantic Ally from driving too hard a bargain, to give some vestige of independence to British 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 technical secrets.

Empire versus inter-Allied relations. What a thorny problem for the impoverished British capitalist class. They can neither

## UNEMPLOYMENT—TIME TO ACT

writes **ERIC HEFFER**

THOSE in the Labour movement 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 Merseyside). Harold Wilson has correctly said that the cotton towns are "bleeding to death." All the government can offer is a sort of elasto-plast, and that of very poor quality.

Let me quote some comparative figures which show the extent of the workless.

On October 13 the following position existed:

Northern Ireland	37,963
Wales	38,942
Scotland	85,817
North-West 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 unemployment developing in the heavy basic industries, which can only mean that we are now entering a classic capitalist slump.**

In Britain as in America increasing 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 Federation of Trades Councils. He broke down the total and gave us the situation town by town.

*contd. page 8*



## INDUSTRIAL

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 production was practically unheard of. On the contrary, particularly since nationalization in 1947, there has been an acute shortage. For this reason capital has been poured in, wages have risen and miners have been cajoled and bullied all with the object of bridging ever-threatening deficit in fuel supplies.

Only eighteen months ago, Sir James Bowman, 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 power loading machinery on the widest possible scale was in full swing. Saturday shifts were being worked and even in January, 1958, Sir James Bowman told Ernest Jones of the NUM 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 12, 1958). Until recently this involved the production of 140 million tons of coal leaving a gap of 76 million tons to be bridged by other fuels.

## Threat

Today, however, one year later, the position is drastically different. It is not raising output to 300 million tons by 1965 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 re-employment, during the course of this year. Furthermore, since this will reduce output by only 3 million of the 9 million tons which need to be cut, the sword of Damocles 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.

Basically, of course, the reason for the changed situation is that the coal famine has ended. At the beginning of December last year NCB unsold stocks were over 19 million tons and distributed stocks were practically as much again.

## Lower production

This 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 the level of production has affected coal-using industries quite seriously and has reduced their need for fuel. Thus, for example, production from British iron foundries in the third quarter for 1958 was 12 per cent lower than in the same months of the year 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 (i.e., 77,000 tons). 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 measure 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 by contract at the same 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 pressure some four years ago when the Ministry of Fuel and Power planned to save 8 to 9 million tons of coal per annum by this means.

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 NCB's best customers for small coal which is

the most difficult type of fuel to dispose of. Despite repeated protests 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 advent of a major slump.

**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 only too clearly, the improvement in the miners' conditions has been fundamentally the result of the coal famine—not of nationalization.**

## Capitalist adjunct

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 so scarce and expensive that British steel and consequently British engineering would have been crippled.

**However, from the socialist 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 Bowman wrote in *The Times* of December 11: "The policy of going all out for 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 carefully its competitive position" (*The Times* report, December 4, 1958).

In other words, price and not production is to be the criterion of the NCB's policy in the future.

## The hierarchy

Such a policy is anything but socialist. If the NCB appears to make a profit or cut losses at the cost of throwing thousands of workers out of employment where even in financial terms 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 cosy nooks in which their contribution to the industry is insignificant.

As far as sales policy is concerned, it is often deplorably unadventurous. An example which recently came to my notice was one in which the Coal Board's tender to supply a large customer with fuel was higher than all other coal suppliers, although of course they were themselves customers of the NCB.

Board policy on the problems of converting the all-too-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 sort, however, normally receives scant consideration.

## SOCIALIST REVIEW SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I enclose <sup>16s.</sup> <sup>8s.</sup> <sup>4s.</sup> subscription for <sup>1 year's</sup> <sup>6 months'</sup> <sup>3 months'</sup> issue of

SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Name.....

Address.....

Send to M Maddison  
21 Aubert Park, London, N5



AS WE TURN into 1959, we leave behind us the most devastating year that the British worker has experienced since the close of the last war, with unemployment increasing day by day, and the employer becoming infinitely more jubilant as Trades Union leaders surrender concession after concession with every turn of the screw.

Whilst this is obvious in almost every section of British industry, nowhere is it more apparent at the moment, than in the coalfields of South Wales where the closing of six mines is due to commence immediately.

It is of course true, that since the inception of nationalization 34 other pits have been closed and no outcry has been made, but the difference in the present case is that on closing the other pits the National Coal Board have always been able to absorb the

## MINES contd.

The smaller coal itself would be in much higher demand if householders possessed the 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 the increasingly-popular oil-burning convector heaters.

In the long run, however, something more basic than a bolder 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 was 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 as in many cases today, solely because it is to the short-term benefit of private, capitalist, sectional interests. Pit closures would be foreseen years ahead, and planned for instead of being carried out as part of a panic 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. Then, of course, the requirements and output of coal-using industries would not be subject to the

# PETER BERKELEY ON

## • DEFENCE OF MINERS

## • DOCK LABOUR SCHEME IN DANGER

workers displaced by the closure, with no increase in the unemployment 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 per-

vagaries of a market so susceptible to recession and slump.

**The building of a planned economy can only come about, 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 to fight NCB policies and the supine acceptance of these by some NUM leaders. However, they must realise that industrial militancy alone is not enough.

In the long run the only security 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.

turbed, but leaving out the problem of finding the new job in an increasingly difficult labour market, consider the problem of what such a move must entail.

Firstly, the vast majority of the men working in these pits are approaching fifty years of age, some of course, are even older and are at a time of life when they are more or less settled in their aims and ideas. Additionally, quite a large 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 against such a venture, 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 imbecile to allow whole villages to become abandoned and permitted to fall into decay simply because the whole project has been mis-managed in the past. **Of course a small pit won't pay its way if it is run by men unused to the type of coal concerned and if it has to provide the salaries of the armies of unprincipled bureaucrats who batten upon its operation, and compensation to the hordes of ex-mine-owners.** 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 affairs.

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 enterprise.

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 reveal one of the most disgusting 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, in conjunction with the Minister, to introduce a

## TU COMMENTARY

resolution in respect of perishable cargoes, into the National Docks Scheme.

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

Unfortunately for the machinations of the Minister and his myrmidons, the dockers throughout the country 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 alter the course of the current and future strikes.

In Tooley Street of course, and at such a time, the presentation was ludicrous, more especially since it was at a Public Meeting where the catches embodied in the resolution were exposed to all and sundry. What the resolution said in effect was that, upon the occasion of a stoppage, the local Medical Officer of Health should be in a position to declare what constituted a perishable cargo, and upon such declaration he would issue a certificate which must entail its being worked by the men who were on strike, or failing this, would enable the employer to use "black labour" without incurring any penalty or transgression of the Dock Labour Scheme.

### Resolution rejected

**It is obvious to anyone exactly what would happen if such a resolution was to become an integral part of the Dock Labour Scheme, more especially in places like Tooley Street where almost every commodity handled is food of some description and is, in consequence, of a perishable nature. A stoppage or a strike against the most arbitrary action of an employer would become a farce, and the greatest weapon possessed by the worker would disappear, whilst the Scheme itself would become non-existent, through the introduction of unregistered 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 and smash the closed-shop bias of registration, allowing the employer to return to the days when he could 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

## SOCIALIST REVIEW BULK ORDER

(Six or more copies post free)

Please send me.....copies of the next.....

issue(s) of SOCIALIST REVIEW, for which you will bill me.

Name.....

Address.....

Send to SOCIALIST REVIEW,  
35 B Priory Terrace, London, NW6.



# 40 Years to the death of ROSA LUXEMBURG — REVO

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 restricted to acts of individual terrorism carried out by a few heroic intellectuals, "Proletariat" was organising and leading thousands of workers on strike. In 1886, however, "Proletariat" was practically decapitated 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 nationalistic tendencies and a proneness 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 them, like the veteran disciple and friend of Marx and Engels, Wilhelm Liebknecht, going so far as to accuse her of being an agent of the Tsarist secret police. But she

with the increasing parliamentary representation of the Social Democratic Party, moved away from revolution and lent great strength to those who were already proclaiming gradualism, or reformism as their principle. The main spokesman of this trend was Eduard Bernstein, a disciple of Engels. Between 1896 and 1898 he wrote a series of articles in "Die Neue Zeit" on "Problems of Socialism," more and more openly attacking the principles of Marxism. A long and bitter discussion broke out. Rosa Luxemburg, who had just entered the German Labour movement, immediately sprang to the defence of Marxism. Brilliantly, and with magnificent élan, she attacked the spreading cancer of reformism in her booklet, "Social Reform or Social Revolution." (For an elaboration of Luxemburg's criticism of Reformism, see Chapter II.)

## On the national question

Soon after, in 1899, the French "Socialist" Millerand entered a coalition government with a capitalist party. Rosa Luxemburg followed this experiment closely and analysed it in a series of brilliant articles dealing with the situation in the French Labour movement in general, and the question of coalition governments in particular. (See Chapter II, sub-heading 5.) After the fiasco of MacDonald in Britain, that of the Weimar Republic in Germany, the Popular Front in France in the 'thirties, and the post-Second World War coalition governments in that 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, with whom she disagreed on the national question (see Chapter VI), and on the conception of Party structure and the relation between the Party and the activity of the masses (see Chapter V).

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 Russian revolution, she wrote a series of articles and pamphlets for the Polish party, in which she developed the idea of the Permanent Revolution, which had been independently developed by Trotsky and Parvus but was held by few Marxists of the time. While both Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, despite the deep cleavage between them, believed that the Russian revolution was to be a bourgeois democratic one, Rosa argued that it would develop beyond the stage of bourgeois democracy and would end either in workers' power or complete defeat. Her slogan was "revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat based on the peasantry."\*

## Life of action

However, to think, write and speak about the revolution was not enough for Rosa Luxemburg. Her entire life illustrated the dictum: "At the beginning was the deed." And although she was in bad health at the time, she smuggled herself into Russian Poland as soon as she was able to do so (in December, 1905). The zenith of the revolution had by then passed. The masses were still active, but were now hesitant, while reaction was raising its head. All meet-

\*It was not for nothing that Stalin denounced Luxemburg posthumously in 1932 as a Trotskyist. (See J. V. Stalin, Works, Vol. XIII, pp. 86-104).

On January 15th, 1919, Rosa Luxemburg was murdered. With her death the international workers' movement lost one of its noblest souls; "the finest brain amongst the scientific successors of Marx and Engels," as Mehring said, was no more. This article is the first chapter of a commemorative issue of **International Socialism** to mark the fortieth anniversary of her death—Editor.

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 these that Rosa Luxemburg joined at the age of 16. By 1889 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 recognized as the theoretical leader of the revolutionary socialist party of Poland. She became the main contributor to the Party paper, "Sprawa Robotnicza," 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 title. Rosa continued to be the theoretical leader of the Party (the SDKPL) 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

stuck to her point.

## Against reformism

Intellectually she grew by leaps and bounds. She was drawn irresistibly to the centre of the international Labour movement, Germany, where she made her way in 1898. She started writing assiduously, and after a time became one of the main contributors to the most important Marxist theoretical journal of the time, "Die Neue Zeit." Invariably independent in judgment and criticism, even the tremendous prestige of Karl Kautsky, its editor, "the Pope of Marxism" as he 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—in some cases their editor—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 known before.

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

ings were held mee-  
tories. Al-  
but Rosa  
to appea-  
tinely. O-  
and kept  
then in  
ground of  
ality, she  
country.

The Russi-  
to an ide-  
some year-  
tical and  
element  
struggle  
from all  
elaborated  
torical ex-  
Speaking  
she was  
and spent  
time in G-  
In 1907 s-  
the Social  
She spoke  
Polish par-  
lutionary  
militarism  
Between  
Rosa Luxe-  
of the SP  
oretical r-  
1907 Rosa  
fear that  
their prof-  
before a  
was called  
in 1910, w-  
between F-  
on the q-  
power. Fro-  
three sep-  
who prog-  
policy; th-  
Kautsky (a  
"leader of  
verbal rad-  
and more  
struggle; a  
which Rosa  
tion.

In 1913 Ro-  
important  
tion of Cap-  
of Imperia-  
of the mos-  
economic  
wealth of  
trenchancy  
pendence,  
grapher of  
"Capital" c-  
problem it-  
cal and po-  
effect the  
backward t-  
traditions  
stability of  
this work, s-  
On Februar-  
arrested for  
basis of th-  
she declare-  
our French  
let us tell  
stances." In-  
into prosec-  
later under  
the Workin-  
inspiring re-  
tion of imp-  
year's impr-  
on the spot  
immediately  
she repeated  
paganda.  
When the F-

READ THE REST IN

# INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM 2

NOW OUT 4/- post free (bulk order 2/6 per issue) from M. Maddison  
21 Aubert Park N5



# REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST

bidden, but the workers still in their strongholds, the factories' papers were suppressed, Luxemburg's Party paper continued to be printed clandestinely. On March 4, 1906, she was arrested and spent four months, first in prison, then in exile. After this time, on the grounds of her health and her German nationality, she was freed and expelled from the

## The revolutionary

Revolution gave flesh and blood to Rosa Luxemburg had conceived in her theory: that mass strikes—political—constituted a cardinal principle of the revolutionary workers' movement, distinguishing Socialist revolution from bourgeois revolutions. Now she had the idea on the basis of new historical knowledge. (See Chapter III.)

Its effect at a public meeting, where she was charged with "inciting to violence" and sentenced to two months in prison, this was the beginning.

She participated in the Congress of the International held in Stuttgart. She was the name of the Russian and the developing a consistent revolutionary policy to imperialist war and

and 1910 the split between the left and the centrist leadership, which Kautsky was the theoretical piece, widened. Already in 1905 Luxemburg had expressed her views to Party leaders, notwithstanding her adherence to Marxism, would flinch in the face of decisive action. The culminating point came when a complete break took place between Luxemburg and Karl Kautsky on the workers' road to revolution. The SPD was split into two tendencies: the reformists, who had adopted an imperialist policy (called Marxist centre, led by Kautsky, nicknamed by Luxemburg the "socialist swamp"), which kept its feet on the ground but confined itself more to parliamentary methods of the reformist wing, for Luxemburg was the main inspira-

## Spartacus League

Rosa Luxemburg published her most important theoretical work "The Accumulation of Capital: A Contribution to the Study of the Economic History of the Modern Era." This is without doubt one of her principal contributions to Marxist theory since "Capital." In its lucid knowledge, brilliance of style, analysis and intellectual independence, as Mehring, the biographer, stated, was the nearest to the Marxist work. The central theme is of tremendous theoretical importance: namely, what is the role of capitalism in the development of capitalism and on the other hand the system. (For an analysis of this see Chapter VII.)

In 1914, Rosa Luxemburg was arrested and sentenced to prison. She was a speech in which she expected us to murder our foreign brothers, then she said: "No, under no circumstances will she turn from defendant to executioner and her speech, published in the title "Militarism, War and Revolution," is one of the most important socialist condemnations. She was sentenced to a year but was not detained, leaving the courtroom she went to a mass meeting at which she gave her revolutionary anti-war pro-

World War broke out; prac-

tically all the leaders of the Socialist Party were swept up into the patriotic tide. On August 3, 1914, the Parliamentary Group of the German Social Democracy decided to vote in favour of war credits for the Kaiser's Government. Of 111 deputies, only 15 showed any desire to vote against. However, after their request for permission had been rejected, they submitted to Party discipline, and on August 4 the whole Social Democratic Group unanimously voted in favour of the credits. A few months later, on December 2, Karl Liebknecht flouted Party discipline to vote with his conscience. His was the sole vote against war credits.

This decision of the Party leadership was a cruel blow to Rosa Luxemburg. However, she did not give way to despair. On the same day, August 4, on which the Social Democratic deputies rallied to the Kaiser's banner, a small group of socialists met in her apartment and decided to take up the struggle against the war. This group, led by Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht, Franz Mehring and Klara Zetkin, became after a time the Spartacus League. For four years, mainly from prison, Rosa continued to lead, inspire and organise the revolutionaries, keeping aloft the banner of international socialism. (For further details of her anti-war policy, see Chapter IV.)

## The Russian revolution

The outbreak of the war cut Rosa Luxemburg off from the Polish Labour Movement, but she must have gained deep satisfaction from the fact that her own Polish party remained loyal throughout to the ideas of international socialism.

The February 1917 revolution in Russia was a realisation of Rosa Luxemburg's policy of revolutionary opposition to the war and struggle for the overthrow of imperialist governments. Feverishly she followed the events from prison, studying them closely in order to draw lessons for the future. Unhesitatingly she stated that the February victory was not the end of the struggle but only its beginning, that only workers' power could assure peace. From prison, she issued call after call to the German workers and soldiers to emulate their Russian brethren, overthrow the Junkers and capitalists and thus, while serving the Russian revolution, at the same time prevent themselves from bleeding to death under the ruins of capitalist barbarism.

When the October Revolution broke out, Rosa Luxemburg welcomed it enthusiastically, praising it in the highest terms. At the same time she did not believe that uncritical acceptance of everything the Bolsheviks did would be of service to the Labour Movement. She clearly foresaw that if the Russian revolution remained in isolation, a number of distortions would cripple its development; and quite early in the development of Soviet Russia she pointed out such distortions, particularly on the question of democracy (see Chapter VIII).

## Murdered

On November 8, 1918, the German revolution freed Rosa Luxemburg from prison. With all her energy and enthusiasm she threw herself into the revolution. Unfortunately the forces of reaction were strong. Right-Wing Social-Democratic leaders and generals of the old Kaiser's army joined forces to suppress the revolutionary proletariat. Thousands of workers were murdered; on January 15, 1919, Karl Liebknecht was killed; on the same day a soldier's rifle-butt smashed Rosa Luxemburg's skull. With her death the international workers' movement lost one of its noblest souls; "the finest brain amongst the scientific successors of Marx and Engels," as Mehring said, was no more. In her life, as in her death, she gave everything she had for the liberation of humanity.

# 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.

If having done this carefully and honestly you decide that there is no alternative but to open fire, and then do so, you will be doing your duty and acting lawfully whatever the consequences.

#### 2. WHEN YOU SHOULD FIRE.

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

- To defend yourself, your comrades, families, Police and all peaceable inhabitants against serious attack.
- To protect against serious damage all Government property, e.g., buildings, installations, vehicles and equipment.
- To disperse a riotous mob that you honestly believe will cause serious injury to life and property if not forcibly prevented.
- 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. WHEN YOU SHOULD NOT FIRE.

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

- Always fire aimed shots.
- Aim at the part of the body you are least likely to miss, i.e., in the middle.
- Never fire warning shots over people's heads.

#### 5. SENTRIES AND PICQUETS.

- If you or the persons or place you are guarding are attacked with arms or explosives open fire at once.
- 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, get a member of the guard to investigate. If he does not and you really believe that he is about to attack you with arms or explosives shoot him at once; otherwise try to halt him with your bayonet.

#### 6. ESCORTS.

- 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.
- If you are only stoned, tell your driver to keep going and get away. Don't fire unless the stoning 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.
- If your vehicle is obstructed by a road block try to remove it. If you are then attacked with arms or explosives, open fire.
- Always be on the alert with your weapon at the ready.

#### 7. INDIVIDUAL SELF-DEFENCE.

- If you are attacked with arms or explosives shoot the attackers at once, wherever you are.
- 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 giving details:—

- Location.
- Details.
- Method of attack.
- Description of assailants.
- When applicable, number of rounds fired and results.

CS/1060/A/Dec. 55.



# INDUSTRIAL CHIPPY ANSWERS TRAMP NAVY— CRACKS IN DIRECT LABOUR

**I**N YOUR LAST ISSUE "Tramp Navy" dealt with Direct Labour and gave us the impression that all building members are 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 Labour Party and one who has worked on Direct Labour sites I have found a great deal of apathy on this vital subject which is, in my opinion, due to lack of leadership by our unions and lack of 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 a member of the AEU replying for the platform, whilst a prominent ASW official, elected by building members to the EC of the London Labour Party, sat on the platform twiddling his thumbs.

## Lack of leadership

Again in July last at an ASW stewards' meeting at Denison House the comments made on Direct Labour and Nationalisation 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 canker and we must cut it out.

Upon entering into the service

PETER BERKELEY—end

If rumour is to be believed, he has put the suggestion to two of the most prominent members of the National Docks Group, who have informed him, that whilst it would not be possible for them to come out in open support of the proposal, they will not oppose him in any way, shape or form. They have, in fact, despite its monstrous implications, given tacit consent to its incorporation in the Scheme if and when the Minister introduces it, at least that's how the story goes.

It should be interesting indeed to watch events over the next few months, to see whether or not, this has indeed happened, although in the meantime, dockworkers everywhere should be attending their Union Branch meetings to ascertain not only that the rumour must prove false, but to take effective action to ensure that such a terrifying and retrogressive action can never be effected.

**W**ITH SO MUCH emphasis on Education, and the realisation that teachers act in *locum parentis* to posterity, it is essential that all Trade Unionists everywhere, support their fight for a decent standard of living, so necessary in a job of such importance.

of the LCC I was immediately surprised by the lack of organisation upon the building site, only one section having any semblance of organisation, this being the labourers' section. I immediately set myself the task of organising all sections; this was achieved very quickly.

The first approach was then made to the general foreman over the question of safety upon the site, and this first encounter soon made it obvious to the men's representative that they were not going to get any co-operation from the general foreman; to quote the general foreman's own word: "If I give you one or two concessions you will be worrying me all the time for more."

## 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 waging a struggle against a 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 laid down by law, 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 Departments responsible for industrial relations should make it clear to general foremen and other petty officials that they WILL carry out the Statutory Instruments without the men having to force them to carry them out.**

## Chronic wastage

**W**ASTAGE OF MATERIALS is a problem that again can be solved by correct supervision. I have seen new materials arrive upon the sites only to be fit for the rubbish heap a few weeks later. Shovels and wheel-barrows 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. Wastage 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.

**S**AFETY REGULATIONS are only partially carried out on some sites and practically ignored on others, and it strikes a funny note when we remember that it was the Labour Party that was responsible in large measure for bringing this into being and having them placed upon the Statute Book. It is then ludicrous that now many Labour Party supporters, including myself, have to fight a 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 remoteness in a nationalised industry."**

## ECONOMICS— DOLE QUEUES UNLIMITED by John Crutchley

**U**NEMPLOYMENT is rising. 536,000 last November. MacLeod, Minister of Labour, has predicted that the figures will rise to 630,000 (2.8 per cent) by January - February. Moreover, these figures ignore the part-time workers, women and older people who have been pushed out of the labour market. If these were included the total number of unemployed would probably be over one million.

Also short-time working has increased. 2 per cent of the manufacturing labour force is on short time. A four-fold increase on last year. Overtime earnings have also declined. Unemployment is higher now than at any time since 1940 except for a couple of months during the 1947 fuel shortage.

## Stocks reduced

The first reason for unemployment is the reduction of business inventories. The average level of these inventories (raw materials plus manufactured goods) is almost half the total annual output of British industry. Therefore any reduction in these stocks has a vast effect on demand. During the third quarter of 1958 stocks of finished goods declined 3 per cent.

There is a minimum below which these stocks cannot be reduced without seriously dislocating output. As consumption has not 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 1½ 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 devote more resources to outstanding export orders. The world commodity market has 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 this year.

The investment boom of 1954-58 has now ended. It is predicted that investment will be 15 per cent less 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 industries in 1955. **Although there are many factors which decrease this figure it is certain that after the recession many jobs will have disappeared for ever. In the motor industry, which has now recovered from its depression, the level of employment is still below the 1956 level but production is above its former level.**

contd. next page



## DISCUSSION

## FOR A SOCIALIST FOREIGN POLICY

by KEN JONES, HARLOW

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 if this demand by the Labour movement is to be more than a revulsion from the horrors of nuclear warfare, it is essential that it should be embodied in a realistic Socialist foreign policy. Similarly, the weakness of the Nuclear Disarmament Campaign is that it rejects atomic weapons for Britain but advances no alternative acceptable to the non pacifist majority in this country.

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

Important contributions have been made in the VFS pamphlet *A Policy for Summit Talks*, by Konni 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 altogether. A Labour Government which had contracted out of the nuclear arms race would use its independent position to effect a series of agreements between the two nuclear powers at the conference table, which would bring the "cold war" to an end.

Comrade Zilliacus fails, however, to appreciate how deep and complex are the antagonisms and suspicions dividing the two great nuclear powers. He stresses the policy of British "disengagement" as a means of so affecting the strategic interests of the United States, and so isolating it, that it would 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 "disengaged" 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 that makes one wonder whether the policy of "disengagement" and "neutrality" is not in need of further development and elaboration. I suggest that if our Socialist foreign policy is to be successful emphasis needs to be put not so much on an "actively neutral" Britain 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 ourselves at the head of the non nuclear nations of the world, and wage a 'peace campaign' . . . against all those . . . who continued to obstruct reasonable proposals 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 no more than £45 for each year spent there, while the former commandant of the Sachsenhausen camp was paid £500, 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 man incapacitated by years in concentration camps only £27. Former political prisoners who served a total of 99,242 years in camps and prisons have received in all rather less than £4,500,000; this year alone the Federal Government will pay about £115m. in pensions to dismissed officials and former professional soldiers.

**Only one force**

There is only one force which can achieve the nuclear disarmament of the two atomic giants, and that is humanity organized on a world scale. A British Labour Government, together with the British Labour movement, would attempt to associate together 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 (e.g., Yugoslavia and India). To this end, British Socialists and Trade Unionists should be working now to build up an understanding on foreign policy with the people of these countries.
- (2) The colonies and other underdeveloped areas. A satisfactory Socialist policy for these countries is essential if they are to play their part as stable and independent mem-

bers of our anti-nuclear alliance.

(3) Attempts must be made to associate other countries (e.g., Japan and the Scandinavian countries) in this anti-nuclear club. Here again there is a great deal of important work to be done now, and a return to the internationalism which was once practised by the Labour movements, before the Cold War killed it.

(4) In working now towards such an association we can build up a truly independent international Socialist and Labour movement. Such a movement would have an influence out of all proportion to its numbers, no matter what barriers the rulers of the USA and USSR might erect against it.

Some Socialists ("Black the bases! Ban the bomb!") hold international working class industrial action against war as the sole acceptable Socialist foreign policy. However, desirable it may be, industrial action against the Bomb is at present virtually out of the question, in Britain or anywhere else. The single minded pursuit of this objective can at present only divide and confuse the Labour movement and wastes valuable time and energy. The task is to create the **conditions** in which international industrial action becomes a practical proposition.

**Towards a common understanding**

This association is the only power no earth capable of ending the nuclear stalemate decisively and forever, and carrying through the foreign policy which is being advocated at present by the British Left. It could, in course of time, mount such social and economic pressures as would oblige the two great nuclear powers to recognise it as a more potent factor than those mutual fears and antagonisms that had hitherto kept them locked in Cold War.

In contrast to talk about "disengagement" and "neutrality," and the mere repetition of the laudable aims of our Socialist foreign policy, the above suggestions emphasize the positive, dynamic character of the policy we propose. Furthermore, they point to the need to work now towards a common understanding on an anti-nuclear foreign policy with Socialist and other organizations in other countries.

Confident in our long term policy, we could work with greater assurance towards our more immediate objectives—a permanent cessation of tests, limited disengagement in Europe and any other limited measures which might be forced upon the Government by popular pressure, always at the same time doing what we can to prevent a collision between the nuclear powers, as crisis succeeds crisis.

**DOLE—end**

The only Government measure to increase production—the lifting of hire-purchase restrictions—will not substantially increase employment. It will only bring extra trade to the consumer goods industries (TVs, cars, etc.) which anyway have a lot of spare productive capacity at the moment.

The experience of the American depression shows that even after trade has revived unemployment is always the last thing to show an upward turn. Unemployment is therefore certain to remain 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.

**ERIC HEFFER**

from page 8

The above measures are obviously only a minimum program, which could rally all sections of the movement for action. One thing is clear: **in order to get such a minimum carried 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 market, 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 devote time and energy to arouse action, the field will be left clear for reaction, as the events in Nottingham and Notting Hill proved.

Let those of us who have influence in our trade unions use that influence, particularly in the coming months. Ensure that resolutions urging action are placed on every agenda of forthcoming Union conferences and see that they are then placed on the agenda of the TUC. Let us end the period of passivity as far as the official machine is concerned (the rank-and-file in many industries of late have proved their fighting spirit), and let 1959 be

**FORUM**

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 to past experience. Personally, I prefer to rely on the organized strength of the worker. The point is that strength must be used. If it is not, then I am afraid we shall have a bitter future before us.

**S R  
BOOK  
SERVICE**

35b PRIORY TERRACE  
LONDON, NW6



## Editorial—ctd

its exponents tend to appear exotic and outside the every-day life of the workers and their movement, but that the cause they are championing appears, not as it should, something which is vital to everyone, but something outside and extraneous to ordinary life.

**Effective marches against sites or centres of Government, or effective action among workers to black the building of rocket sites or military establishments can only make sense and achieve their ends when the workers themselves are consciously and actively in anti-H-bomb and anti-Tory opposition.** It is, unfortunately, the case at the present moment that workers are not only apathetic on the question of rocket site building, but with growing unemployment, often only too willing to work on well-paid sites.

## ERIC HEFFER ON UNEMPLOYMENT

From page one

He also emphasized that as well as unemployment, short-time working is wide-spread. His figures were as follows:

	Out	Short-Time
Manchester	8,000	
Stockport	1,000	500
Wigan	2,194	774
Warrington	1,100	80
Rochdale	one in ten	unemployed
Salford	1,750	
Stalybridge	432	
Hyde	550	

Let me add the position in the Merseyside.

The total unemployed in the area on November 4, 1958, was 27,656, of which 18,554 were in 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 well over three months.

### On the Merseyside

Christmas is supposedly a festive occasion, where all the family congregate together and have their fill of the good things of life. Last year in thousands of homes there has been the haunting fear of continued financial struggle in the new year. This fear is so great that not far from where I live an entire family committed suicide rather than go on. What an indictment of Capitalism and just how weakly-based is our so-called Welfare State. I have heard it described by the workers as the Farewell State, a fair enough description as far as I am concerned.

Can we be satisfied by what is being done by the trade unions to combat the growth of unemployment? I feel that no-one can answer that in the affirmative. The TUC has up to now made no general call for action and has confined itself to resolutions passed at Congress. The AEU Manchester District Committee developed a positive policy for action and very soon came into conflict with the EC of that union. The position is still unsolved at the time of writing.

On the Merseyside, overtime is being controlled by the Mersey branch of the NFBTO and by the Boilermakers. However, such

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 on the sophisticated level of general political action in industry (as we ourselves were guilty of doing not too long ago) still ignores the fact that the British workers although they are on the move once again are fighting most of their present battles on economic and job issues.

True, the H-bomb is an urgent threat to humanity. But there are no short cuts to a solution. The threat of Britain's involvement in a third World War can only be stopped by the overturn of British capitalism, and the first step is to do everything possible to mount an anti-Tory offensive in which the workers actively participate and which, therefore, must begin on a level the workers understand and support.

**That level is to support, even**

a policy should not be confined to areas but should be a National policy in which the EC's give the lead.

The need for national action is surely underlined by the situation in mining. **Let there be no mistake, if the pits are closed without a struggle, as the mills are being closed, it will be taken as a clear signal for an intensified offensive against all sections of the workers. That offensive is in any case well under way, and up till now, apart from honourable, isolated struggles (mainly unofficial) the movement has generally retreated and seem to pin their hopes on the return of a Labour Government.** In my opinion such a strategy is basically false, firstly because the Labour leadership offers no real alternative and secondly, once 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 Councils' 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 meet heads of Government departments. They have also fully acquainted the TUC with the serious position.

### More to be done

The Lancashire Federation of Trades Councils called a conference last November and in December devoted its entire meeting to the problem. At the meeting many delegates felt that much more must be done and after a serious discussion the EC of the Federation were asked to set a date when contingents of workers, employed and workless, should lobby the MP's in the House of Commons and demonstrate in the heart of London. It was felt that each town and city in the Federation area could contribute their quota of lobbyists, and therefore make the demonstration wide-spread and effective. (Other Trades Councils such as

with the small resources of militant or radical socialists, every real manifestation of discontent on every front among the workers in the trade unions 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 working class, 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 by acts designed to still the individual conscience.

Despite the best intentions of the marchers and the demonstrators, the less dramatic way of day-by-day agitation for the ousting of the Tory Government and replacing it by one pledged 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 fully aware of the seriousness of the position.

This, of course, is understood to be but a first step in a broader and stronger campaign. Appeals to Government departments, interviews with the Prime Minister are useful to get publicity and spotlight the problem, but now definite action is required, action which brings the entire class into the struggle. That is the only way forward, all else is illusory.

### Next steps

What then should be done? What are the next steps? Firstly, I feel all action which spotlights the problem should be supported.

Secondly, we must demand of the TUC, the various Federations (NFBTO, Confed., etc.) that they formulate a positive policy of struggle and immediately bring the TU's into action.

### A Program

Thirdly, the programme should include at least the following proposals:

- 1 The immediate reduction of hours — and no overtime.
- 2 Where redundancy is threatened, a policy of 'no sackings' to be adopted, with the work shared out without loss of pay. Let profits suffer, not people.
- 3 Unemployment benefit to be immediately increased under Tom Mann's old slogan 'Work or full maintenance.'
- 4 All the absurd restrictions on trade with the Soviet Bloc be removed.
- 5 Let the youth position be treated as a national emergency with legislation introduced making day release compulsory and training schemes developed.
- 6 A national token stoppage as a warning to the Government.

contd. on page 7

**SOCIALIST REVIEW** is published twice a month by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd. Subscriptions, post paid: 1 year: 16s. 6 months: 8s. 3 months: 4s. Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of **Socialist Review** which are given in editorial statement.

All communications to be addressed to the publisher, M. Maddison, 21 Aubert Park, London, N5

Printed by H. Palmer (Harlow) Ltd. TU, Bush Fair, Harlow, Essex

## WHAT WE STAND FOR

The **SOCIALIST REVIEW** stands for international Socialist democracy. Only the mass mobilisation of the working class in the industrial and political arena can lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

The **SOCIALIST REVIEW** believes that a really consistent Labour Government must be brought to power on the basis of the following programme:

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments based on a means test. Renationalisation of all denationalised industries without compensation.—The nationalised industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.
- Workers' control in all nationalised industries, i.e., a majority of workers' representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and receiving the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.
- The establishment of workers' committees to control all private enterprises within the framework of a planned economy. In all instance representatives must be subject to frequent election, immediate recall, and receive the average skilled wage in the industry.
- The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions.
- The establishment of the principle of 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 right to requisition privately held land.
- Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fee paying schools. For comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants—without a means test—for all university students.
- Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection to all workers whatever their country of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.
- Freedom from political and economic oppression to all colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to the people of the underdeveloped countries.
- The unification of an independent Ireland.
- The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas. The abolition of all weapons of mass destruction.
- A Socialist foreign policy independent of both Washington and Moscow.