

Join the  
**LABOUR  
PARTY**  
TODAY

# Socialist Outlook

WEEKLY

No. 130

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

FRIDAY, MAY 21st, 1954

3d.

Help the Fight  
**AGAINST  
TORYISM  
and WAR!**

## KENYA: More Reverses For Imperialism

**T**WO developments in Kenya over the last week serve to highlight the deepening crisis facing White settlers and Tory Government. These amount to a weakening of the grip of Imperialism on the one hand, and a strengthening of the forces of the Colonial Revolution on the other.

The first is the spread of the revolutionary "contagion" to another powerful tribe—the Kamba. Kamba (not Kikuyu) gangs are reported to be in action in the Machakos, Changamwe (near Mombassa) and Simba areas.

The half-million strong Kamba inhabit the region which lies between Nairobi and the Indian Ocean. Strategically, this tribe dominates the only railway link between Uganda and the coast. Further, according to the "Daily Telegraph" of 14/5/54, this tribe constitutes "the backbone of the Regular Army and Police in Kenya. At least a third of the rank and file and more than half the N.C.O.s come from this tribe."

### Sent Delegates

Apparently, the Kikuyu army sent delegates to work amongst the Kamba, established liaison with them, and set up a skeleton state organisation, i.e. presidents elect, courts and laws, a treasury, tax collectors and executioners.

This means that the African Revolution—the so-called Mau Mau is part of that—has not only tapped an additional reserve force of half-a-million and thereby strengthened its own forces, but has undermined the very structure of the army of occupation. It has extended the area of military operations by something like threefold, and thereby increased tenfold the military, economic and political problems of colonial suppression.

Simultaneously with this comes further information to throw interesting light on the actual effects of the war on the financial resources of the colonial government.

Kenya's Finance Minister is coming to London soon to make some "grave" requests. Last November it seemed as if Kenya's reserves would last out the war until mid-1955, but only on three conditions:—

1. That the Emergency did not cost any more than at the time.
2. That revenue did not decline.
3. That no other fresh expenses were incurred.

To help out, Britain supplied £11,000,000. However, after five months, none of the conditions now exist.

1. By June, this year's expenditure is expected to reach £8,000,000 (originally estimated for at £2,000,000)!
2. By mid-1955, despite the British

aid, all surplus balances will be exhausted!

3. The expenditure on the R.A.F. for the first 17 months of the Emergency exceeded the original estimate of £590,000 by £1,160,000!

### Cost of Killing

In the meantime, the expenditure on the Emergency as a whole has soared from £200,000 in 1952 to £4,300,000 in 1953! As against this expenditure, Kenya's total revenue is less than £20 million. Over 25 per cent. of Kenya's revenue is thus spent on suppression, and what increases the crisis is that the suppression of "Mau Mau" entails the destruction of Imperialism's primary source of sustenance—cheap labour—embodied in the Kikuyu.

Such is the dilemma of Imperialist policies in Kenya.

A. Banda

## Spotlight On Old Age

(See page 2)



# Opposition To War Among U.S. Workers

## Indo-China Crisis Revealed in America

**I**F the Eisenhower administration drags America into the Indo-China war, as the White House continues to threaten, it will be against the will of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

While the press was screaming about the "heroic defence" of Dien Bien Phu by hired mercenary troops of French imperialism, the newspapers were deliberately burying a big Indo-China war story that was happening right here in the U.S.A.

This was the unexpected expression of tremendous popular opposition to U.S. military intervention against the Indo-Chinese struggle for independence.

A fuller glimpse of the real scope and depth of this opposition is disclosed by the May 7th "U.S. News and World Report" magazine, under the title, "Why War Talk Is Fading... Kickback From the Voters Jolted Policy Makers."

### "POLITICAL DYNAMITE"

This ultra-conservative magazine, generally known as one of the fire-eaters in demanding aggressive imperialist policies against the Asian people, admits:

"War in Indo-China is political dynamite in the U.S. That's what Congressmen find when they sample the mood of the voters."

It reports that if Congress were asked to decide on sending American G.I.s to Indo-China, the response would be: "no sale".

"This is the mood of the country," says U.S. News, "as interpreted by members of Congress after samplings taken around the cracker barrels of county stores, in talks with constituents in towns and cities, in the mail that comes across their desks."

99 PER CENT. SAY "STAY OUT"

The "chairman of an important

This article from an American Socialist shows that in America as in Britain, there is a deep-seated opposition to a new "Korea" in Indo-China. The lesson for British Labour is that an international appeal against the war plans in the Far East would find a positive response in America itself.

Senate Committee" is quoted: "Ninety-nine per cent of my mail urges that Americans be kept out of any more Asian wars, such as Korea or Indo-China."

A "midwestern Republican" is cited: "If we take troops into Indo-China, the Republicans might as well not even plan a campaign for the November elections."

A Wisconsin Republican—ob-

By  
**Joseph Keller**

viously not McCarthy, who is an agent of the war-promoting China Lobby and who backed Syngman Rhee's demand for continuation of the Korean War—said: "If war comes under this Administration, it could well be the end of the Republican Party."

According to U.S. News, "These are just samples. But they catch the main trend of the reaction that runs across the country. One Republican says he will have a tremendous selling job to do in his district if the U.S. should decide to send troops to Indo-China."

Last June a Gallop poll of nation-wide sentiment on sending troops to Indo-China showed a six-to-one opposition. By March 1954, the ratio of opposition stood at ten-to-one. Some 85 per cent. said "no" to intervening against

### Change of Address

Socialist Outlook address is now  
**177 Bermondsey Street,  
London, S.E.1**

All correspondence must be addressed to the **Editorial Board.**

**Indo-China in its revolutionary war for independence; only 8 per cent said "yes."**

It is true the capitalist politicians in the White House and of both parties in Congress must take into account these sentiments of the people, especially in an election year, but it must be borne in mind that the rulers of this country have no real respect for the feelings and opinions of the people.

In June, 1950, Truman, by a simple executive order without consultation of Congress, let alone the approval of the American people, dragged us into the most unpopular war in our history. Poll after poll, hundreds of thousands of pleading letters, showed the American people wanted "our boys brought home." But these appeals were brutally brushed aside.

### WHERE DANGER LIES

Eisenhower is just as capable of dragging us into another war in

Asia — an even worse one than Korea. There is nothing to stop him so far as Congress is concerned. If most of these Wall Street politicians in Congress had their way, American troops would have long since been wading knee-deep in blood in Indo-China.

The usually well-informed Washington columnist, of the New York Post, Robert Allen, reported: "Eisenhower has won support of top Republican and Democratic leaders of Congress for sending American troops to Indo-China — on one condition." The condition is that such intervention be given an international cover-up by the approval of the British and French imperialists.

Part of the propaganda build-up to sell the American people on Indo-China intervention will be to make them believe that "most of the fighting" will be done by other people, like the French or the Indo-Chinese themselves

However, the anti-war sentiment of the American people, as shown by their reaction to the threat of being pulled into the Indo-China war is a strong base to build on.

## U.S. Delegate says "Sorry!" But HE'S allright

**E**LEVEN members of the "Marshallese Congress Hold-Over Committee" and a hundred other citizens have petitioned the United Nations.

They allege that the populations of two radio-active atolls suffer from burns, lower blood count, falling out of hair and general nausea—all the after-effects of radio-activity resulting from the recent Hydrogen Bomb tests at Bikini and Eniwetok.

Further, they allege whole populations are being arbitrarily uprooted and transplanted in other islands to facilitate the experiments and tests on their former homes.

To this plea, the United States delegate to the United Nations replied that the government of the United States of America was "very sorry indeed". Some compensation!

# Statement by the new Editorial Board

**T**HE Editorial Board believes that if the Labour Party is to give the lead which its support among the working people lays on it as a duty, then it must have a thoroughly socialist, internationalist programme for a drive against capitalism at home, the repudiation of imperialism abroad, freedom for the colonies and a struggle against war.

It believes that the Labour Movement must firmly take sides with the historic revolution sweeping Asia and Africa and sweeping through the colonial and semi-colonial countries; Labour must take sides against the drive of the western capitalist nations to war on this revolution and the anti-capitalist countries of Eastern Europe, China and the Soviet Union.

Labour's policy must be independent, based solely on the interests of the working people of this country and their common bonds with the exploited peoples of other lands.

The foremost problem of the

world's working people—how to prevent war—will not be solved by meetings of statesmen from the Great Powers, above all, when they confer in secret, attempting to stabilise the status quo. The threatening horror of war, with its fearful atomic destruction; the constant eruption of the colonial struggle for freedom, will be ended only when the colonial peoples have driven out imperialism, and the major bastions of capitalism in the world have been removed.

The biggest contribution the Labour Movement can make to peace is to reassert its independent socialist policies both in home and foreign affairs as against those of the Tory Government and American Big Business. It must relate its activities to the goal it was built to achieve—the socialist goal of common ownership at home and an end to imperialism abroad.

Great tasks demand great principles. The "realists", those who seek to chain the movement to the politics of "expediency" only thereby help to prop up the old decayed system which today threatens to disintegrate into radio-active dust a large proportion of humanity.

A great responsibility rests on

the working people and their organisations in Europe and America. Without their action the Third World War will not be prevented, without their help to the colonial peoples, imperialism will not be eradicated.

What is needed above all else is socialist leadership. The question of working-class leadership is the most important in the modern world. Under men bound up with the old order, refusing to break with the capitalist parties and strike out for the formation of an independent, Labour Party (America); under men striving to compromise with capitalism, fearful of measures against it, or timid men going along with it in its drive to war and colonial suppression; under these leaderships the great potential of the working people is imprisoned and they are split across frontiers, and inside them, with sections confused, bewildered and overcome by the apparent immensity of their tasks.

By adopting a consistent socialist programme and fighting for it tenaciously the Labour Party in Britain would release once again the spirit of self-sacrifice and courage which drove forth the best of the pioneers to build up

the workers organisations amidst the greatest difficulties. It would set an example to the world working-class movements and provide a new rallying centre for the international struggle against world capitalism.

"Socialist Outlook" was formed to help the fight in the Labour Party for just such a programme. The task which it carried forward from its inception and for which it gained support and sacrifice from its readers was to make its own independent contribution to the leftward development of the Labour Movement. The desire of its supporters has been shown that this contribution should be courageous, consistent and principled.

In the past "Socialist Outlook" was not afraid to swim against the stream. Such was its position on the outbreak of the Korean war, when it warned the Labour Movement against supporting an action under the flag of the United Nations which had as its aim the bolstering of imperialism and corrupt puppet governments in the Far East. "Socialist Outlook" opposed the intervention in Korea. Its stand then has been abundantly justified.

On the other hand, it welcomed, and must continue to welcome enthusiastically, and unify every step which is taken by the movement or tendencies within it, towards a struggle against capitalism, against its colonial policies and its drive to war. But, while supporting all partial, and even hesitating, steps of the movement toward the left it cannot give up its right to pose the need for a consistent programme, socialist and internationalist through and through. It is the fight for such a programme which alone justifies its existence.

The Editorial Board asks for increased support from readers of the paper and shareholders to carry forward the task for which our paper was created — that of aiding the development of the Labour Movement to a position where it can play its full part in the struggle for Socialism. We urge every supporter to increase contributions to the Fighting Fund, to build up their sales.

For our part we intend to the best of our ability to keep the paper a lively, fighting, principled organ worthy of the great tasks it must perform.

## CONSTRUCTIONAL ENGINEERING UNION

### Increased Wage Application

Mass meetings are to be held in every division in the country in connection with the union's claim. Members will be advised through the press and by other methods when they are taking place.

Jack Stanley,  
General Secretary, C.E.U.

# S.E. Asia Alliance

## Goes Ahead!

By Bill Hunter

**P**RESIDENT EISENHOWER recently stated that the South-East Asia Alliance—described by Aneurin Bevan as the military and diplomatic encirclement of China—was in the process of formation. Despite the diplomatic evasions of Selwyn Lloyd and Winston Churchill when pressed by Labour M.P.s in the House of Commons, it is clear that Eisenhower revealed the truth.

Tory Government spokesmen stated first, some weeks ago, they were only "examining" the possibility of a N.A.T.O. type pact in the Far East. Journalists, such as Mr. Percy Cudlip in the "News Chronicle", denounced Aneurin Bevan for irresponsibility in opposing a South East Asia Alliance when it had not been decided to bring it into being. Truth is, however, that it was not the Alliance itself that was being examined, that aim had already been fixed. What was being examined was—how to bring it into being.

In his statement to the Commons last Tuesday Churchill admitted that negotiations were taking place around the question of this Far East pact. These negotiations between the Western powers, between Britain and America and the Asian "neutral" countries are taking place with the purpose of laying the foundation of this prop for colonialism in Asia—as are the forthcoming meetings of the Chiefs of Staff of Britain, the United States, France, Australia and New Zealand to discuss South East Asia.

After Churchill spoke last Tuesday, the impression was created by the press that the plans for the South East Asia Alliance had, in any case, been dropped until after Geneva. Churchill stated that until the outcome of the Geneva parleys there would be no final decision on this Far East pact. But it is clear the plans for it continue to be put into operation. In fact Geneva is part of those plans.

Having failed to concert a "united will" of capitalist nations for immediate intervention in Indo-China and a drive against China, American Big Business is striving for a settlement in Indo-China which would "contain communism" and give it a breathing space to continue the build-up of forces in the Far East. It hopes also to involve as many allies as possible in the guaranteeing of a settlement which is bound to blow up sooner or later.

As James Reston wrote in the "New York Times," on May 15th; "If the United States is to intervene in Indo-China it clearly wants to intervene with as many allies as possible."

Washington seeks, first of all, to involve Britain. The British Government, for its part, helps in the attempt to involve Asian Governments—so far not very suc-

### More Arrests in Greece

**T**HE youngest brother of Tony Ambatielos—Nikos—has been arrested in Greece. Nikos Ambatielos was imprisoned by the Nazis and only freed when they withdrew from Greece in October, 1944. In 1946 he was called into the army and, after a few months sent to the infamous Makronosis camp for "political unreliable" soldiers. He was one of the 100 men from this camp who were court-martialled in February, 1948 after incidents in the camp when the guards shot many soldiers dead. At the court-martial he was one of twelve sentenced to death.

Later, the death sentences were commuted to life imprisonment and then reduced to ten years. A year ago he was released. Now he has been re-arrested.

### Ourselves and Contributors

Signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the Editorial Board, even when written by Editorial Board members themselves.

cessfully. That can be seen from the reports on the exchanges between the United Kingdom High Commission and the Indian Ministry for Home Affairs.

"These consultations" reported Philip Deane in last Sunday's "Observer", "have established that India would oppose any South-East Asian military arrangement—were it designed only to prevent a breach of a possible Indo-China settlement—if both sides were not parties to that arrangement."

Now India is being asked

#### NEW "SOCIALIST OUTLOOK" EDITORIAL BOARD APPOINTED

At its first meeting held on Sunday, May 16th, the management committee of the Labour Publishing Society, Ltd., elected the following to the Editorial Board of "Socialist Outlook": Jack Stanley, W. Hunter, G. Healy, T. Mercer. In addition, M. Banda will act as a co-opted member.

The management committee also adopted proposals for increasing the paper's circulation and building up the fighting fund. These will be elaborated in future issues.

whether "she will side with the Western view that such a military arrangement, signed by both sides should come into operation immediately a characterised aggression has occurred, and without further consultation between the two opposing sides."

That means a commitment to military activity immediately an "aggression" as defined by Washington takes place. The Indian Government resists that.

What negotiation the British Government have entered into do not involve any commitments declared Winston Churchill. That is quite true, insofar as India and other Far Eastern nations are concerned, but that is no wish of the British or American capitalist governments who have been wooing them. It is the Governments of these Far Eastern countries, under the pressure of mass opposition to involvement in colonial suppression, who have so far resisted the plans of American Big Business and its junior partners.

The South-East Asia Alliance is not being "examined", it is being prepared. It is all the more urgent that the Labour Movement makes crystal clear an opposition to the plans for the defence of colonial interests in the Far East and the regaining of territories lost to imperialist exploitation.

## Spotlight on Old Age

By Bernard Dix

**T**ODAY, after many years of struggle, the whole structure of old age, or retirement, pensions is becoming unstable and could quite easily be demolished. The reasons for this situation are two quite distinct sets of circumstances which demand a fairly close examination.

When the Beveridge Plan was produced in 1942 it established one very important principle—that principle was that the benefits paid, in this case the old age pension, should be sufficient to meet a minimum standard of life by providing sufficient money for food, clothing, housing and so on. This principle was rejected by the Coalition Government of the time on the grounds that it would mean constantly adjusting the rates of benefit to meet increases in the cost of living—in other words the principle was prostrated before the administrative difficulties; readers may perhaps remember that when the Coalition Government adopted this attitude there was a revolt by Labour back-benchers in the House of Commons who entered the division lobbies against the Bill while the Party leadership who were holding office in the Coalition supported the Bill.

However, the Labour Government which took office after the war took steps to establish the principle which had been rejected by the Coalition Government and inserted into the National Insurance Act the Section 40 which implied the acceptance of providing a minimum standard. This was provided for by ensuring that every five years the Government Actuary has to report on the working of the scheme and, upon receipt of this report, the Minister of National Insurance must review the rates of benefits in relation to the existing circumstances.

Five years is an extremely long period and one in which prices and the cost of living can rocket sky-high—thus reducing the real value of the old age pension. What in fact has happened in recent years bears this out quite clearly; between 1947 and 1951 the cost of living, according to the official index, rose by 25 per cent.—the old age pension for a married couple was 42/- in 1948 and it remained static until 1951 when it went up to 50/-, and this was only

the case if the couple were already drawing the pension in 1951—those receiving it for the first time in that year still received the 42/-.

In 1952 the pension was increased to 54/- at which level it has remained, but in the two years 1952-53 the cost of living has increased by 12 per cent. This all means that the standard of living of the old aged couples has in fact been reduced and that the established principle of maintaining a minimum standard has remained, to a very large degree, a paper myth.

#### THE AGEING POPULATION

The second problem related to old age pensions is something entirely different. For many years the population of Great Britain, as a whole, has been getting older—and it has been doing so for two reasons. Since about 1880 the birth rate in Britain has been steadily falling, in the seventy years following 1880 the birth rate per thousand of the population dropped from 35.4 to 16.2—a decline of over fifty per cent. But at the same time, due to the advancement of medical science and the provision of higher standards of sanitation, the number of deaths per thousand of the population has fallen from 20.8 to 11.0—a decline of a little less than fifty per cent.

Boiled down to simple terms it means that whereas one hundred years ago there were 13 persons of working age for each old person today there are only 6, and what is even more important it means that in 25 years time there will be only 3—it means that, even at the present rate of benefit, there will be an annual deficit of £417 million in the insurance fund by 1978!

#### WHAT ARE THE SOLUTIONS?

At the Labour Party Conference last year an amendment from the floor of the conference was carried which strengthens, to a large degree, the policy outlined in "Challenge to Britain." It is now recognised Labour Party policy that benefits must be maintained in the face of rising costs of living and that there will be an annual review in order that the value of the

## Means Test For Landlords?

**T**HE Tory Minister of Housing and Local Government is most disturbed that some local authorities have had the temerity to reject applications by opulent landlords for grants to improve housing accommodation. A means test for old age pensioners or for unemployed workers is very moral—but to consider the assets of landlords or housing trust is an offence against decent standards.

Under the 1949 Housing Act, Local Authorities may make grants to owners of property provided the improvements conform to certain financial limits. Some Labour Authorities considered that landlords with considerable assets could easily afford to improve their property from the rent received and there was no reason to make grants the burden of which, in part, fell on the rate payers.

Lambeth, one of the authorities which consider applications in this light, rejected an application last year by the Church Commissions for a grant. Their assets were then over 146 millions, the income from rents alone was nearly £2 million and the Council, although prepared to assist with a loan, would not agree to a grant. The Tories, months later are still highly indignant at the Council's decision—but not so much as the Tory Minister of Housing and Local Government.

A new circular No. 36/54 has recently been issued which expresses vehement opposition to "such methods"—and the Minister must say quite plainly that a

refusal to entertain any application, or the imposition of a means test (my emphasis D. F.) which has no sanction in the Act, can only lay a local authority open to increasing criticism from their constituents as the provisions of the grants are made more widely known"....

Why the Minister attempts to convey the impression that there will be "increasing criticism" from the "constituents" is very puzzling because in the same circular he almost admits that the representations made to him have been by the owners of property. "Representations have been made to the Minister that many applications have been rejected out of hand not because they were defective in themselves but because the local authority concerned were reluctant in principle to make grants, particularly where they had any reason to believe that the applicant was financially able to do the work without one."

Once again the Tory government has expressed very clearly how perturbed it is at the sorry plight of large landlords. There must never be a means test for wealthy organisations, sometimes with millions of pounds. The people are not expected to query expenditure

by the authorities to help the landlords. But how different is the Tory attitude to tenants, millions of whom will be expected once the Rents and Repairs Bill becomes law, to pay more in rents—whether they are "financially able" or not.

The Minister admits that local authorities cannot be instructed under the 1949 Act. The question however is posed to Labour authorities should they implement that part of the circular "Obligation on local authorities to consider application, without regard to the financial resources of applicants"?

In my opinion, while sympathetically considering applications from the small landlord or the owner-occupier, local authorities should subject the larger landlords to a consideration of their means—and, if necessary, to investigate the application in public. Many workers will gain useful information not only as to the income received by their landlord but as to how the properties have been neglected in the interest of the best financial returns. It should not be the responsibility of local authorities to reward owners for neglecting properties.

Labour should adhere to its policy of municipal ownership of all rented properties as the answer to problems arising from the private ownership of rented property.

### 'Sanity' in Warfare!

**W**HAT our age needs is not so much permanent peace, which is unobtainable, and perhaps not wholly desirable, but sanity in its wars." The words are those of Sir George Thompson, the famous nuclear physicist. He was speaking to the International Press Institute at Vienna on May 13th.

Sir George Thompson is a great and distinguished scientist but evidently an utterly bankrupt authority on the needs of hundreds of millions of the world's more humble citizens.

The destructive power of military science has expanded to such terrible limits that mankind now stands on the brink of nightmare barbarism. Capitalism has proceeded inexorably to expand the ability of military science to slaughter, maim and destroy. War has become total war. Now Sir George wants to place limits on it. Let us stop the development of the weapons of war right where they were before the hydrogen and the cobalt bomb, let us return to sanity in warfare, he cries.

"For attacks on war factories and use in the field, the atomic bomb is ample" he said. Perhaps, however, that is stretching the limits of sanity a little too far. "Indeed, even (!) this is wastefully powerful" he hastily added.

"So far", he told the Press Institute "more powerful weapons had not really increased the destruction caused by war; nothing in the last two wars was as bad as Germany's sufferings during the Thirty Years War."

But it is precisely Sir George's prospect—bleak as it is—which is unattainable. It is impossible to put the clock back, to have a war not "pushed to the last extremity." There is no greater comment on Sir George's foolishness than to point out that even while he called for a return to "sane" warfare his abilities continue to be used by capitalism to extend war's destruction.

War cannot be caged in Queensbury rules nor the rules of Sir George Thompson. War itself must be ended. That, however, is a social problem and one which Sir George, whatever degrees and honours he has earned by his brilliance in physics, is wholly incapable of solving. Permanent peace is certainly unobtainable under capitalism, forced on to the road of war to defend its colonial exploitation, and to find markets and spheres of investment for its surpluses. Today the spectre of war arises from the fundamental conflict which exists between the decaying capitalist system and the planned societies in the East.

Socialism would end war by ending capitalism.

R. Pennington

pension in real terms may be determined.

On the second problem the issue is not presented so clearly and "Challenge to Britain" talks of encouraging employers to give greater opportunities for older people to remain at work—what exactly does this mean? It could mean that when the employers have thus been encouraged to allow older people to remain at work the age at which pensions are paid would be raised—thus a worker could not retire until he reached perhaps the age of seventy. This would be indeed a retrograde step.

The problem of finding the resources to meet the needs of the old people cannot be abstracted from the political and economic

Continued on page 4

## L.P.S. Shareholders Meet

**T**HE Sixth Annual General Meeting of the Labour Publishing Society, Ltd., was held in London, on Saturday, May 15th. It was the best attended shareholders' meeting in the history of the Society, and in itself a splendid demonstration of the growth of influence of the "Socialist Outlook". Shareholders were in attendance from practically all the major cities in the country.

The arrangements for this meeting were decided by the outgoing management committee on April 3rd, and during the five weeks up to the meeting a lively discussion took place among shareholders around the paper. Several meetings were organised by groups of shareholders to ventilate different viewpoints right up to the last days prior to the meeting.

It was a great demonstration of democratic procedure, which forms the bedrock of all that is best in the Labour Movement.

The chairman, Jack Stanley, opened the meeting and he was followed by reports from the Secretary, Mr. T. Mercer, and Treasurer, Mr. T. Braddock, and

the editor of the "Socialist Outlook", Mr. J. Lawrence.

The audited statement of the accounts covering the past year was unanimously accepted. Following the Editor's report, Councillor J. Goffe moved a resolution as follows:—

"This Annual General Meet-

ing endorses the Editorial Report and consequently repudiates attacks made in articles (such as that by G. Healy entitled "John Lawrence and the struggle against German Re-armament") and contributions against the editorial policy of the paper."

This was defeated by 287 votes to 213.

### John Lawrence Resigns

**J**OHAN LAWRENCE is no longer the Editor of the "Socialist Outlook." The Annual General Meeting of the "Outlook's" shareholders rejected by 287 votes to 213 his editorial report in which he outlined his idea of the role and future policy of the paper. Under these circumstances, John Lawrence felt obliged to decline nomination to the new Management Committee and to resign as editor, believing that those whose political ideas were endorsed by a majority of the shareholders should now take full responsibility for running the "Socialist Outlook."

His resignation has been accepted by the Management Committee.

The meeting elected a new management committee. Jack Stanley, the retiring chairman proposed, as chairman for the coming year, Harry Ratner, well-known Manchester engineering shop steward and Editor of the "Textile Machinery Worker". He was elected without opposition. The meeting went on to elect the following officials unopposed, supporters of Cllr. Goffe's motion declining nomination.

Vice-chairman ..... G. Ellis  
Secretary ..... Cllr. T. Mercer  
Treasurer ..... Jack Stanley

The seven other members of the management committee elected were: Dan Brandon, (Birkenhead), Cllr. D. Finch, (London), Cllr. H. Finch, (Birmingham), G. Healy, (London), Cllr. W. Hunter, (London), R. Pennington, (Leeds), and Cllr. D. Smith, (Edinburgh).

# Engineers Want An Increase

## A Warning on Wage Structures

By Cllr. Harry Finch

THE National Committee of the A.E.U. decided to go forward with negotiations for a new wages structure. The decision was not well received by militant engineers in the workshops. Negotiations on a new wages structure will be long and drawn out. The fact that it was adopted at the National Committee as against the demand for a straight increase was received with jubilation by the press as being a victory for a "responsible" approach to the wages problem.

The President, Bro. Openshaw,

### A.E.S.D.'s Claim Rejected

THE engineering employers recently offered the Association of Engineering and Shipbuilding Draughtsmen a flat increase for their members of 8/6d. per week. This was less favourable than an increase granted by the ship-building employers as a result of parallel negotiations.

The Executive Committee of the union held a referendum of all branches. The answers were overwhelmingly in favour of positive action to gain more from the engineering employers. Suggestions for action ranged from the imposition of an overtime embargo, token strikes, one-day stoppages to a total strike.

The Draughtsmen's leadership has now instructed its branches to approach the employers individually for a wage increase. In any subsequent action they will have the full backing of the E.C.

warned the National Committee against a course which would only invoke bitter opposition from the employers. But, precisely any demand for an increase will invoke that opposition, in a period of increasing competition for markets. Surely, our task is to realise that and prepare for it. It is right that we have an increase and all our rights were won in the face of bitter opposition.

### EMPLOYER'S HAND STRENGTHENED

The rejection of the demand for a straight increase strengthens the hand of the employers. To go forward for a new wages structure can be a good thing, but it is not an alternative to a demand for an increase in wages.

Negotiations for the new wages structure will give the employers infinite opportunities for delaying tactics. In fact the possibility exists that it will be the employers who, by offering a little in the new structure, will gain a lot. The engineering workers will want a new structure to raise varying rates to that of the best. Employers for their part are quite prepared to have a new wages structure if thereby they can sectionalise the industry and increase their bargaining power.

### ISSUE PUT CLEARLY

This was put clearly in an article in the April issue of the "Times Review of Industry":

"The present structure" it declared, "embraces a wide range of industries, all in some way meriting the title 'engineering.'" There is no reason in logic or practice why these widely varying industries should be bound together, for some may be in need of labour while others are adequately

manned, some may be enjoying a boom while others face a slump. There are already excellent reasons, apart from that of its excessive influence on the general wage pattern, why the engineering industry's structure should be broken up into appropriate segments."

### BOLD LEADERSHIP NEEDED

In putting forward the demand for a new structure the unions must not fall into the trap of creating too many grades of workers! The aim of the union is to simplify the structure and not to add to its complications nor to disperse its power into sectional agreements.

Some members of the union appear to believe that by pressing for a new wages structure we can get an increase by the back door.

But the employers are not fools. If they decide to resist wages increases then they will not be manoeuvred into them by attempts to catch them napping.

As the negotiations over this new wages structure drag on it is certain that the demand for a wage increase will grow in face of the still rising cost of living. Now, instead of the whole weight of the union being brought to bear workers in the individual factories will be faced with the task of attempting to get the best they can from their employers. The union then must give them full backing.

I may be wrong in thinking that a majority of engineers want a new wage demand, but I doubt it. The answer could be found easily, of course—by a referendum of branches.

We need a bold leadership and a bold policy. On the wages question the National Committee gave neither. In effect, it capitulated to the employers before the fight has begun. The rank and file must reverse this dangerous trend.

# A King Steps Out . . .

By Geo. Andrews

MR. EVELYN MANSFIELD KING, a former Junior Minister in the Labour Government, wrote to Mr. Attlee last week resigning from the Labour Party.

The main reason he gave was that the party was not able to deal with "Bevanism". Mr. King puts the demand of the Labour rank and file for left wing policies in the same category as the witch-hunting anti-labour movement around Senator McCarthy, the American Hitler.

"Bevanism", he wrote to Mr. Attlee "ought to be regarded with

the same instinctive revulsion that I, and I think probably you, regard McCarthyism in America."

He attacks those who want to "conserve the views of forty years ago." No serious Labour Party member would want the Labour Party not to relate its policy to the great changes that have taken place in the world over forty years. But here Mr. King expresses his revulsion towards those who resist the liquidation of the independent socialist principles which are as vital to the Labour Party as they were four and five decades ago.

Mr. Attlee replied to the ex-Junior Minister. However, the important thing about the reply was it met King on his own ground. Phrases in it showed Mr. Attlee in substantial agreement with the man who was deserting the party and attacking those within it. The only difference appeared to be that Mr. Attlee thought what he named as the "so-called" Left Wing were being dealt with.

Mr. Attlee's remarks on party democracy are worth thinking over. "I am quite at a loss to understand your suggestion that the Labour Party Conference is undemocratic and increasingly appears as an annual appeal to the unwise by the unscrupulous, which annually succeeds," he wrote, and continued:

"In fact, it always sensibly

# SANT-STURGESS STRIKE

By Our Industrial Reporter

ONE-HUNDREDA-N-D-THIRTY workers employed at Sant-Sturgess, Ltd., Park Royal, Acton, have been on strike since April the 28th. They are members of six unions.

The dispute arose when the firm declared a number of workers redundant including the chairman and three members of the works' committee. The management refused to meet union officials before the expiration of the notices. With no alternative, under such circumstances, the workers downed tools.

All members on strike were dismissed by the firm. Some were informed that, despite the fact that they had absented themselves from work, they could return. However, the management stated "... the factory does not undertake to employ only union labour and will be what is commonly known as an open shop."

Other union members in the company's employ not affected

directly by the redundancy but faced with the open shop ultimatum, came out on strike on April 28th.

The strike is recognised as official by all the unions involved. It is the third to take place on the Park Royal Estate in a year on the question of redundancy, declares the statement of the strike committee. However, it is the first time redundancy has been declared in a closed shop while the firm was requesting excessive overtime. Donations should be sent to A. Bowden, Faraday Hall, Horn Lane, Acton.

## The Nurses Charter

ONLY 30 years ago the Board of Guardians in Kingston told protesting nurses that they were "their rulers and masters." There is still a long way to go before nurses get the conditions they deserve. The T.U.C. and the unions which organise health-service workers have set a target. Every nurse in a union and a new deal for them all.

The five points of the T.U.C. Charter call for the implementation of the 48-hour week and recognition of hours worked in excess; easier transfer from one branch to another; removal of all military discipline and restrictions; the carrying out of the Ministry of Health's circular on accommodation for nursing staff; and abolition of compulsory sleeping-in for non-resident staff.

Achievement can be swift if nurses unite to act. And they can count on the backing of millions of organised workers in every profession, trade, craft and industry, all of whom have a vested interest in getting the best possible service from the hospitals.

Leaflets explaining how trade unions can help are being distributed in thousands. These remind the nurses that what were merely aims in the 1937 T.U.C. Charter for Nurses are today accepted conditions of work—thanks to trade union action.

Now comes the time for a fresh advance to conditions that nurses deserve.

turns down the kind of nonsense that is put up."

We can only conclude from that, if a party conference fails to turn down what Mr. Attlee views as "nonsense", then in his eyes it will cease to be democratic. A view of democracy which the party's rank and file certainly do not share with Mr. Attlee.

Mr. King declared that perhaps the Labour Party "like the Liberal Party will wither away." We can assure him that it won't wither away because he has left it, nor because, as he opines, "few useful functions are left to it which it is willing or able to perform".

The Labour Party has still its basic function to carry out—the achievement of the common ownership of society's productive forces and the elimination of the exploitation of man by man. For the inspiration engendered by that goal the Labour Party could afford to trade any number of Mr. Kings.

## DURHAM MINERS DEFEND RIGHT TO STRIKE

NEARLY 1,800 miners from Whitburn Colliery, County Durham, at a mass meeting held on Sunday May 16th, turned down the N.C.B.'s proposal that they pay off the Coal Board's claim for £63,000 damages by working extra shifts.

The claim for damages was lodged against the miners by the N.C.B. following a stoppage at the colliery last February. Over 1,800 miners struck because they objected to the "tyrannical and bullying attitude" of a fore-overman.

Miners from Harton and Wesco also supported the strike.

Mr. James Edmondson, their secretary said after the meeting: "that the decision to reject the Coal Board's proposal to do extra shifts instead of paying up to £21 per head was unanimous."

The men were also informed at the meeting of what occurred at the previous week's secret meeting between the local Mineworkers' Federation Board and the N.C.B. officials.

# THIS MARG RACKET

IT looks like butter, spreads like butter, tastes like butter, but it isn't butter! This wonderful, new, golden teatime spread is MARGARINE! A number of Margarine manufacturers are spelling this newly improved product in capital letters and British housewives, having recently been bombarded with new "wonderful" detergents, are now to be the target of another advertisers' ramp.

In the course of the next few weeks, hundreds of thousands of pounds will be spent on a colossal advertising campaign—in the press, on the hoardings, in the shop windows, through the letter boxes.

Twenty-eight margarine companies are competing one against the other for the biggest market—and the biggest profit. One of the foremost in this competitive battle is none other than the familiar firm of "wash tub fame"—Unilevers. Advertising costs of course be obligingly met by the housewives, it will be added to the price of the goods.

The main aim of the marg. magnates is not, as they try to kid us, the provision of better quality food for the housewife and family, but bigger and better profits for the Kings of Marg. The biggest margarine manufacturing company is the Co-op, and willy nilly it will be dragged into the competitors' battle, competing with all the other concerns for the biggest market. But a wonderful opportunity presents itself to the co-op



It's the housewife who pays for the margarine advertising war.

movement to expose completely the racket which is going on.

This terrific advertising campaign by 28 different margarine companies is directed at the working-class population of Britain. With all its resources the co-op could show the proper place of such ersatz products as margarine in helping to solve the world food problem. Instead of battering away with all its might at the co-op housewives, the co-op should direct its attention further afield also. To the native population of Africa for instance, where the nuts are grown from which the oil for margarine manufacture is obtained. Here the people are so poor, that although they produce the raw materials, they can't afford the finished produce to spread on their bread, if they're lucky enough to get any bread. Ironical isn't it?

What a golden opportunity for the co-op, to assist in the development of an industry which would supply both work and food where they are badly needed—on the basis of mutual co-operation.

The manufacture of synthetic food products to supplement real shortages of natural foods and to alleviate the wretched conditions of a starving population is one thing—but when synthetic foods are produced purely and simply

from the profit motive then the whole racket must be exposed.

There is an assured sale of hundreds of tons of marg. per week because an ever-increasing number of working-class housewives now have no alternative but to buy marg. instead of fresh butter. Butter is not in short supply, but the housekeeping money is.

The Tory Government's policy of lifting controls, resulting in the fabulous increases in the price of butter from 3/8d. to 4/8d. per lb. with further increases to follow, has been a boon to the marg. men. For working-class families it means back to the '30s—bread and marg. For the old-age-pensioner, and others dependent on social insurance benefits, it means: not the marg. which "looks like butter, spreads like butter, tastes like butter" at 2/2d. per lb. nor even the "marg. with a buttery flavour" at 1/9d. per lb. for them it will be the "marg. which should be used generously for cooking" at 1/4d. per lb.—scraped on to the bread, with perhaps a little "best" marg. on Sundays.

But the Manufacturers will be happy, they have an assured market and profits will soar. Could not some of this surplus be dispersed in wage increases or to help the long suffering O.A.P.s. Oh no! The margarine manufacturers depend for their existence on the making of better and bigger profits and if the pensioners had an increased pension, who knows, they might buy butter! Perish the thought! We must keep a market for marg.

If, however, margarine is as good as the producers say, why doesn't it appear on the tables of the rich, why do they prefer the natural product? Could it be that fresh dairy butter is so much more palatable and appears to refined taste, something the worker doesn't possess of course, he is no connoisseur of delectable dishes.

How to stop the margarine racket?

Clear out of Westminster the people who support and encourage the money grabbers, who are themselves part of the racket. Let's have some socialist planning of the production and distribution of food.

Mrs. M. Shaw

## + WORLD NEWS + in Brief

PEURTO RICA, the United States colony in the Caribbean, has one doctor for every 250,000 inhabitants. New York has one for every 250. Puerto Rica's infant mortality rate is two-and-a-half times higher than that of the U.S.

IN NYASALAND, total government expenditure on Education in 1951 was £248,000 or approximately 2/- per head of the population per year. In Britain, the government expenditure on education works out at slightly less than £6 per head per year.

"LEED'S WEEKLY CITIZEN", official organ of the Leed's Labour Party, in its edition of May 9th, did not report one word of Aneurin Bevan's speech made five days earlier at a May Day demonstration called by the Labour Party and Trade Unions.

BRITISH INDUSTRY now pays little more than one-third of what it did before the introduction of the "De-Rating" Act in 1929 although its profits have trebled since then.

MOSCOW RADIO recently announced the re-introduction of the death penalty for murder. Progress?

THE AMERICAN C.I.O. Textile Workers' Union President announced on the eve of the union's biennial conference "in two years total employment in the textile industry has declined from 1,300,000 to a little more than 900,000."

THE HOUSING REPAIRS AND RENTS ACT was amended in committee. Clause 31, as amended, now means that six months after the new bill becomes law, dwellings belonging to Charitable Housing Trusts and "non-profit making" Housing Associations will no longer come under the Rents Acts. Tenants then can be subjected to rent increases without any statutory limit and can, if the landlord so desires, be evicted. A "non-profit making" Housing Association is defined in the 1936 Act as one which limits the rate of interest on its capital to "the rate for the time being prescribed

by the Treasury." Present rate is 5 per cent.

IN CAIRO last week, Lieutenant-Colonel Anwar Sadat, a member of the Egyptian Revolutionary Command, said that the "lesson given to the French in Indo-China was a lesson that must also be taught to Britain.

SOUTH KOREA went to the polls on May 20th in an election to the National Assembly. A supporter of the opposition to President Rhee's Liberal Party died after being interrogated by the police. Two independent candidates were arrested while making election speeches. One was charged with violating the national security law, a charge which carries the death penalty. At least fifty campaign organisers have been detained by the police for alleged offences. The chairman of the National Assembly complained that police pressure was being used to urge electors to support the Liberals. ("Manchester Guardian", May 17th).

B.P.

Is the "SOCIALIST OUTLOOK" in your Local Library?

If not—ASK FOR IT!

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.

# Labour's Policy For Transport

## Comments on the N.E.C. Pamphlet

NO other British industry has been the subject of so much political controversy as transport. The recently published Labour policy pamphlet "British Transport" traces this controversy from 1844, when Parliament passed a bill giving the Government powers to acquire the railways, until the present day when the battle of public ownership has still to be won.

Many things are restated in this pamphlet about transport history which are well worth bringing to the fore now. For instance the fact that such was the opposition to the building of railways at all by the landed gentry, and such was the price extorted for land, that the English railways were the most expensive to build in the World, costing £64,000 per mile compared with £21,000 for Prussia and £13,000 for America. Railwaymen and the travelling public are suffering today for these extortions.

★

Despite the 1844 Act no Government was bold enough to nationalise the railways although in both World Wars the Governments took over the railways and operated them as a national concern. In 1914 over 200 railway companies were taken over but in 1939 the Government had to deal with only 4 main line companies and London Transport, due to the compulsory amalgamations which took place in 1923. No Tory Government was prepared to go further in spite of the statement of Churchill in 1918 that "the Government's policy is the nationalisation of the railways." It was only successive Labour Governments which made any serious attempts to raise order out of the transport chaos.

In 1929 Labour initiated the London Passenger Transport Board before which public travel in the Metropolis was the paradise of "pirate enterprise." The history of this progressive step mutilated as it was by the Tory-controlled L.C.C. is told in the N.E.C. pamphlet. It is, however, the greater challenge of Labour with which the pamphlet is mainly concerned, the passing of the Transport Act in 1947, against which Churchill assembled all his battery of bombast. The Tories were defeated then but Churchill had his chance in 1951 and when he assumed office he led the Tories in the work of sabotage.

★

Was Labour right to nationalise? Must Transport pay its way? What will be Labour's policy when it returns to power? The policy pamphlet gives the answer of the Labour Party N.E.C. on these questions.

There can surely be little argument about the correctness of the nationalisation of transport. Even the financiers of the railways and the owners of the lorries received tender treatment by the Labour Government.

The ex-shareholders received almost pound for pound shares in British Transport and the shares were to be guaranteed stock, the first call on the Transport Commission's finances.

Thus the N.E.C. points out in

### Gaitskell versus Burma

MR. HUGH GAITSKELL, speaking at Ampthill, Beds. last Saturday night declared: "I see no reason why we in the Labour Party should be opposed in principle to a regional security pact for South-East Asia. The general idea is fully in keeping with our foreign policy for the past twenty-five years. "We must face up to the danger of Chinese Communist imperialism pushing southwards through Indo-China and Siam to Burma on the one side, and Malaya and Indonesia on the other."

A Reuter despatch from Rangoon on May 15th reported that Burma had told the United States she was not interested in any proposed South-East Asia defence alliance.

the first 5 years of nationalisation the shareholders took £222 million out of a total revenue of £2,860 million as interest, a further £16 million being paid over for capital redemption, which is a sort of final payment, to some of the shareholders.

The policy pamphlet states that it is an "illusion that efficiency is synonymous with profitability". But is not this exactly the cornerstone on which the Transport Act was built? This was Labour's biggest mistake in Transport, but has the lesson been learned? By Railwaymen, yes! but by the N.E.C., no!

The N.U.R. has repeatedly stated its opposition to the crippling burden of the shareholders in-

By

Ernest Jones

terest and called for the scaling down of the suspension of the interest charges, but the N.E.C. proposes no such policy in the new Labour Government. In spite of the damning case which the pamphlet itself presents against the interest charges and their crippling effect on the industry, it remains silent about future policy on this question. One can only assume that the policy will remain as before, the yearly handout of £44 millions to spivs.

★

That British Transport has proved more efficient than the old set-up is shown in the policy pamphlet by an impressive statement of facts. More total freight was carried in 1952 than in 1948 or any pre-war year, and this with less men, fewer locomotives and 100,000 less wagons. Empty running of wagons has been curtailed, paper work cut down, unnecessary offices shut down and all to produce a more efficient transport service. In 1952 economy measures totalled £½ million and the efficiency drive continues, the Transport Commission aiming to save a total of £16½ million by new economy measures during the next few years.

Pity the poor railwaymen therefore as he is being speeded up, streamlined, and shoved around generally and all for less and less

pay. This is the great human failure of nationalised transport. Economies and efficiency drives are no doubt necessary but this is far from bringing greater well-being, security and happiness to the working people which is surely the aim of socialism.

★

No nationalised industry can be said to have succeeded if it has failed to improve the workers lot. In the N.E.C. pamphlet three paragraphs are devoted to the acknowledged improvements in the working conditions attained under British Road Services, but about the conditions under which ½ million railwaymen must work, there is silence. Is it too much to expect the N.E.C. to inject a little humanity into its policy statements? There is no point in us being a Labour Party if we simply set out to make capitalism more efficient, our job is rather to fight for the rights of working people and for a better life in every sense of the term. Right at the forefront of the Labour programme for Transport should be the demand that it gives a square deal for its workers. In fact every nationalised industry should be a model of good workers conditions and wages, not the reverse.

### German Re-armament

#### Private Meeting

(admission free)

Restricted to G.M.C. members of Labour Parties in London and Middlesex.

Holborn Hall (Grays Inn Rd.) Saturday, 29th May at 2.15 p.m.

Further particulars and copies of the Statement of the Case Against German Re-armament from Holborn and St. Pancras South C.L.P., 169 Hampstead Road, London, N.W.1.

EUSTON 2540

# Youth Wants Socialist Policy

WE often hear repeated by Labour Leaders that very true statement — *The Labour Party need the Youth.* Some of the more daring ones even go so far as to assure us (as if we weren't already too well aware) that a party without Youth is a party without a future.

This year's National Conference of the Labour Party League of Youth showed a decline in League branches from 538 in 1953 to 384 in 1954. As some branches have been formed during the past 12 months, the number which has really gone out of existence is appreciably more than the 154 which these figures show. We must also realise that many branches consist of half a dozen or fewer members. The L.O.Y. members know well enough and so also do the Left Wing of the adult Party that a REAL CRISIS exists in Labour's present Youth Section.

### LET'S BE HONEST

We are told that the Youth today are "apathetic" and too concerned with having a good time to bother with politics. It would be much more honest for the Labour Party to admit that the fault lies within itself. Young people cannot be attracted and inspired by policies expressed at present at the top of the Party.

Young people will not flock in their thousands to support Conscripted, South-East Asia pacts and re-armament of Germany and the Western World.

It is our job to present a bold attractive policy to the Youth. Firstly, we must launch an all-out attack on Conscripted. British

lad's are called up for two years, their jobs and home life are disrupted. This is done under the pretext of defence of Britain and the "democratic way of life." To defend Britain, they are sent to Egypt, Germany, Malaya, Kenya, British Guiana, etc. We ally ourselves with Sygman Rhee, Bao Dai, Chiang Kai Shek, Franco, and many others like them to defend a "democracy" which exploits the mass of the population from the day of their birth to the day of their death, in the interests of Big Business and Landlordism. Opposition to this and a fight to abolish conscription would find an immediate response amongst the Youth.

### WORK AND HOMES

Secondly, a campaign for better Apprentice conditions, better pay — replacement of night school by day classes in the employer's time.

Thirdly, a campaign to help newly married couples find decent homes at a reasonable rent. This would involve an attack on the landlords and on private "enterprise" in the building industry to wipe out the inefficiency and monopoly which hold up the building of houses and send prices up. For instance, Associated Portland Cement Ltd., and its subsidiaries known as the "Blue Circle Group" produce two-thirds of Britain's cement, and along with the Tunnel Portland Cement Group, controls 80 per cent. of the industry. Since 1939 the price of cement has gone up from 25/- to 104/- per ton. In 1952 the Blue Circle Group alone made a profit of 12 million, but they put up the

The N.E.C. pamphlet shows how the Tory policy of lopping off the road services from the Transport Commission has stopped or curtailed many schemes inaugurated for improving its services. These road services are to be restored to the Transport Commission if it wants to buy them back but the private owners are again to receive payment for their value plus any value added during their ownership.

The pamphlet calls for an investigation into the C licensing system whereby private firms can operate their own vehicles at will. Here the N.E.C. policy appears weaker than ever. Surely the only solution for Transport is to take over all transport services both road and rail, both passenger and goods, leaving out only the smallest operators and integrating the whole into one national scheme. The N.E.C. has condemned the wasteful method of competition but has proposed no alteration to the present half-and-half method of British Transport competing at disadvantageous terms with "the rest". To fail to tackle this problem is to condemn the people to suffer indefinitely under the worst features of both private and public transport.

★

On the question of the workers participation in management, the N.E.C. is again silent. Yet this question was one on which most criticism was directed against the Transport Commission during Labour's terms of office. The N.E.C. has looked the other way and by its silence has expressed itself satisfied with the present bureaucratic set-up. Transport workers certainly cannot leave the matter there, most especially in view of the Railway's current drive to rationalise the industry. Worker's control is essential to a well run nationalised industry if it is to work for the benefit of the workers.

There will be at least one Conference no doubt before Labour again has the chance of assuming office. Meanwhile the Transport Unions and the Constituency Parties should get busy with amendments to put more teeth into Labour's policy on transport.

price of their cement a further 2/- per ton.

Not only cement, but every material used in house building is controlled by monopolies. It is also essential that we should reduce the cut of the bankers, landowners, and building societies.

Youth are affected by the rising cost of living—Labour must not only carry out an effective campaign to reduce PRICES but must support the WAGE demands put forward by the workers, instead of shirking the fight.

Obviously, the above points do not affect Youth alone, they affect everybody. A militant Socialist policy on such lines would mean, not only the building of a strong Youth Section, but a strong active Labour Party as a whole.

However, there is another point which seriously affects Youth—How can we hope to attract young people into a political party, if they are denied the right to discuss policy at their Annual Conference? The reason they are not allowed policy discussion is that the matters they would discuss would be those mentioned above—and the Right Wing Leadership knows this and so deliberately GAGS the L.O.Y.

# People, Places and Politics

By Cassia

### WHO ARE THE MUDDLED THINKERS?

I SEE that Herbert Morrison, when speaking at Newcastle last week, once again offered his advice to the "suicide clubs" of the Constituency Labour Parties. He is reported as having said: "I appeal to the constituency Labour Parties, among whom I have spent the greater part of my political life, to throw overboard sloppy, spiteful and muddled thinking." This, it seems to me, is excellent advice—but it appears to have been given a little late. From my observations of the activities of constituency parties they have long dispensed with "sloppy, spiteful and muddled thinking" and as a consequence they have made, insofar as they are permitted, some realistic changes to the policies of the Movement as a whole.

I venture to suggest that nobody is in a better position to confirm this than Herbert Morrison himself, as he revealed when he said: "I see month by month a list of resolutions that come to headquarters from constituency parties."

### HELLO!

MR. P. G. L. BAINES was, until a few short weeks ago, the prospective Tory candidate for the Yorkshire constituency of Don Valley; but a few months before he was straining his lungs by presenting vocal opposition to the Labour Party candidate in the Harrogate by-election. Mr. Baines has recently seen more the folly of his previous position and is now a fully paid-up, bonafide, unproscribed member of the Labour Party. I have no doubts that his experiences in the Tory Party will stand him in good stead in certain quarters!

### UPPER CASE OR LOWER CASE?

IN the technical language of the printer a capital letter is referred to as "upper case" while a small letter is referred to as "lower case", a slip with either of these two in the editorial or composing departments of a newspaper can lead to frequent misunderstandings, as is evidenced by the following example.

In the last issue of our contem-

porary — "Tribune" — Michael Foot wrote an article dealing with the situation which has arisen as a result of the much publicised article written by Herbert Morrison, he concluded his article as follows:

"For ourselves, we make no bones about what we want. We don't care who knows it. We want to see much more Socialism in the Labour Party. And, to show our modesty, we assert that a good start should be made by importing a healthy dose of liberalism. It is sorely needed to loosen the hardened, bureaucratic arteries which a too conservative leadership has induced."

The "Daily Worker" of Friday, May 14th, devoted about nine column inches of its front page to a report of this article in the "Tribune". Through reasons of space, no doubt, it did not quote the demand of Michael Foot for "much more Socialism in the Labour Party"; but it did quote: "A healthy dose of Liberalism was sorely needed," with a capital letter—or upper case! Now there is a difference in demanding "liberalism" for the Labour Party and "Liberalism" for the Labour Party—particularly in view of the unfortunate omission of the earlier sentence regarding Socialism. It just shows you how careful compositors, editors and readers have to be!

## O.A.P.'s

(from page 2)

situation as a whole—temporary expedients may be found by adopting such an approach but sooner or later the problem must be faced fully—and the problem is just this. Can a country make adequate provision for its workers and at the same time maintain an historically out-dated form of political and economic society?

In Britain today we still have the economic and political structure of capitalism—by far the greater part of industry is in the hands of private capitalists, a large portion of the national income is still paid to the capitalist class in the form of rent, interest and profit and a considerable amount of the country's material resources are drained away in military adventures.

With such conditions existing the long term problem of meeting the needs of the old folk can never be fully realised—temporary reforms can only serve to postpone the ultimate attack which will eventually be made on the whole of the social services—such an attack can only be met by making positive steps towards the establishment of a Socialist society; which means, at this stage, drastic inroads into the spheres of private capital and the rapid extension of publicly-owned industry. In this way not only will the old age people be able to maintain their position—it will be improved upon.

## New Readers

Take Out a Special Subscription

9 'Outlooks' For 2/-

Buy a subscription for yourself - and for your friend(s)

Please send "Socialist Outlook" for ..... to the name and address below. I enclose P.O. ....

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

Normal Subscription Rates: 1 year, 19s. 6d.; 6 months, 9s. 9d., 12 issues, 4s. 6d.

SOCIALIST OUTLOOK,  
177 BERMONDSEY ST., LONDON, S.E.1