

SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

9th YEAR No 12

SEPTEMBER 1 1959

SIXPENCE

FORTNIGHTLY
for the
Industrial Militant —
for
International
Socialism

WORKERS CAN EXPECT NOTHING FROM THE SUMMIT CONFERENCES

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

* * *

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

* * *

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

* * *

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

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

Cousins Gaitskell

LABOUR AND THE BOMB

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

A slight odour

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

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

Socialist policy

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

turn to back page

INSIDE

- L P Conference page 3
- H-Bomb Facts pages 4-5
- Central Africa pages 6-7
- Rosa Luxemburg page 6
- Notting Hill Notebook page 8

HOW TO FIGHT THE BOMB

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

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

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

Creates jobs and keeps money

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

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

We don't need better missiles to destroy each other—the ones we have will do the job adequately.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

These two high executives, each with first-hand experience of missile production, clearly show how economic forces—the fear of a slump—provides the basis of America's

nuclear arms program when no rational justification can be given. It is sheer self-preservation that makes Capitalism produce H-bombs and missiles. Consequently, opposition to the H-bomb must not be divorced from the struggle for Socialism.

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

Labour to power! minus the bomb!

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

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

The Labour Party has also got its part to play. No professing socialist government can have the Bomb because—and this shows Russia not to be socialist—there can never be any occasion on which it would be justified in using it, necessarily killing millions of fellow workers. Therefore, the Labour Party must come out clearly against the Bomb, declaring it will ban it when in power. This step which would arouse the Party workers from their present dispirited apathy and galvanize the whole Movement into an enthusiastic crusade behind the slogan:—

DOWN WITH THE TORIES! DOWN WITH THE BOMB! LABOUR TO POWER! MINUS THE BOMB!

BOOKS by M Millett

On the 'change

The Poor Man's Guide to the Stock Exchange. Published by Labour Research Department Publications. 80 pages, 6s.

IN THE forward to this book, Jack Charlesworth speaks of the Stock Exchange as a casino, but it is sharply differentiated from other forms of gambling in that it is far from being a mug's game. Undoubtedly, people can, and have, lost money on 'change, but with reasonable prudence the average punter (or investor) is much more likely to gain than to lose. The only difficulty is, that comparatively large amounts of money are necessary to start with. Even so, City office workers frequently contrive to make a few pounds on the side, but then, the poor things aren't paid overtime anyway and have to go to work with clean collars.

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

From the Socialist point of view the book is descriptive rather than analytical. In any case, the finances of capitalism cannot be analysed without refer-

See next page

P Mansell discusses LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS

LP COMMENTARY

THE PRELIMINARY agenda for the Labour Party Conference usually has very little direct connection with the discussion at Conference. By the time amendments have been tabled, resolutions composited and the chairman has exercised his (or her) discretion about who to call upon to speak from the floor in the intervals left by the platform speakers, very little of the original agenda may in fact be discussed.

But the resolutions, if they are nothing else, are the best indication, year by year, of how opinion is crystallising in the party. It is one of the, unfortunately all too few, opportunities for the voice of the rank and file to be heard and even be regarded as important enough to rate a mention in the National Press.

This year one issue above all stands out among all those included in the agenda—nuclear disarmament. It is not surprising that the question should loom so

On the 'change

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

One of the best chapters is the sixth, which exposes the various schemes for 'democratic' workers shares. But in the main, the work suffers by not considering the basic accumulation of the money that makes the Stock Exchange hum. In the description of take-over bidding, there is no account of where the value has come from.

A take-over bid is occasioned by the fact that the land, buildings, etc., a company owns can increase greatly in value in the course of time. Since under the rules of the game he who holds fifty-one per cent. of the shares of a company has absolute control of it, someone who has sufficient cash or credit can often buy enough shares in a company to control it he can then sell the company's assets and hire them back to the company again!

Naturally in an operation of this sort, there is plenty of chance for profit all round. That these profits have come out of labour there can be no doubt in any socialist's mind. But students could do with much more detailed information than this. Does the value come from the workers in the firm involved or from increased productivity of the working class as a whole?

Another point worth noting is this: a take-over bid implies that a financier assumes control of a firm of whose work he probably knows nothing, save that he can sell part of the business at a profit. He knows nothing and cares less but all the chartered accountants and professional engineers and time and motion study men rush to his bidding. So much for 'the skills of management'! Although possibly inexperienced in some respects, an elected committee of workers would have a much better understanding than any financier. Could they not do a great deal better, both for themselves and the community?

large, since it involves the whole future of humanity. But what is impressive is the virtual unanimity among the resolutions in favour of unilateral nuclear disarmament. There are one or two lone voices raised in support of the official 'non-nuclear' club policy; a few resolutions vaguely for disarmament but without calling for a definite pledge to renounce nuclear weapons unconditionally; and a few others which direct their main criticism against nuclear bases in this country. But the overwhelming mass of opinion is for this country to get rid once and for all of these suicidal weapons.

Disarmament

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

No fewer than 140 of the general resolutions (i.e., those on policy and not party administration) are devoted to disarmament. Compared with this, no other subject attracts many resolutions. Unemployment and redundancy 17, the National Health Service and medical research 24, pensions

and welfare payments 17, and housing 21. On unemployment, the majority of the resolutions call for limited ameliorative measures such as more vigorous action by the government to attract industry to the badly hit areas rather than for the fundamental change of nationalizing all industry under the control of the working class, which alone can banish unemployment from the lives of the workers. Indeed, nationalization is barely mentioned among the resolutions, except in relation to housing, where three or four resolutions call for the nationalization of the building industry as the only means of getting a decent standard of housing for the workers. Very few of the unemployment resolutions call for action which the workers themselves can fight for on the factory floor. The emphasis is on government measures. Barrow CLP calls for legislation by which, in any period of unemployment, workers will get full unemployment benefits, plus at least half his wages, the latter to be paid by industry.

Still poverty

The resolutions on the Health Service are mainly concerned with relatively minor, though useful reforms. There is little echo of the furor of a few years ago over prescription charges. Most of the housing resolutions call for the reversal of the Tory Government's policies which have hampered the housing pro-

grammes of local authorities and forced them into higher rents. The Rent Act attracts far less attention, but Islington S.W. calls for a pledge from the party to repeal it when returned to office and reintroduce rent control and security of tenure.

The resolutions on pensions and welfare payments reflect the poverty and hardship which are imposed on the groups in society who find it hardest to defend themselves economically—widows and old age pensioners, and those on national assistance generally, who certainly don't "Have it so good" under the Tory era of "prosperity". Pledges are called for that a Labour government will raise old age pensions, allow widows to retain their earnings, and so on.

The so-called "re-thinking" in the Labour Party symbolised by the production of the "Future Labour Offers You" is not allowed to go unchallenged. Three resolutions on this, rather quaintly grouped together on page 35 under the title "Socialism", as though Socialism were an incidental matter to be considered in isolation from all the other problems dealt with in the agenda, want a reaffirmation of the party's Socialist principles, instead of the reformist "image" that the present leadership have been at such pains to put before the electorate. That, indeed, in all it implies, is the key issue for the Conference and the main task for the members.

John Phillips on

The print workers and BMC

TU COMMENTARY

NOW THE PRINTING STRIKE is over. At least the workers are working and union officials and bosses are heaving a sigh of relief. What a narrow squeak they had. The workers, asking for better hours and pay to the tune of 25 per cent. managed to get 8½ per cent. The fact that there would be a compromise sooner or later was obvious right from the start. The final result however was not nearly as good as it could have been.

Why, for instance, didn't the printing unions campaign, or even ask, for support from other unions on such a vital issue as the 40 hour week? Why indeed didn't they accept financial aid even when it was offered? It is known that the ten printing unions spent over three million pounds on strike pay to their members. The fact that they went so far was very good. But why the undertones of isolationism? Why was no effort made to get TUC support? Of course such support is not vital, but in some cases it could act as a morale raiser. In this instance the ones who could have done with the official pep up were the union officials who were a long way behind the men at every stage.

One thing about the strike which should be mentioned is the part played by the women. Very little attention is drawn at any time to women on strike, due perhaps to their 'traditionally conservative' attitude when voting for a government. Of the 370 thousand employed in the printing, bookbinding, and newspaper industry one third are women, which means that probably over 25 thousand have been engaged in the strike. It is about time a lot more attention is paid to the subject, particularly by the unions.

40 hour week

So what then is the outlook for the future? The workers have got an equivalent rise far in excess of the busmen's 3 per cent. last year. But the price was rather high, in that the workers will have to co-operate fully with the employers in increasing efficiency, etc., etc.

As to the 40 hour week there is little doubt that it will be achieved within the next couple of years, although maybe not by the printers, despite the setback received this summer (because no doubt the printers' hours will be taken as a precedent in the near future, as was the busmen's wage rise).

THE BMC strike at Oxford was a question of trade union principle, not policy, and although the victimization of a shop steward is nothing new it always brings to the surface the question of who is the representative of the workers on the shop floor, the union official or the shop steward. It also brings to the surface the attitude of the union officials towards stewards they choose to protect or ignore.

The case of Bro. Horsman, convenor at BMC who was sacked on various pretexts has brought the AEU into disrepute. Bro. Horsman, a member of the TGWU, was officially supported by all unions in the factory except the AEU, who have delayed their decision to support or not in a way that makes a mockery of trade union principle and solidarity.

To make matters worse the AEU, perhaps hoping to justify their behaviour, during the strike accused the TGWU of poaching their members at the factory. **If the AEU spent more time on defending workers' representatives from vicious attacks by the employers then they would have less to fear from other unions poaching their disgruntled members.**

**SR is happy to reprint the following article from "OUTLOOK
an Australian socialist review"**

H BOMB — FACTS AND FIGURES

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

Sources of information

The facts are now coming to us through several channels. Civil defence organisations have increasingly pressed for, and have obtained, the relevant results from bomb tests. They have combined their information on the explosive power and fall-out of modern weapons with their experience in estimating casualties from blast and fire in the last war. The facts, and the conclusions drawn from them, are now laid out in manuals available to the general public¹. The most useful material for our estimate, however, is contained in the testimony of fall-out after a bombing raid given before a sub-committee of the US Congress in May 1957², which will be given in some detail. There are also now available books or compilations of facts published in the last few years by scientists accustomed to the labours of gathering information from the enormous body of scientific and technical journals³. From these sources it is now entirely possible to form one's own conclusion on the probable results of a nuclear war.

• Need they be used ?

It would be redundant to enquire whether the next major war is likely to be a nuclear war. Statesmen and military leaders have bestrewn us with statements of their intention; the military strategy of both the NATO and Warsaw Pact powers is based on the use of nuclear weapons. It is worth noting, however, the pressing military reasons for their use. Prof. P. M. S. Blackett, in the Lees Knowles Lectures on Military Science for 1957, calculated the number of successful aircraft sorties required to destroy from the air an area of 400 square miles, using different types of explosive. The relative numbers are: one for H-bombs; 50 for A-bombs; 10,000 for conventional high-explosive bombs carried by bombers with a ten ton load. Apart from the cost and difficulty of delivery conventional high-explosives are several hundred times more expensive than uranium, for equal powers. The natural uranium which is used as a tamper around an H-bomb core in the three-stage weapon is the cheapest explosive raw material known; it costs only £5,000 per megaton, and yields in addition large amounts of most damaging radio-active fall-out.

• 'Clean' or 'dirty' ?

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

• How many ?

One further point should be dealt with; are the stockpiles sufficient to support the size of attacks which we shall postulate in our calcu-

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

• A single bomb on a single city

It is not necessary to recapitulate the effects of 1945 atomic bomb on Hiroshima; these are sufficiently well-known. It is worth noting, however, that such weapons are now available for tactical use at the discretion of a local commander, and can be fired from any of the atomic cannons now scattered about Europe. The relevant weapon for present day use against cities is the 10 megaton 'clean' H-bomb, or the 30 megaton 'dirty' three stage bomb, with an explosive power about a thousand times that of the early weapon. The British Home Office, in their civil defense manuals, have compiled a guide to the likely effect of such weapons on a British city. They estimate that a 10 megaton 'clean' bomb, detonated at a height of 8,000 feet, would totally destroy buildings out to a radius of four miles from the point beneath the explosion, and produce moderate to severe damage to a radius of 16 miles. Above ground installations of public utilities would be more or less severely damaged to a radius of eight miles, while the inner circle would have a covering of such heavy debris that no movement would be possible. People directly exposed to the heat flash would receive third degree burns (charring) up to a four mile radius. The heat flash lasts for up to half a minute and on a clear day will ignite combustible materials at distances of up to thirty miles. It appears that in these circumstances nothing can prevent the resulting fires from joining into one mass engulfing a whole area. A fire storm will then occur similar to those produced during the last war at Hamburg, Tokio and Hiroshima, but with a diameter of twenty miles. Were the bomb detonated at ground level, however, the inner debris would be so pulverised that it would not ignite, and there would be a clear area seven miles across in the centre of the fire.

Death by the million

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

BUILD THE SOCIALIST REVIEW!

Please send a free trial copy of **SOCIALIST REVIEW** to the following:

Name.....

Address.....

Name.....

Address.....

Name.....

Address.....

Send to **SOCIALIST REVIEW,**
M Maddison, 21 Aubert Park, N5

seven mile radius there would be only 70,000 uninjured survivors.

A rough estimate

The Home Office consider it more likely that an enemy would use a 'dirty' bomb, and burst it at ground level. This, for the same explosive power, would reduce the area of complete destruction by some 20% but would add enormous radioactive hazard from local fall-out. They estimate that such an explosion would contaminate a cigar shaped area extending some 200 miles downwind plus 20 miles upwind and varying in width up to 40 miles. Unprotected people in this area for 36 hours after the burst would receive the following doses of radiation and the percentages shown would die. 190 miles downwind, 300 roentgens, 5-10%; 160 miles, 500 r., 50%; 140 miles, 800 r., 100%. Adequate shelter would much reduce these figures; it is nonetheless certain that a high proportion of those within 140 miles would die. Applying this fall-out pattern to the Sydney case we find that a suitable wind could bring Newcastle, Orange or Canberra within the lethal area. Six suitably placed bombs might be expected to kill or injure at least a third of the Australian population.

• Effect of one major raid

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

Which way the wind blows

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

Day	Dead (millions)	Injured	Uninjured
1st	36	57	58
7th	51	42	58
14th	61	31	58
60th	72	21	58

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

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

BUY YOUR BOOKS THROUGH S R BOOK SERVICE

35b

Priory Terrace
London
N.W.6

• Casualties in a nuclear war

Let us consider the effects of a series of mutual attacks of the similar weight to the one discussed above. Let us drop 2,500 megatons on the USA, 5,000 on the USSR, and 2,500 on Europe. On the American figures this could be done by 750 successful aircraft sorties, which might require attempts by, at the most, 2,500 aircraft, a much smaller number than can be put into the air by the contending powers, even ignoring rocket delivery. Stockpiles are ample for this; the whole amount could be dropped in one or two days. Let us assume, as in the American study, that the bombs are predominantly three-stage and burst at ground level. In this study, after the 60th day, half of the population was dead and a third of the survivors were injured. In the USSR the density of population is smaller, and in Europe larger, than in the USA. It would seem reasonable to apply the same casualty rate to all populations involved. There are 225 million people in the USSR, 425 million in Europe, 166 million in the USA and perhaps another 100 million in those neighbouring regions which are most likely to be heavily affected. Of these 916 million, then 220 million would die during the attacks while after two months there would be a total of 450 million dead, 133 million injured and 333 million uninjured, due to the events of the first day.

For the 'survivors'

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

Seven times too much

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

(1) Home Office Manual of Civil Defense, Vol. 1, Pamphlet No. 1, Nuclear Weapons, 1956; Fire Research Bulletin No. 1, Fire and the Atomic Bomb, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, 1954. Available from Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London.

(2) Hearings of the Special Subcommittee on Radiation of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, May 27 to June 7, 1957. (The Nature of Radioactive Fallout and Its Effects on Man.) Obtainable from the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, DC., USA.

(3) See for instance 'No More War' by Linus Pauling, Gollancz, 1958, the best book so far produced for the general reader; 'The Arms Race' by Phillip Noel-Baker, Atlantic Books, London, 1958; Atomic Energy Progress Notes, Vol. 2, Association of Scientific Workers, 15 Half Moon Street, London, W.1.

NO TO CENTRAL AFRICAN

Your Majesty, what I want to know from you is if people can be bought at any price . . . Your Majesty, what I want to know from you is: Why your people kill me?
—Chief Lobengula, last King of the Matabele, in a letter to Queen Victoria.

SUCH a letter from Dr. Hastings Banda to Queen Elizabeth II would be a most poignant and appropriate comment on the progress made in Nyasaland since the days of Queen Victoria. The pattern remains the same. The persecution is fiercer and more up to date.

The misfortune of Nyasaland's people began in 1859 when Dr. Livingstone discovered Lake Nyasa. Himself a missionary, he was followed by more missionaries, then traders and lastly guns. In 1891 a Protectorate was proclaimed over the areas adjoining Lake Nyasa. This was done with 'the consent and desire of the

chiefs and people'. But, it was 1907 before the country could be pacified. In February 1915 the people of Nyasaland rose in revolt again, under the leadership of John Chilembwe. It was put down mercilessly and required vigorous military action. Chilembwe himself was killed resisting capture.

After the ruthless suppression of the revolt the country was so exhausted that it remained quiet for a long time. Then, just before the war, the Federation of The Rhodesias and Nyasaland was mooted and immediately aroused African suspicions. In 1944 the Nyasaland African Congress was formed.

By 1949, when the idea of the Federation was revived, the Africans were in a position to express organized opposition to the

scheme. The Government, however, came to the conclusion that Federation was needed. Despite African protests, the new constitution was brought into force on the 1st of August, 1953. The Africans were naturally alarmed and began to agitate against this unjust imposition of Federation on them. At the beginning of this year things came to a head and revolt broke out in February. This led to the appointment of the Nyasaland Commission of Inquiry. The Report of this Commission, popularly known as the Devlin Report, has thoroughly exposed the Government.

Between the 19th February, 1959, and the 19th March, 79 persons were wounded by bullets, 44 men and four women were killed by gunfire and three were killed by the use of a baton or

bayonet. They were all Africans. On the 3rd March an emergency was declared in Nyasaland and leaders of Congress were arrested. In Parliament the Colonial Secretary justified the declaration of emergency on the ground that a massacre was being planned. On this the Devlin Report tersely comments, 'We have not found any detailed plan for massacre and assassination'. (Para. 149).

It is clear by now that the story of so-called massacre and murder plan was a deliberate lie to mislead the British people and the world. The Report exposes the inconsistency in the story and goes on to comment, 'On the whole therefore we think that belief in the murder plot did not materially affect the conception of government policy. When the time came to prepare the justifi-

M Kidron reviews

THE MOVEMENT

ROSA LUXEMBURG THE REVOLUTIONARY

THE FATE suffered by Rosa Luxemburg's memory in the forty years since her murder is an accurate reflection of the fate of the international socialist movement. This mighty revolutionary, probably the greatest tribune the western proletariat has produced since Marx and Engels, has laid almost undisturbed in the byways of socialist research, dimly remembered, grossly misrepresented, incapable of being accommodated within the turgid streams of social democracy and Stalinism. Even the minuscule groups of misnamed Trotskyists have found her too turbulent a spirit to commit to their gallery of deities.

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

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

New men old problems

This, Tony Cliff has now done in his critique of Rosa Luxemburg, published as nos. 2 and 3 of *International Socialism*.^{*} His method is to fasten on to the major problems facing the West European labour movement at the turn of last century by describing their formulation in Rosa Luxemburg's work, and then to present her conclusions and solutions in a spirit of criticism and objective evaluation. This is creative writing. The reader sees the subject in historical perspective. Her magnificent achievements placed in context, her equally magnificent mistakes sharply exposed.

Sometimes the logic of ideas leads the author to ignore his subject, completely imputing to her a train of thought more his than hers. But even these broad asides

merely serve to underline the major lesson of the book: that there is an amazingly strong similarity between the problems that faced our grandfathers and those confronting us; that the searing revolutionary energy and clairvoyance that enabled Rosa Luxemburg to cleave to the very heart of their solution have made her the greatest teacher of our time, a never-ending source of inspiration to the isolated revolutionary socialist minorities of today.

Where we have a Strachey, Luxemburg's generation had a Bernstein. Both ex-Marxists, both projecting a brief capitalist prosperity into the limitless future; both ascribing a regulatory, "democratic" role to trade unions which, in the long run, is bound to transmute the system gently, ever so gently, into a socialist one; both, in a word, providing the intellectual fodder for reformism and class collaboration.

Luxemburg declared relentless war on these prophets of weakness. She exposed the analytical pretensions of Bernstein and his followers, placed the struggle for socialism firmly on its material base in capitalism's inescapable economic contradictions, revealed the limitations of trade unions as offensive weapons in the battle for social change, attacked parliamentary fetishism, excoriated the social-democratic politicians who accepted office in order to disorientate and destroy independent working class action. In short, she represented the revolutionary opposition, the hard lump of uncompromising proletarian power within the soft, messy porage of reformism. In her understanding of deep-rooted reformism, in the fury, subtlety and accuracy of her campaign against it, Rosa Luxemburg is unsurpassed in the history of socialist thought. In this alone, she has left a testament which we have yet to read.

But however central to her life and thought this struggle against capitulation within the ranks of the mass movement, it was only one aspect. Her understanding of the awakening of mass consciousness, gained from the experience of the mass strikes that thrust the new from out of the old century, from Russia to Belgium, is a model of sensitivity for, and harmony with, the tonalities of the mass movement. It is

a specific for both the mindless militancy and the militant mindlessness so prevalent within it today.

More than anyone else she opened the eyes of socialists to the detailed impact of imperialism on backward, pre-capitalist countries. Nothing can be a better antidote to our neo-fabians' *New Colonial Essays* than one page of her moving descriptions and incisive analysis.

One of her greatest contributions, long since lost within the grinding maws of social democracy and stalinism, uncherished within the lesser bureaucracies of the movement's sects, is her passionate defence of democracy for the working class and within it. Nothing could stem her tirades against the machine and the machine men, the lifeless multi-limbed bureaucracy that grew on the movement in her day and is still there. Nothing could trim her infinite belief in working-class initiative, in consciously-conceived self-directed working class action. Her deep understanding of the role of leadership, the intricate interaction between leadership and led, indeed of the physiology of the movement, led her into battle not only against the Gaitskells of the German labour movement of her time but also against the Lenin of the early, hunted Bolsheviks. It was this deep-rooted and passionate defence of democracy that, more than anything else condemned her memory to a restless homeless life in the annals of 'orthodox' socialism. Orthodoxy of any sort could never be made to spell Luxemburg.

Great marxist

Cliff has dealt fully with these and other aspects of life and work. He covers more than Luxemburg, the revolutionary fighter against reformism, imperialism and bureaucracy. He analyses her views on the national question and her criticism of the Bolsheviks in power; he shows himself an informed critic of her major intellectual contribution to the body of marxist thought, a sympathetic recorder of her life and a comrade who well understands her unique place in the movement and in history.

There is little more that can be said in a short review such as this. Readers can do no better than buy Cliff's study of Rosa Luxemburg.

^{*}95 pages; 4s 6d post paid (soft cover), 8s 6d post paid (hard cover) from M Madison, 21 Aubert Park, London, N1.

FEDERATION ! G Dev Murarka

cation for government policy, the murder plot began to play a larger part; no doubt it was natural to make it the front piece of the story'. (Para. 177). And Lord Malvern had the cheek and brazenness to claim that all Africans are liars!

But a plot there was certainly, a criminal conspiracy between the Tory Government in Britain and the Federation Government of Sir Roy Welensky, to wipe out the Nyasaland African Congress and to impose the Federation on unwilling Africans and thus sell them to ultimate slavery of the type which exists in the Union of South Africa.

This is the condition in the best paid industry, mining. In other occupations the conditions are even worse. In contrast the profits of the rich copper mining corporations are staggering. In 1953 the net profits of the four copper mines were £31½ millions. In 1955 they were £52 millions. In Nyasaland the statutory minimum wage is 1s. 3d. a day, rising to 2s. for industrial labour. Again the Report is revealing. 'In 1958 it was estimated that 170,000 men were abroad as migrant workers. Recruiting organisations function throughout Nyasaland . . .' (Para. 14). Besides these economic diffi-

decided by a hostile government, whose members think themselves to be so civilised that they have become arrogant enough to think others, with a different skin, to be sub-human. (Sir John Peel, a Tory M.P.).

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

Losing allies

But the danger also comes from the muddled thinking and woolly ideals of the European liberals. They are always pleading for time. They will go on pleading for time till it is too late. It is these liberals who talk about the ideal of racial partnership. For them, it is essential that this figment of their imagination is kept alive by perpetuating the Federation, whatever the price. They are not so much concerned with the justice and urgency of the African case as with the correct behaviour by standards which they never apply to advocates of racial supremacy in Africa.

Another danger is from the frightened, floating-vote chasing leadership of the Labour Party. Their advocacy of the African cause is so timid as to be almost useless. It is time that they realised that polite jibes and throat lozenges for the Colonial Secretary is not a demonstration of socialist virtues. It has failed to put the African case clearly before its own rank and file members. It has done little to counteract mass chauvinism at home and its roots in Fascist and Tory propaganda. It still talks in terms of giving a fair trial to the Federation. Instead, the Labour leadership should realise that the Devlin Report has killed Federation as an agreed proposition. It should call for the release of prisoners, the burial of Federation, and independence for Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia while there is still peace. Time is running out fast in Africa. Labour is losing its natural allies.

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

TWO - FACED

MR LENNOX BOYD: 'That information made it clear that plans to carry out widespread violence and murder of Europeans, Asians and moderate African leaders; that in fact a massacre was being planned.'—*Hansard, 3 March, 1959.*

'We have not found any detailed plan for massacre and assassination.'—*Report of the Nyasaland Commission of Inquiry, Para. 149.*

Mr Lennox Boyd: 'It soon became quite clear that (Dr Banda) was determined to reject any constitutional proposals which did not meet the maximum demands of the Nyasaland Congress and then to create disturbances and to court arrest.'—*Hansard, 3 March, 1959.*

'The White Paper goes on to say in Paragraph 14 that Dr Banda made it equally clear in his talks with government officials that he was not prepared to compromise. This last statement is not true. We have already given instances which show that Dr Banda was willing to compromise on details of constitutional reform.'—*Report of the Commission, Para. 68.*

Mr Lennox Boyd: 'It was a ridiculous suggestion that the federal government said that (Lord Perth) should not go. That was utterly without foundation.'—*Hansard, 3 March, 1959.*

'On 25 February Sir Roy Welensky asked the Governor, in view of the further developments in Nyasaland, to give serious consideration to deferring Lord Perth's projected visit.'—*Report of the Commission, Para. 159.*

There is no doubt about the solidarity of the African opposition to Federation. The Report is explicit on this. 'Naturally on this point we have heard different opinions but it was generally acknowledged that the opposition to Federation was there, that it was deeply rooted and almost universally held. We found it to be so. Even amongst the chiefs, many of whom are loyal to the Government and dislike Congress methods, we have not heard of a single one who is in favour of Federation'. (Para. 43).

Nyasaland is about the size of Scotland. Out of the total population of about 2,750,000 only 8,700 are Europeans. Yet the Europeans have all the political power and economic advantages. In Southern Rhodesia roughly 47 million acres out of 95 million acres of land is owned by the whites who are less than eight per cent of the population. In Nyasaland more than a million acres of best land is owned by whites. This inequality between the genuine inhabitant and the settlers is even more glaring in the industrial sphere. Thus in 1956: 76 per cent. of African miners earned less than £3 3s. a week. 46 per cent. of African miners received less than £2 13s. a week. But 6,852 European miners received about £46 a week.—from *Dominion Status for Central Africa?* by Kenneth Kaunda.

culties the Africans are subject to various types of racial discrimination and generally treated as less than human beings.

These are the reasons why the Africans are so bitterly opposed to Federation. They know very well that once the Federation is established and Dominion Status is conferred on it, the white minority will treat them just as they treat the Africans in South Africa.

Danger

The Report sums up the African reasoning on this question admirably: 'For the completely un-educated, it is fear for his land. The land for him is his means of subsistence and his constant suspicion is that in some way or another the settler would like to take it away from him. Federation means the domination of Southern Rhodesia; the domination of Southern Rhodesia means the domination of the settler; the domination of the settler means the perpetuation of racial inferiority and of the threat to the African's land; that is the argument.' (Para. 43). It is unanswerable.

The Africans in the Federation are in grave political danger. They already live in a police state, in perpetual fear of a fanatical minority and without the normal means of political expression. Their fate, however, is to be

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 ie, 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 instances 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, 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 under-developed countries.
- The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas.
- The abolition of the H-bomb and all weapons of mass destruction. Britain to pave the way with unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb.
- A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington or Moscow.

● **Labour and the bomb** from page 1

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

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

<p>NO APOLOGY</p> <p>There is no need to apologise to our readers for not appearing during the printing strike. We are sure that they will join with us in congratulating the printworkers for their magnificent advance towards the forty-hour week. They have led the entire labour movement</p>	<p>in this particular campaign.</p> <p>AN APOLOGY</p> <p>Apologies are due, however, for our non-appearance in mid-August. We hope our readers will appreciate that even editors and writers need to rest.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Editor.</p>
---	---

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

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

stocks of bombs already manufactured should be destroyed.

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

Ban the bomb withdraw from NATO

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

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

NOTTING HILL NOTEBOOK

Dear Reader,

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

—Editor.

MR. GARNET GORDON, the West Indies Commissioner, received a delegation of the Coloured People's Progressive Association on Thursday, August 13th. Mr. McDonald Moses, Public Relations Officer, led the discussions and was supported by

Mr. Frances Ezzreco, Welfare Officer and Treasurer, and Mr. C. C. Byfield, Chairman.

A meeting

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

The subjects

Among the subjects raised was the apparent lack of urgency on the part of the police in pursuing

the investigations of the murder case of Kelsoe Cochrane. The Commissioner was told that there is a growing apprehension among the coloured over the matter. In particular, there is the well-founded fear that if the criminal or criminals were not brought to justice, it would encourage like-minded people to do even more.

Immigrants

Apart from other problems

den, was guest of the C.P.P.A. during the first few days in August. He had read of the activities of the Association in the Swedish newspapers and as a social science student race relation was a subject of much interest to him.

Interested

Mr. Svensson said before he left that: 'University students in Sweden, especially the socialist

MISSING CLUE

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

"Half the houses in Glasgow have only one or two rooms and over 400,000 people are living in them", he went on.

"30,000 citizens are living at more than four to a room and 80,000 at more than three to a room. Over 100,000 Glasgow families have no separate sanitary facilities inside the house and over 150,000 families have no fixed bath in their homes."

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

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

like housing, lack of recreation facilities in the district and meeting halls, the estrangement between coloured migrant and students was causing much disquiet. The Commissioner agreed that this was a matter of great importance and promised to give some attention to it.

the colour problem, especially in developments in Britain in this respect'. He was rather pleased of the opportunity to get first hand information on these questions and was grateful for C.P.P.A.'s help and hospitality.

Keep in touch

● **A GUEST**

MR. JORN SVENSSON from the University of Lund, Sweden, are rather interested in

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

SOCIALIST REVIEW SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I enclose ^{16s.} _{8s.} _{4s.} subscription for ^{1 year's} _{6 months'} _{3 months'} issue of

SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Name.....

Address.....

Send to **M Maddison**

21 Aubert Park, London, N5