

Join the
**LABOUR
PARTY**
TODAY

Socialist Outlook

WEEKLY

No. 70
[Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper]

FRIDAY, MARCH 13, 1953

3d.

Lead with
**LABOUR'S
LEFT!**
Demand NOW a
General Election

COME OFF IT MR. HEAD!

TORY Minister of War, Mr Head, says that the two-year period of National Service is necessary to defend Britain in case of an attack. There are already 900,000 men under arms in this country—but nine out of ten regular Army formations are overseas, and two out of five National Servicemen are stationed abroad.

If Mr. Head is expecting an attack, why are our soldiers overseas?

But in fact, Mr. Head is not expecting an attack. Our troops are overseas engaged in defending colonial possessions which feed the rubber and tin magnates in the City of London.

Furthermore, they are being held in all corners of the world to play their part in what General Eisenhower has called "the liberation of the peoples of Russia, China and Eastern Europe".

I am sure that Britain's youth does not agree to being sacrificed to further the bombastic plans of Wall Street and the City of London. But British youth has never been consulted on this question!

We are denied the right to take part in the choice of Government if we are under 21. But we are conscripted to do all this rotten fighting at the age of 18. We understand why the Tories won't give us a vote at 18. They know

QUIET! BUSINESSMAN'S GOVERNMENT AT WORK!

NEW YORK, Friday. United States Army authorities here today announced the award of a contract for nearly 15 million yards of cotton sateen to J. P. Stevens Incorporated. The firm is one of the biggest textile manufacturing concerns in the world. Mr. Robert T. Stevens was formerly chairman of the company's board.

He is now Secretary of the Army. — "Daily Telegraph."

we should vote them out of office and vote to stay at home.

In our "democratic" army, we are pushed around by Colonel Blimps whose educational standards are not up to that of cannibals. Under their guidance many young soldiers develop an attitude towards colonial peoples which is summed up in the filthy expressions "wogs" and "gooks".

I appeal to all youth—especially those in the Labour League of Youth like myself—to fight against this Tory Government and get a Labour Government back in office which will bring all British troops home from overseas and let the colonial people run their countries as they want to and in peace.

G. H. Terry.

THE END OF AN ERA

Stalin with Roosevelt and Churchill at Yalta in 1945.
(See article on page 2).



Austin Strikers Must Get Labour's Full Support A Fight For Trade Union Rights

BY 2,000 votes to 10, the Austin vehicle builders decided, at a mass meeting on Monday last, to continue their strike for the reinstatement of their former convenor John McHugh.

"They will never break this strike" said George Evans, N.U.V.B. District Organiser.

This solid decision follows Saturday's packed meeting of the Birmingham Trades Council which, by the overwhelming vote of 158 to 17, carried a motion giving the N.U.V.B. its "full support in its fight to prevent victimisation".

Such clear cut votes are the best

Editorial

possible answers to the hysterical campaign which has been waged in the Birmingham press for the past three weeks. It is to be hoped they may also cause the T. & G.W.U. men to reconsider their misguided and ill-advised action in withdrawing from the Joint Shop Stewards Committee at Austins. Many T. & G.W.U. delegates at the Trades Council voted full support for the strikers.

The A.E.U. members have already said that if the N.U.V.B. call out their members in the other Austin-Morris combine factories, they will support it by a sympathy strike at Austins and call on A.E.U. members in the other combine factories to follow suit.

Events are proving the point made in the "Socialist Outlook", Friday, Feb. 27th, that the strike is becoming a "showdown battle between the N.U.V.B. and the arrogant directors of the Austin Motor Co.". The Ministry of Labour conciliation officers have not shown their usual eagerness to step in, which shows that the Tory Government hopes the strike will be beaten.

All employers are watching this fight closely. It is significant that the A.E.U. Convenor of Turner Bros. was sacked only a week ago (see report on page 3). It is widely realised among trade unionists that if the Austin vehicle builders are let down, or lose through lack of support from other trade unionists, no shop steward or active trade unionist will be safe in Birmingham—or anywhere else.

The national press is now taking a hand, and as usual is insulting the workers by making them out to be the dupes of "communist agitators". We have come to expect this sort of thing from such spokesmen of the employers as the "Express" and the "Telegraph". But need the "Daily Herald" follow suit and play the role of splitter and strike breaker?

On Monday, March 9th, the "Telegraph" gleefully reported that "during the weekend the rift widened between the moderate T. & G.W.U. and the N.U.V.B.". The "Herald" echoed the claim

the making of instruments of war. What a prospect! It must not be allowed to develop.

Not only must the Labour Movement oppose this blockade of the Chinese people—we must insist on the extension and promotion of trade with China. That was the policy decided at Morecambe; that is the policy we must fight for.

The great motor works of the Midlands could be working full blast for years making tractors, lorries and all kinds of motor vehicles for revolutionary China.

The Tory Government will never agree to these things, so they must be removed—and quickly. But the next Labour Government, if it is to seek real friendship and co-operation with China and all other peoples must show a sight more courage and socialist conviction than the last one did.

"The strike... is opening a gulf between moderate and left-wing trade unionists". Is there not an ominous similarity in these reports?

The T. & G.W.U., so the "Herald" tells us, "wants a just settlement so that their members affected may return to work". What then does the "Herald" think the other workers want? An unjust settlement?

The demand of the N.U.V.B. for the re-instatement of their former convenor is the only basis for a "just settlement".

The "Daily Herald" unlike the "Telegraph" has, as Mr. Deakin has recently pointed out "a responsibility to the Trade Union movement". That responsibility under the present circumstances means,

in our opinion to throw all weight behind the Trade Union Movement which is now locked in conflict with an arrogant and reactionary employer. For this is a hole-in-the-corner dispute, neither is it even "unofficial".

The Birmingham Trades Council supports the strike. The Birmingham District Committee of the Confederation of Engineering Unions (of which the T. & G.W.U. is a part), supports it. The A.E.U. supports it. The N.U.V.B. supports its members. The Smith Heath Divisional Labour Party has supported it—and sent a donation of three guineas to the strike fund.

It is time the "Herald" showed a little of its much vaunted "responsibility" and supported too.

**"We Want Every Union's
Active Support..."**
Says Jack Gardiner

Bro. Gardiner is the President of the B'ham Dist. Committee N.U.V.B. and Convenor of Solihull Rover Factory. He writes this article in his personal, not official, capacity.

It is not necessary for me to reiterate what has already been said about the Austin dispute. Sufficient for me to say that most people understand the circumstances and will agree with me when I say that the dispute has developed into a straight fight between the Austin management and the trade union movement as a whole

Who amongst us would believe that, if the employers won this fight, it would finish with McHugh? Indeed I would venture to say that no Shop Steward would be safe at any time.

I am shocked beyond measure to find working people finding fault and criticising the attitude of the N.U.V.B. when no other course was left for them. Austin's employ roughly 20,000 people, but just can't find a job for McHugh!

WHAT HAS TO BE DONE

I think all unions with members employed at Austin's have to call their National Executive together and come out with a straightforward statement, and

a directive to their members to come out in sympathy with the N.U.V.B.

I would therefore appeal to all Labour Parties, Wards and Divisions, plus trade union branches to put pressure on their respective executives for this course to be taken.

I would appeal to all Labour Party members and trade unionists to support financially this fight which is becoming virtually a fight for the very survival of trade unionism.

Send donations to: The Financial Secretary, F. Wilkins, 14 Wolverton Road, Rednal, Birmingham, 31, or to N.U.V.B. Offices, 4 George Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham, 15.

THE PAY-OFF

A TRAM driver of my acquaintance was told on reaching retirement age of 65, that in view of the staff shortage he could continue to work if he so desired. He consented to work on, and one of the reasons was that upon retirement he was faced with a big reduction in his standard of living.

So he worked on for another five years. He completed his last duty said cheerio all round, and went home. A man of leisure, well earned after 56 years of labour. He put his key in the lock to open the door, collapsed, and was dead before they got him to hospital.

Bill Pur

Eden and Eisenhower's Dirty Deal on China

BY agreeing to tighten restrictions on the "shipment of strategic materials to Communist China" the British Tory Government has fallen in with the plans of the American capitalist rulers who would like to see an all-out war on China.

As we have said time and again in these columns, no reliance whatever can be placed on this Tory Government to resist the war plans of the Eisenhower Administration.

THIS IS ACT OF WAR

Economic boycott such as this is a formidable weapon of war. The Allied blockade of Germany has twice contributed as much to her eventual defeat as all the fighting efforts of the soldiers, sailors and airmen. The words "strategic materials" in the Washington communiqué can be interpreted in a variety of ways. Food and clothes are as essential to an army as guns and bomber planes—and the needs of military and civilians are identical in thousands of instances.

Some of the measures which the Tories propose to enforce this blockade are unprecedented be-

tween two countries who are supposed to be at peace and whose Governments recognise each other. The revival of the wartime system of "navicerts" to control British ships trading on the China coast is an example. This has never before been done in peace time. There will also be restrictions on the bunkering and fuelling of the ships of other nations in all British-controlled ports.

The immediate reaction in Asia to the Washington agreement, is one of anger, because it threatens, not only the Chinese, but the economic standards of all the Asiatic peoples.

AMERICAN BLACKMAIL

Ceylon, which is almost completely dependent on China for her rice supplies, have a barter agreement to provide rubber in exchange for this vital food crop. The blockade would greatly hamper this trade, even if it does not succeed in cutting it off all together. Apprehensive of the reaction of the people, even the present Ceylon Government, friendly to British imperialism as it is, have been compelled to protest.

Referring to Britain's pledge to the United States, Mr. Richard Senanayake, Minister of Trade and Commerce, said that Britain and

America must deal directly with the Soviet block if they wish to stop supplies of strategic material to China, "instead of trying to starve us into obedience". Ceylon would allow bunkering facilities in her ports for any ships, if it were in her interest to do so.

Why has the Tory Government agreed to this demand from Wall Street? Undoubtedly it will affect British trade and British capital interests.

The first reason, of course, is that the Tories are in general agreement with the Americans that the anti-imperialist movements of the peoples of the world must be halted. For this they are prepared to make sacrifices—even to give up a part of their sacred profits.

HORSE-DEAL ON PERSIA

But even more sordid, perhaps, is the horse-deal Eden and Butler made in Washington. By agreeing to the China blockade they secured American support for putting the screws on the Persian people to get from them the greatest possible amount of oil compensation.

For the British workers, the economic consequences will be immediately disastrous. More ships idle, more dockers unemployed, more engineers redundant—until the logic of the blockade turns British factories into plants for

The End of an Era

Stalin's Place in History

WILL the death of Joseph Stalin open a political crisis in the Soviet Union from which the imperialist enemies of the workers will profit? Such at any rate is the ill-concealed hope behind most of the press speculations on the character and likely policies of Stalin's "successor". Big Business is banking on a capitalist restoration in Russia aided by outside military intervention. They will be as rudely disappointed as those who banked on a feudal restoration in England after the death of Cromwell.

The Soviet Union—the first Workers' State, product of the great Russian Revolution—has already survived 35 years of isolation, capitalist hostility, civil war, wars of intervention, internal political crises, and a major and devastating war against Hitler's Germany. It is certain that it will also survive the death of Stalin.

The tremendous authority and power of Stalin will not be easily—if ever—handed on. His death will therefore introduce a great instability into the ruling circles of the Soviet Union. The reference to "avoiding panic" which appeared in the communique of the Soviet Communist Party would seem to bear this out from official sources. Nevertheless the real crisis in the Soviet Union was maturing long before the leader died. But it is not one from which the imperialists will profit. It is the political crisis of a whole regime built up during a period when the international workers' movement was at its lowest ebb and now faced with another 1917—and on a world scale!

Some idea of the nature of this crisis can be gleaned from an analogous situation which exists today in our own trade union movement. There the top leaders have also developed into a comfortable bureaucracy wielding great power during a period when the British working class was prostrate before the onslaught of capitalism. Today those union leaders face a different working class re-invigorated by years of full employment, radicalised by the experiences of the war and insistently demanding socialist solutions to working class problems.

But the origin, habits, and social background of most of our present trade union leaders completely unfit them for leadership in such a struggle. They want only to preserve things as they are! But history doesn't stand still. On an international scale, that is the dilemma which also faces the men reared in the Stalin school.

DEVELOPED IN DEFEAT

Stalin's rise to power dates roughly from the year 1923—the year which saw the end of the post-war revolutionary wave in Europe, the defeat of the German revolution and the fatal illness of Lenin. The year which in fact closed the heroic period of the Russian revolution.

The best forces of that revolution had been either worn out, drawn into administrative tasks or killed in the civil war. The overwhelming desire of great masses of people was to have done with the fighting, settle down and enjoy the benefits of the revolution. Such a phenomenon—an exhausted reaction following the tumultuous upheaval of the old society—has accompanied every great social revolution.

Lenin and Trotsky had always insisted that the safety of the young Workers' State could only

be assured by the extension of the revolution to at least the advanced industrial countries. In the conditions which existed in 1923-24 in Russia such an idea—absolutely correct though it was—failed to inspire. New moods of conservatism began to appear side by side with the idea of a national socialist self-sufficiency. After Lenin's death these moods were rationalised by Stalin into the theory that it was possible to build socialism in a single country.

Violating all of Marxism and Leninism, his theory conquered only because these social forces wanted it to conquer. The phrase "building socialism" bowed to the

By
John Lawrence

revolutionary origins of the Soviet Union while its polar opposite—"in a single country"—satisfied all those who wanted to dig their fields in peace undisturbed by the problems of the world Labour Movement.

The Bolshevik Party trained by Lenin not unnaturally resisted this theoretical innovation. A struggle followed which was to determine the fate of the Soviet Union for the next three decades. History records that the Bolshevik Party was beaten and destroyed. The whole of Lenin's revolutionary General Staff was first isolated and then physically eliminated. Zinoviev, Kamenev, and many others were shot as "spies". Trotsky was exiled and later assassinated.

Thus, with all opposition de-

stroyed or crushed, with democracy stifled, the era of Stalin and Stalinism began.

(In passing we may note that nearly all the obituary writers in the capitalist press have again seized the opportunity to repeat the stupid falsehood that the struggle between Stalin and Trotsky was nothing more than a sordid personal fight for power. From these scribbles nothing better can be expected. History for them is always made by "great men" and never by the movement of classes. They have depicted the present fight for the socialist future of the Labour Party in exactly the same way—as a sort of gang fight between warring groups of ambitious politicians.)

But the revolution did not go all the way back. Great revolutions never do. The planned economy remained and so did the revolutionary consciousness of the Russian workers. Together they eventually enabled production to develop to magnificent heights. The superiority of planned production over the anarchy of capitalist private enterprise was proved once and for all. The first Workers' State was built on foundations so sure that it survived not only all the excesses of the Stalin regime (the forced collectivisation and the glaring inequalities in income), but also the terrible war on the Eastern Front in 1941-45.

During all this period, the effects of Stalin's anti-internationalist policies were absolutely disastrous to the Communist Parties of the world who were impelled into all sorts of combinations with capitalist parties on the theory that the main thing was to prevent war against

She Only Fought For Freedom

A young conscripted British soldier sends us this gruesome picture taken in Malaya. Look at it and—if you have any spark of feeling for suffering humanity—swear vengeance on the politicians and generals who are responsible for this atrocity. It has been done in your name.

The young Malayan girl was still alive when the picture was taken—she died ten minutes later. She had been shot by a British jungle patrol and carried in—alive and terribly mutilated—tied to a pole like an animal. The ropes can still be seen on her wrists.

It is revolting to all decent people that young boys should be used for such fiendish brutalities. End this British terrorism in Malaya! Bring the soldiers home at once!



STALIN was a great leader whose influence on world history no man can deny. At this moment, as the peoples of the Soviet Union mourn his passing, it is well to remember the tribute paid to the Russian Armies by Winston Churchill in the House of Commons on August 2, 1944. "It is the Russian Armies who have done the main task in tearing the guts out of the German Armies."

KRUPP AND HIS DUCATS

That much and more was said. Memories are short and now we listen to the Minister of State, Selwyn Lloyd, telling us about the rehabilitation of the Krupp Empire in Germany.

After January, 1951, no power remained to confiscate any of Herr Krupp's property. When Eric Fletcher wanted to know from the Minister what the value of assets Krupp is being required to sell would be, we were told that the amount of monies involved is really a matter of guessing. I'll give the Minister's guess, which to my mind is a great understatement, namely £20 to 25 millions!

Barbara Castle expressed our fears when she hinted in a question at the possibility of Krupps regaining control of that great industrial and armaments empire once

Russia. This was the heyday of "Popular Frontism" when all talk of socialism was outlawed as "ultra-leftism" and "Trotskyism".

The result adds up to the greatest series of defeats ever suffered by the international working class. The British General Strike in 1926 . . . the Chinese revolution drowned in blood by Chiang Kai-shek in 1927 . . . the victory of Hitler in 1933 . . . the cruel defeat of the Spanish workers in 1938. And it was precisely in this period of unprecedented defeats that Stalin rose to his greatest heights of power.

The capitalist and fascist encirclement struck fear into the hearts of the Russian workers and Stalin was able to perfect his state apparatus and secret police in the knowledge that the Russian workers would not resist for fear of aiding a possible capitalist intervention.

In the end of course none of these things saved the Soviet Union from war. "Collective security"—for which the communist parties had been sacrificed—collapsed, and in 1941 Hitler launched his armies against the Workers' State. Socialism it was now tragically proved could not be built in a single country if for no other reason than that capitalism in decline, in 1941 as in 1953, can continue in existence only by smashing every conquest of the working class, the trade unions, the Labour Party and, above all, the Soviet Union.

WAR AND REVOLUTION

But the Soviet Union survived the war—and the war in turn upset all the old relations between Russia and the rest of the world.

Capitalism fell apart in Eastern Europe. After a first attempt to shore up its crumbling structures (the period when Kings still "ruled" in the "People's Democracies"), Stalin was compelled by the growing hostility of world imperialism to bring the economies of Eastern Europe into line with the nationalised economy of the Soviet Union. In a military-bureaucratic manner the revolution was extended and the capitalist encirclement broken.

But it was in the East that the old relationships were most violently disrupted. Here not only was Japanese imperialism defeated but the Chinese workers and peasants eventually overthrew also the native reaction of Chiang Kai-shek. Britain was forced to quit the great sub-continent of India and the fires of anti-imperialist revolt spread throughout all Asia and Africa—and are still spreading.

In this new situation the men around Stalin proved absolutely incapable of providing the revolutionary leadership required. It suited the "peace" pose of the imperialists to paint Stalin as some devotee of world revolution stirring up discord and insurrection in every corner of the globe. Nothing was further from the truth. In a world breaking up under the revolutionary pressures released by the Second World War

The Great Krupp Scandal

FOR six long years the workers of Britain and other countries fought what they believed to be a war against Fascism. The armies of Hitler and Mussolini were defeated. Nazi leaders were tried for war crimes and sentenced to death or various terms of imprisonment. The danger of Fascism had been removed for good, democracy had emerged triumphant out of the carnage—or so it seemed!

But the reality—the fraud—has now been exposed. Hitler is dead, but the basis of Hitlerism—German monopoly capitalism hemmed in its own shrunken borders—remains and indeed is being actively restored by . . . the very leaders of the "war for democracy". This is the real meaning of the Krupp Scandal.

Among those arrested by the victorious Allied forces in 1945, was Alfred Krupp von Bohlen and Holbach, head of the notorious Krupp armaments empire. He was charged with exploiting slave-labour and plundering Nazi-occupied countries, and sentenced to 12 years imprisonment.

After serving six years of his sentence, Herr Krupp was released in 1951, and immediately steps were taken to restore to him and his family the fortune which had once been theirs. The final agreement, signed in Bonn on March 4, provides for the retention in the Krupp family of cash and plant valued at between £30 and £50 millions!

While the agreement prohibits the Krupps from acquiring coal and steel shares in Germany, it leaves it open for them to enter these industries in other countries. Furthermore, there is nothing in the agreement to stop them from

taking part in the manufacture of arms.

This gives rise to the strange paradox that while the Krupps are excluded from peaceful production of coal and steel, they can go on manufacturing the engines of death from which they derived their family fame and fortune!

Krupp, the man who financed the Nazi Party and raised Hitler to power, who was exempted from taxation as a reward for his services to Nazism, is well on his way to becoming all-powerful once again.

The tragedy of it is that all this could have been prevented!

From 1945 to 1951, the Labour Party was in power and as such, responsible for the administration of the Ruhr, the main base of the Krupp fortunes. During this period, the Labour Government had every opportunity to appropriate the Krupps and to establish control by the German workers over the operation of the Krupp plants. This would not only have broken the power of the Krupps, but would have gone a long way toward destroying the very roots of capitalism in Germany. Such a move would have given tremendous encouragement to the German Labour Movement.

No wonder that, when the Krupp Agreement was debated in the House of Commons on March 4, the Labour Front Bench never opened its mouth. It was "silenced by its past", as the "Manchester Guardian" put it.

The Labour Party can only make amends by giving the fullest support to the rising forces of German Labour. Only a Socialist Government in Germany, can check the rise to power of Herr Krupp and by taking over his industries carry out the policy which our own Labour Government so miserably failed to do.

C. Van Gelderen

all that Stalin could offer was . . . the "peaceful co-operation of capitalism and socialism". The status quo! And this offer has been repeated by Malenkov in his first public announcement as head of the Soviet Union.

Such men with such policies are out of step with events—historically stranded as it were. They cannot much longer remain the absolute dictators of the World Labour Movement—for the social forces which gave them birth, no longer exist. Signs of a break up of the previous monolithic structure have been apparent for some time. Tito first defied and then broke away from Moscow—yet Yugoslavia still remains a workers' state, albeit much weakened and

distorted by the opportunist policies of its leadership. Purges have been initiated in all the countries of Eastern Europe. Old stalwarts like Marty in France have been expelled as "police spies". Meanwhile the authority of revolutionary China throughout all the Far East and the colonial world continues to grow.

These are all signs of a crisis and a loosening of Moscow's grip on the world labour movement. It is something entirely new in the history of Stalinism. The cause is the further development of that world revolution upon which Lenin, Trotsky and all of Bolshevism based their belief in the ultimate regeneration and flowering of Soviet democracy.

The leaders of the Soviet Union (like the bureaucracy of the British trade unions), react in a conservative way to these great events. Their whole origin and development unfit them to lead the international workers' movement against capitalism. At the same time, because they are the heads of a non-capitalist state they are also unfitted to capitulate to the warlords of American imperialism. There is nothing for them but to hope for "peace".

It should be clear—and it certainly will become so in the near future—that this dilemma will only be solved by the intervention of the workers in the advanced capitalist countries. The Russian workers await a sign from us—the British Labour Movement. It is no abstract matter for our own Labour Party. By making a serious attempt to finish off the Tories; by joining hands with the colonial peoples in revolt—or by any other real socialist step—we can remove from the minds of the Russian workers the fear of capitalist intervention and thus aid tremendously the re-emergence of Soviet Democracy.

The historical conditions have disappeared which permitted Stalin (and that system of vulgarised Marxism which will forever bear his name), to dominate the world labour movement for nearly 30 years. New conditions have appeared—conditions of world revolution—which will be as intolerant of conservative labour and Stalinist bureaucracies as of the reactionary governments of decaying capitalism.

The Week at Westminster

by Harold
Davies, M.P.

again. In reality, the steel plants are in the hands of close relatives, and if, as the Minister said, the manufacture of armaments is to be left to the European Defence Community, then let's face it, the Krupps, like the Zaibatsu in Japan, are back in the saddle!

DEFENCE—WHITE OR "BLIGHT" PAPER

WE are over-reaching ourselves with this burden of "Defence". The Debate on the White Paper paid little attention to the overseas commitments of Britain, and it seemed that Churchill over-emphasised the value of our sale of weapons to smaller nations. "By making arms for others in addition to those we make for ourselves, we are enabled to build a war potential substantially greater than we could otherwise achieve."

How true is all this if the "Free World" begs itself by becoming one vast soup kitchen in an effort to police the world and prevent the flow of goods from West to East?

Dick Crossman showed us how the American national product has

risen by 20 per cent., American consumption by 7 per cent., their fixed capital investment by 17 per cent., and their defence by 130 per cent. This gives America at the moment 'arms, butter and the cow'.

In the same time, Britain's economy increased its output by about 5 per cent. in every year from 1946 to 1950, but then it began to fall. Our consumption is 2 per cent. down. While our economy now grows weaker the American, German and Japanese economy is growing stronger. We are making less new equipment for our factories and yet have increased our defence by about 90 per cent. in the past 5 years.

This is sheer lunacy and in the event of a war we shall have an economy that could not feed itself or keep up the necessary firing power. The Labour Movement fully accepts the responsibility of being strong in defence of these islands. In this so-called realistic

world we must accept some arms programme, but the one envisaged in the White Paper is one that will give weakness, not strength.

In this column a couple of weeks ago, I pointed out the extent of the National Service and its burden on our youth. The Labour Party asked for an annual review of this service. I think we were too kind to the Government. While we voted against the White Paper as it is set out, we should have seriously demanded an immediate review of our overseas commitments.

As for costs, let me give one example from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Defence, Nigel Birch, "Without the use of radar our Forces in a modern war would be ineffective, but it is not a cheap business. In a modern all-weather fighter the electronic gear costs as much as a Spitfire did before the war. Radio equipment in an aircraft carrier in 1939 costs £12,000; today it costs £345,000." But all the Tories seem to do, like Mrs. Fezziwig, is to enter the Chamber 'with one substantial smile'.

Socialist
Outlook

177, Bermondsey St., London,
S.E.1.
HOP 4554

Editor: John Lawrence

Mr. Deakin Goes Into 'Battle'

LAST Sunday the Tory Press gave great prominence to the latest speech of Mr. Arthur Deakin. What exactly did he say to warrant such a furore in the Sunday press?

Addressing 2,000 Trade Unionists at a Transport Festival in Bristol, the General Secretary of the Transport and General Workers' Union said: "During the last 12 months since the Conservative Government came into

By VICTOR MARTIN

office, the relationship of the Union with them has been good. We have seen and talked with Ministers of State and made our representations. In some cases—I am bound to give them this credit, they are not all a bad bunch—we have had consideration given to our point of view."

And this on the eve of the Tory denationalization of Road Transport!

Now, as an interested rank and file trade unionist, a lorry driver and the son of a dock labourer, I ask myself: What is this all about? Arthur Deakin has not always been so enthusiastic about the "consideration" of the Tory Government for the Trade Unionists.

In April, last year, reviewing the Budget Speech in the T.G.W.U. "Record," he wrote: "The Budget, stripped of its glamour, leaves no doubt that the burden will fall most heavily upon those who are least able to bear it—the lower wage group and pensioner."

How true that has, all worked out!

Again, in the July "Record," Deakin expressed himself very forcibly on the Tory Government. "In all my fifty years as a Trade Union official," he wrote, "I've never known so much bitterness as exists today amongst our road transport members over the Government's threat to de-nationalise the industry... Mr. Churchill was asked in the House why he chose to ignore our Union's point of view... In all my knowledge of Government's activities, I have never known such barefaced robbery, it is the world's worst racket."

How can we accept this man as sincere when he so openly contradicts himself? So the "world's worst racket" is the work of "not a bad bunch"!

This July article was headed "Ready for Battle". Would I be wrong in asking—What Battle? In the March issue of "Record," the General Secretary's article was headed: "Bold Leadership in Perilous Times." Again, am I wrong in asking—What Leadership?

In his February article, Mr.

Do you want to know what rank and file Dockers think about the

Dock Labour Board? The Tory Government? Mr. Arthur Deakin?

Portworkers' Clarion

THE VOICE OF BRITAIN'S DOCKERS

Price 2d.

Order from: DAN BRANDON, 9, Exmouth Street, Birkenhead

READ

Britain's only T.U. Weekly Newspaper

The Railway Review

FEARLESS, FACTUAL, STIMULATING and packed with information.

Price 3d.

Obtainable from any newsagent or bookstall.

Deakin writes on the denationalisation of Road Transport, under the title: "Tragedy: The Last Act". At the Bristol Festival, however, he showed no concern over this 'Tragedy,' this 'Last Act.' All he was concerned about was the National Executive's criticism of his colleague, Sir William Lawther, and he launched forth into an attack on the political wing of the Movement.

The objects of these attacks and of all the talk about the so-called splits are very clear. The right wing leaders of the Trade Unions and of the Labour Party are quite prepared to destroy our movement rather than accept and put into operation the policy decisions reached at both Morecambe and Margate.

The threat to the unity of the Labour Movement can only arise if an attempt is ever made to go back on these decisions!

Mr. Churchill and the Tory Party can "woo" right-wing trade union leaders. What these trade union leaders must accept and understand is that the rank and file will never be wooed from the Labour Movement.

STRIKE THREAT at Turner Bros. SAVES CONVENOR

WHILE Austin workers fight victimisation on one front, it appears that other employers are attempting to emulate their "big brothers" the Austin capitalists.

Here below is a statement by the convenor of Turner Bros., Birmingham, who was sacked but still remains at work due to the threat of his workmates to strike. It is a warning to all trade unionists that the Austin fight, the "Lindsay" fight and any other fight against victimisation is the fight of workers everywhere.

THE SHOP STEWARD'S STATEMENT

"After attending a regular monthly meeting between shop stewards and the management of Turner Bros., I, the convenor of Turner Bros., was told by the foreman that I was dismissed for being absent from my machine. This happened on Friday, 27th February, 1953. I was informed that I could call for my wages and cards at 11.30 a.m. Monday morning. I refused to do this and reported as usual at 8 a.m.

"Meetings of A.E.U. members and the management took place with no result except that we were informed that the foreman now stated "he could not get on with me". A further meeting of A.E.U. members was called and a decision was taken to withdraw our labour unless I was reinstated. The management immediately called in Mr. Turley of the Ministry of Labour.

"We were told that my discharge was postponed until a meeting of A.E.U. officials, management and the Ministry of Labour conciliation officer could take place.

"No evidence has been offered to prove that I was guilty of being a bad worker or time-keeper or of any insubordination. In fact the reverse is true." (Signed) F. Lindsay (Convenor, Turner Bros.).

A glimpse of the... 'GOOD OLD DAYS'!

AT 14 I got a job with Pick-fords—a human pony. My job was taking cases of tea around the city—eight big cases on a hand truck. I often did not finish till after 7 o'clock at night—for I had to collect the orders first before I delivered the goods.

Our starting time was 8 a.m., but the yard foreman would try to get us boys in at 5 a.m. by tell-

Problems of the Left-wing

Labour and the Trade Unions

By Phillip Williams

SINCE Morecambe Conference, thoughtful supporters of the left wing will agree that it is vital to win a mass base in the Unions if the right wing is to be decisively defeated. But the task is not as simple as it sounds, and cannot be accomplished simply by poking fun at Mr. Deakin.

The Trade Unions are organs of the working class; that is, of the millions of people who work for wages, the real producers of wealth. Whilst the Labour Party contains representatives of the Unions, its individual membership includes large numbers of professional and middle class people who in many cases have absolutely no real contact with the rank and file of the Trade Unions. Furthermore, from 1945 onwards, our Party has been invaded by all sorts of careerists looking for Parliamentary jobs. Sometimes they talk left in order to get the C.L.P. votes and sometimes right, depending on the constituency. The basis of Morrison and Co. rests mainly on these people.

To win the Trade Unions, the left wing must understand Union problems and how they are related politically to the work of the Labour Party.

Trade Unions were formed to protect the economic interests of the workers, and in spite of the right wing leaders, they continue directly or indirectly to serve this end. That is in general why the average Trade Union branch meeting, especially covering the basic industries, is a refreshing place to work in. Attendances, unfortunately remain small, like those in the Labour Party Wards. Real problems concerning conditions of work are almost always up for discussion which is in many cases far more lively and down to earth than that in some Ward Labour Parties.

Great changes have taken place since the days of the old craft societies. The protection of our economic interests is today not only a T.U. matter but a first-class political question (hence the important role of the Labour Party).

That is the basis of the conflict today between the right-wing Trade Union leaders and the Labour Party.

Deakin, Lawther & Co. find the Labour Party useful only insofar

Red Indians Seize the Land

ON February 17, the 112 Red Indian peasants of the Chimaltenango province received eight and three-quarter acres each in the first land distribution undertaken by the government of President Guzman in Guatemala.

It was the start in the application of an agrarian reform law passed by the legislature last July and which has since been subject to dispute in the courts.

Two per cent of the population up to now has owned 70 per cent of the land. The law calls for the break-up and distribution of all estates over 220 acres. Government action was precipitated by seizures of land by groups of peasants, impatient at the delay ever since last summer.

Guatemala is only one of a number of South American countries where peasants and workers are in social ferment.



Engineering workers at a Strike Meeting. These men and women are the allies of Labour's Left-wing.

as it serves their own narrow interests. They treat it like one of the sections of the T.G.W.U. The Trade Unions they look upon only as a means of wringing economic concessions from the employers. They are interested in governments only from the point of view of collaboration and negotiation. While preferring a Labour Government, they are quite prepared to work with the Tories. The question of Socialism does not arise in their considerations.

Of course, Trade Unions must negotiate. No one denies this. But on what basis do these negotiations take place? That is the important issue.

To the Union rank and file, the solving of the economic issues is inseparably linked with the defeat of the Tories and the return of a Labour Government pledged to socialism. But Deakin and Co. are not socialists. Their job is to make deals with capitalism, not to overthrow it.

These gentlemen enjoy a standard of living which brings them into the ranks of high paid capitalist functionaries. They are

knighted and honoured by the Lords and Ladies of Buckingham Palace. Every now and then Churchill pays them a tribute for "faithful service". Without the Right-wing of the Unions to fight back the rising militancy of the workers, the Tories would be in a really bad position.

For a considerable number of years now they have dominated the Labour Party. Bevanism, Morecambe and the last T.U.C. have, however, brought this to an end. The Labour Party is becoming more socialist and clashes at every turn with the collaborationism of the Trade Union right wing. This is the significance of the fight on Nationalisation.

More nationalisation means a greater drive towards socialism. That is why it will not be accepted at any cost by Deakin and Co. They don't bargain for socialism—but that is what the Labour Party and Trade Union rank and file want. This is the real meaning of the division in the move-

Summons Against Police By Rival Lamps Strikers

SUMMONSES against Surrey Policeman have been taken out following incidents outside the Rival Lamps Factory when, as reported in the "Socialist Outlook" last week, police man-handled women strikers on picket duty.

This was revealed by Bro. Tilbury, E.T.U. District Officer, to a conference of local Trade Union and Labour Party delegates at Addlestone, Surrey, called to consider ways and means of bringing this 44-week-old strike to a successful conclusion.

The workers at Rival Lamps, mostly women, and officially supported by their Unions (A.E.U. and E.T.U.), are on strike against the victimisation of shop stewards and other trade unionists, which followed the organisation of the factory nearly a year ago.

Bro. J. Foster, Secretary of the A.E.U. Kingston District Committee, presided over delegates from the Esher Trades Council; Chertsey, Addlestone and Ascot Labour Parties; Kingston D.C. A.E.U.; branches of U.S.D.A.W. and P.O.E.U.; shop stewards Committees of Aircrew, Vickers Armstrong, Park Royal Vehicles and Weymans factories; and the London area shop stewards of the N.U.V.B.

Bro. Tilbury also reported that M.P.s were being contacted to find out why import licences had been given to Rival Lamps to buy argon gas on the continent, when the British supplies had been blacked by the workers in the British Oxygen Co.

The conference called for volunteers for a picket rota from other factories for "we are determined to prevent the forces of the crown from maltreating our women-folk and this is the most effective way of demonstration".

The Surrey Federation of Trades Councils is being asked to organ-

A REPORT

ise meetings and demonstrations, and a committee was set up to co-ordinate assistance throughout the area and to work in conjunction with the strike committee.

The Esher Trades Council has already advised local labour organisations to boycott the "Ben Stanley" coaches because these coaches are being used to run "blacklegs" into the factory every day from several miles away. They have also asked all their affiliated branches to contact their respec-

Rail Porters' Action Speeds Wages Talks

FOR over 18 months, Railway Goods Porters have been awaiting settlement of their Union's claim for revised tonnage bonus rates. On Monday, March 2nd, their patience ran out. Three thousand men at 14 London Goods Depots began "working to rule".

This "tonnage bonus" is a form of piece work or, as the economists are pleased to call it, "incentive payment". It only becomes payable after a certain weight of goods has been shifted. If this weight isn't shifted there is no bonus.

This "basic weight" varies from depot to depot, depending on the type of traffic handled and the "labour saving" devices available. If you've got plenty of "labour saving devices" then you've got to shift a hell of a lot more goods before you begin to draw bonus!

Unless you work very hard and very fast you don't stand a chance of "beating the basic" and that means you only draw your mini-

ment; more socialism, or collaboration with capitalism.

This split must get deeper and it is the task of our left wing to win the and file away from the spl Last year's T.U.C. demand more nationalisation shows the Trade Union rank and file at one with Labour's left. This will be further strengthened by the adoption of an el policy which includes it as a tral demand.

Meanwhile, the trade union must be drawn closer to the our Party. Every C.L.P. ensure its full quota of T.U. gates. Ward and Management committee meetings must s it that there is every consideration shown for discussing impo Union problems. All steps the right wing initiate to Trade Unionists from the L Party must be defeated. The mum unity between left intellectuals and their brother the Unions should be built u

In the factories, Labour members must take the initiative in leading the struggle for conditions. They must be shop stewards and constantly to enrol members into the L Party. Where several L Party members hold leading tions, arrangements should made to organise the work s it strengthens Labour's left

The future lies with the wing, provided we win the U

PROTEST AT LIVERPOOL ON UNITY THEATRE

The Seaforth and District Branch of the National Co-operative Men's Guild has protested the banning of halls on Merseyside such as the refusal of the City Council of Liverpool to the Unity Theatre the use of Philharmonic Hall.

They call upon the trade and co-operative movement to combat this attack on civil ties.

tive Union Executives to "all Rival Lamps works.

The stubborn determination these women workers who ago were unorganised, is ample to all Trade Union. They need every org worker's support in this fight the very principle of trade organisation.

If nothing else, branch shop stewards can send them financial assistance. It should be to: The Treasurer, Rival Lamps Strike Committee, 71 Byron Addlestone, Surrey.

mum basic rate—£5 17s. 6d 3/- London allowance).

By the time you're earned it. But here's the The present bonus rates are on the 1947 wage rate (for a porter £4 7s. 5d.). So the quite rightly claim that the only have to work very hard order to get bonus—but when do get it, it's at cut price

The same principle applies the "cartage bonus" and the feel the same way as their br "on the bank". All these w are quite literally forced to 50 and more hours every w order to make enough to ex

Can you wonder they are ing their "impatience" and some action to prod their tiators along a little quicker settlement?

And the action has already some effect. As we go to we learn that the Railway I tives has agreed to meet the cutive of the N.U.R. on March 13th to discuss the For the time being anyway "work to rule" is therefore

Albert Moffatt

Join the
**LABOUR
PARTY**
TODAY

Socialist Outlook

WEEKLY

No. 70

[Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper]

FRIDAY, MARCH 13, 1953

3d.

Lead with
**LABOUR'S
LEFT!**

Demand NOW a
General Election

COME OFF IT MR. HEAD!

TORY Minister of War, Mr Head, says that the two-year period of National Service is necessary to defend Britain in case of an attack. There are already 900,000 men under arms in this country—but nine out of ten regular Army formations are overseas, and two out of five National Servicemen are stationed abroad.

If Mr. Head is expecting an attack, why are our soldiers overseas?

But in fact, Mr. Head is not expecting an attack. Our troops are overseas engaged in defending colonial possessions which feed the rubber and tin magnates in the City of London.

Furthermore, they are being held in all corners of the world to play their part in what General Eisenhower has called "the liberation of the peoples of Russia, China and Eastern Europe".

I am sure that Britain's youth does not agree to being sacrificed to further the bombastic plans of Wall Street and the City of London. But British youth has never been consulted on this question!

We are denied the right to take part in the choice of Government if we are under 21. But we are conscripted to do all this rotten fighting at the age of 18. We understand why the Tories won't give us a vote at 18. They know

QUIET! BUSINESSMAN'S GOVERNMENT AT WORK!

NEW YORK, Friday. United States Army authorities here today announced the award of a contract for nearly 15 million yards of cotton sateen to J. P. Stevens Incorporated. The firm is one of the biggest textile manufacturing concerns in the world. Mr. Robert T. Stevens was formerly chairman of the company's board.

He is now Secretary of the Army. — "Daily Telegraph."

we should vote them out of office and vote to stay at home.

In our "democratic" army, we are pushed around by Colonel Blimps whose educational standards are not up to that of cannibals. Under their guidance many young soldiers develop an attitude towards colonial peoples which is summed up in the filthy expressions "wogs" and "gooks".

I appeal to all youth—especially those in the Labour League of Youth like myself—to fight against this Tory Government and get a Labour Government back in office which will bring all British troops home from overseas and let the colonial people run their countries as they want to and in peace.

G. H. Terry.

THE END OF AN ERA

Stalin with Roosevelt and Churchill
at Yalta in 1945.
(See article on page 2).



Austin Strikers Must Get Labour's Full Support A Fight For Trade Union Rights

BY 2,000 votes to 10, the Austin vehicle builders decided, at a mass meeting on Monday last, to continue their strike for the reinstatement of their former convenor John McHugh.

"They will never break this strike" said George Evans, N.U.V.B. District Organiser.

This solid decision follows Saturday's packed meeting of the Birmingham Trades Council which, by the overwhelming vote of 158 to 17, carried a motion giving the N.U.V.B. its "full support in its fight to prevent victimisation".

Such clear cut votes are the best

Editorial

possible answers to the hysterical campaign which has been waged in the Birmingham press for the past three weeks. It is to be hoped they may also cause the T. & G.W.U. men to reconsider their misguided and ill-advised action in withdrawing from the Joint Shop Stewards Committee at Austins. Many T. & G.W.U. delegates at the Trades Council voted full support for the strikers.

The A.E.U. members have already said that if the N.U.V.B. call out their members in the other Austin-Morris combine factories, they will support it by a sympathy strike at Austins and call on A.E.U. members in the other combine factories to follow suit.

Events are proving the point made in the "Socialist Outlook", Friday, Feb. 27th, that the strike is becoming a "showdown battle between the N.U.V.B. and the arrogant directors of the Austin Motor Co.". The Ministry of Labour conciliation officers have not shown their usual eagerness to step in, which shows that the Tory Government hopes the strike will be beaten.

All employers are watching this fight closely. It is significant that the A.E.U. Convenor of Turner Pros. was sacked only a week ago (see report on page 3). It is widely realised among trade unionists that if the Austin vehicle builders are let down, or lose through lack of support from other trade unionists, no shop steward or active trade unionist will be safe in Birmingham—or anywhere else.

The national press is now taking a hand, and as usual is insulting the workers by making them out to be the dupes of "communist agitators". We have come to expect this sort of thing from such spokesmen of the employers as the "Express" and the "Telegraph". But need the "Daily Herald" follow suit and play the role of splitter and strike breaker?

On Monday, March 9th, the "Telegraph" gleefully reported that "during the weekend the rift widened between the moderate T. & G.W.U. and the N.U.V.B.". The "Herald" echoed the claim

the making of instruments of war. What a prospect! It must not be allowed to develop.

Not only must the Labour Movement oppose this blockade of the Chinese people—we must insist on the extension and promotion of trade with China. That was the policy decided at Morecambe; that is the policy we must fight for.

The great motor works of the Midlands could be working full blast for years making tractors, lorries and all kinds of motor vehicles for revolutionary China.

The Tory Government will never agree to these things, so they must be removed—and quickly. But the next Labour Government, if it is to seek real friendship and co-operation with China and all other peoples must show a sight more courage and socialist conviction than the last one did.

"The strike... is opening a gulf between moderate and left-wing trade unionists". Is there not an ominous similarity in these reports?

The T. & G.W.U., so the "Herald" tells us, "wants a just settlement so that their members affected may return to work". What then does the "Herald" think the other workers want? An unjust settlement?

The demand of the N.U.V.B. for the re-instatement of their former convenor is the only basis for a "just settlement".

The "Daily Herald" unlike the "Telegraph" has, as Mr. Deakin has recently pointed out "a responsibility to the Trade Union movement". That responsibility under the present circumstances means,

in our opinion to throw all weight behind the Trade Union Movement which is now locked in conflict with an arrogant and reactionary employer. For this is a hole-in-the-corner dispute, neither is it even "unofficial".

The Birmingham Trades Council supports the strike. The Birmingham District Committee of the Confederation of Engineering Unions (of which the T. & G.W.U. is a part), supports it. The A.E.U. supports it. The N.U.V.B. supports its members. The Small Heath Divisional Labour Party has supported it—and sent a donation of three guineas to the strike fund.

It is time the "Herald" showed a little of its much vaunted "responsibility" and supported too.

"We Want Every Union's Active Support..."

Says Jack Gardiner

Bro. Gardiner is the President of the B'ham Dist. Committee N.U.V.B. and Convenor of Solihull Rover Factory. He writes this article in his personal, not official, capacity.

It is not necessary for me to reiterate what has already been said about the Austin dispute. Sufficient for me to say that most people understand the circumstances and will agree with me when I say that the dispute has developed into a straight fight between the Austin management and the trade union movement as a whole

Who amongst us would believe that, if the employers won this fight, it would finish with McHugh? Indeed I would venture to say that no Shop Steward would be safe at any time.

I am shocked beyond measure to find working people finding fault and criticising the attitude of the N.U.V.B. when no other course was left for them. Austin's employ roughly 20,000 people, but just can't find a job for McHugh!

WHAT HAS TO BE DONE
I think all unions with members employed at Austin's have to call their National Executive together and come out with a straightforward statement, and

a directive to their members to come out in sympathy with the N.U.V.B.

I would therefore appeal to all Labour Parties, Wards and Divisions, plus trade union branches to put pressure on their respective executives for this course to be taken.

I would appeal to all Labour Party members and trade unionists to support financially this fight which is becoming virtually a fight for the very survival of trade unionism.

Send donations to: The Financial Secretary, F. Wilkins, 142, Wolverton Road, Rednal, Birmingham, 31, or to N.U.V.B. Offices, 41, George Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham, 15.

THE PAY-OFF

A TRAM driver of my acquaintance was told on reaching retirement age of 65, that in view of the staff shortage he could continue to work if he so desired. He consented to work on, and one of the reasons was that upon retirement he was faced with a big reduction in his standard of living.

So he worked on for another five years. He completed his last duty, said cheerio all round, and went home. A man of leisure, well earned after 56 years of labour. He put his key in the lock to open the door, collapsed, and was dead before they got him to hospital.

Bill Punt.

Eden and Eisenhower's Dirty Deal on China

BY agreeing to tighten restrictions on the "shipment of strategic materials to Communist China" the British Tory Government has fallen in with the plans of the American capitalist rulers who would like to see an all-out war on China.

As we have said time and again in these columns, no reliance whatever can be placed on this Tory Government to resist the war plans of the Eisenhower Administration.

THIS IS ACT OF WAR

Economic boycott such as this is a formidable weapon of war. The Allied blockade of Germany has twice contributed as much to her eventual defeat as all the fighting efforts of the soldiers, sailors and airmen. The words "strategic materials" in the Washington communique can be interpreted in a variety of ways. Food and clothes are as essential to an army as guns and bomber planes—and the needs of military and civilians are identical in thousands of instances.

Some of the measures which the Tories propose to enforce this blockade are unprecedented be-

tween two countries who are supposed to be at peace and whose Governments recognise each other. The revival of the wartime system of "navicerts" to control British ships trading on the China coast is an example. This has never before been done in peace time. There will also be restrictions on the bunkering and fuelling of the ships of other nations in all British-controlled ports.

The immediate reaction in Asia to the Washington agreement, is one of anger, because it threatens, not only the Chinese, but the economic standards of all the Asiatic peoples.

AMERICAN BLACKMAIL

Ceylon, which is almost completely dependent on China for her rice supplies, have a barter agreement to provide rubber in exchange for this vital food crop. The blockade would greatly hamper this trade, even if it does not succeed in cutting it off all together. Apprehensive of the reaction of the people, even the present Ceylon Government, friendly to British imperialism as it is, have been compelled to protest.

Referring to Britain's pledge to the United States, Mr. Richard Senanayake, Minister of Trade and Commerce, said that Britain and

America must deal directly with the Soviet block if they wish to stop supplies of strategic material to China, "instead of trying to starve us into obedience". Ceylon would allow bunkering facilities in her ports for any ships, if it were in her interest to do so.

Why has the Tory Government agreed to this demand from Wall Street? Undoubtedly it will affect British trade and British capital interests.

The first reason, of course, is that the Tories are in general agreement with the Americans that the anti-imperialist movements of the peoples of the world must be halted. For this they are prepared to make sacrifices—even to give up a part of their sacred profits.

HORSE-DEAL ON PERSIA

But even more sordid, perhaps, is the horse-deal Eden and Butler made in Washington. By agreeing to the China blockade they secured American support for putting the screws on the Persian people to get from them the greatest possible amount of oil compensation.

For the British workers, the economic consequences will be immediately disastrous. More ships idle, more dockers unemployed, more engineers redundant—until the logic of the blockade turns British factories into plants for