

FREE THE UNIONS!

Socialist Outlook

Vol. 2. No. 12

December, 1950

Price 2d.

Editorial

BREAK WITH REACTION!

End the Alliance with World Capitalism

THE significance of the various critical Parliamentary motions on foreign policy tabled by some 70 Labour M.P.'s. lies not so much in what they say—which, in all truth, is innocuous enough—but in the fact that they reflect the anxiety of the working class at the steady approach of the third world war. An anxiety made sharper by the present lowering of living standards which is the inevitable consequence of war preparations.

"Paying for defence," we read in the Party's policy statement, *Labour and the New Society*, "is bound to limit the money available for social services and tax reduction." That's putting it mildly indeed.

Already the housing programme has suffered; school and hospital building has virtually ceased; prices are soaring because workers who should be making the things needed to sustain a decent standard of life are now being transferred to the production of such socially useless things as tanks, guns, jet fighters, and battleships. Shortages are re-appearing in almost every commodity. The war machine consumes a greater and greater slice of the national income. The fact that coal has now been ordered from abroad surely has also some connection with the insatiable appetite of the war drive.

Meanwhile the workers, whose wages are being undermined by the rising prices, are being asked—perhaps forced is a better word—to maintain and equip a conscript army to fight in Malaya, Korea, and anywhere else that U.N.O.'s General MacArthur should choose to send them. The casualty lists—mostly of young boys in their teens—are beginning to sadden the columns of the national press.

THE PRICE OF WAR.

The sharply accentuated defence programme resulted in outlays of 12,400,000,000 dollars in the first four months of the Korean fighting, the Department of Defence announced tonight. This was half the fund authority voted by Congress to the military services for the fiscal year of 1951, which opened July 1st.

—The 'New York Times,' 22. 11. 50.

Sacrifice for What?

All this blood and sweat might perhaps be justified if the cause were a worthy one. But it isn't. On the contrary, it is the most reactionary and anti-socialist cause that can be imagined. Any honest analysis of the present international situation will show the truth of our statement.

The bloc of nations grouped around the leadership of the United States of America are all capitalist states. They are countries, in other words, which periodically and inevitably face crises of mass unemployment and war. If the classical slump has not yet seared their economies it is not due to any re-invigoration of the capitalist system but simply and solely because the "surplus" production is finding an outlet in war preparations. The industrialists have learned from the past. They know that only war can keep the wheels of capitalist industry turning.

The countries in the other bloc—despite their political defects—have quite different economies. Economies of a new type, a basically socialist type, founded on the State ownership of industry and the land. The further extension of this type of economy is a threat to the continued existence of capitalism because, apart from its political implications, it still further limits the area open to capitalist exploitation.

That is why the conflict between Russia and America is a fundamental one, and why, in our opinion, it is absurd to talk of a lasting peace between them.

Enter the East

Now, into this basic clash of interests, there has been projected the vast movement of millions of workers and poor farmers through-

out the Far East. China has thrown off the chains of imperialist domination and commenced a social revolution against those native interests who, through their ownership of the land, have kept this great country for so long in poverty and backwardness. The movements against imperialism in Korea, Indo-China, Malaya, and the Philippines draw added strength and inspiration from the Chinese revolution.

In the sub-continent of India, free from direct Imperialist occupation but not free from capitalism, the events in China cause

(Continued page 8, column 1)

Made for Each Other



Following on the decision of the American Congress to grant a loan of 62 million dollars to Fascist General Franco, the United Nations General Assembly has now decided to recognise his filthy regime and accordingly Ambassadors are to be sent to Madrid. It's all done in the interest of "defending democracy" of course!

Free the Unions!

1305 MUST GO

Says **NORMAN DINNING, A.E.U.**



BY what stretch of the imagination can one justify the prosecution of WORKERS by a LABOUR Government for the "crime" of defending their living standards? This sequel to the Gas Strike must surely have convinced any waverers of the "errors" of Government policy.

The *Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act* of 1875 originated as the recognition of the right to strike—except for those workers engaged in Gas and Water supplies (in 1919, Electricity was added).

Under this Act the Gas Workers were arrested. But they were prosecuted under Order 1305 which covers ALL workers! It seems that the Government wants to demonstrate that strikes in any industry are now impermissible.

What the Order Does

This war-time Regulation states:— "*that there is no obligation upon the parties to report a dispute to the Minister of Labour, but, unless it is reported, and unless the Minister fails to refer it within twenty-one days to some 'means of settlement,' strikes and lock-outs are forbidden.*"

In Butterworth's recording of this Regulation, a note has been added that, "*strikes and lock-outs are now almost impossible, as it is unlikely that neither party will report, or the Minister fail to refer.*"

Clause 3 of the Order tells us that (excepting special circumstances for postponement exist) the Minister must finally refer the dispute to the National Arbitration Tribunal, within twenty-one days of the original reporting, and (here's the rub), that *their decision is binding!*

Thus you cannot strike BEFORE reporting, and, because the decision is binding, you cannot strike AFTER. There's no "almost" about it, strikes are legally impossible. Yet we are asked to believe that the Tribunal dispenses "justice."

Arbitration Against Us

There is nothing abstract about the Tribunal turning down the workers' case because of "*the economic situation*" and the "*inflationary effects.*" These statements originate from the Government itself, and, in the face of the employers' record profits, it is more than understandable that the workers regard them with suspicion.

Let me quote that authoritative organ, written for capitalist consumption, *The Economist* of November 4th, 1950, which states:—

Employers and Arbitration Tribunals have been encouraged by the Government's attitude,

either to refuse the claims or to grant much less than the usual 50% of what the unions asked. The Unions' restraint—and it is real enough—has been to accept with a fairly good grace the slowness of the negotiations and the smallness of the results.

This policy has worked well

There is, however, no reason to think that the fresh wage demands will be so forceful, as quickly to break down all the habits of postponement established by employers and arbitration tribunals—or even the practical caution of the union officials themselves.

Not satisfied, the Government, whilst constantly reiterating that WAGES are the concern of Trade Unions, uses capitalist legislation to sentence workers to imprisonment and to destroy the *only real weapon of the Trade Unions—the right to strike.*

The Right to Strike

Peterloo and Tolpuddle, Taff Vale and The Osborne Judgment, these have been landmarks on the road to a Labour Government and between these were decades of struggle against

A DUD TANNER

By **ANDY WOLFF (A.E.U.)**

IS it any wonder that engineers are fed up with Arbitration? In 1947 the Amalgamated Engineering Union submitted to the employers a claim for a rise of 13/- a week. Of course, the employers "negotiated" as long as possible so that, by the time the claim arrived at the National Arbitration Tribunal, twelve months had elapsed. Meanwhile, the cost of living had risen by 13/- a week so, even had the claim been granted in full, we would have been no better off. But we didn't get 13/-, we got only 5/- — and this measly "award" was accepted by our National Committee on the casting vote of Bro. Tanner.

In 1949, our National Committee decided to try again to catch up with the rising cost of living, so they put in another claim—through the Confederation—for a £1 a week rise. And this time they demanded that it be met out of the ever-increasing profits of the employers.

Another year of "negotiations" followed. No agreement could be reached with the employers and it was decided to ballot the members of the Confederation on whether to strike or send the claim to arbitration. The ballot went in favour of arbitration and

the return of the Anti-Combination Laws (Repealed 1825). This literally bloody struggle established the *right* to combined power, of which the ultimate expression is *Withdrawal of Labour*. Without it, we are powerless.

It is not the ingenuity and lawyer-like qualities of the Trade Union Official which secures a victory, it is the Employers' knowledge that behind the Official are thousands of organised workers, without whose labour profit is unattainable. Without the *Right* to withdraw labour, negotiations become a farce, and the laugh is with the Employers.

I say to all Labour Party members, we cannot condone the events which followed the Gas Strike, and leave the way open for its repetition, for that way lies the complete betrayal of the Workers Movement. Compulsory Arbitration is the breeding ground for "unofficial" strikes.

There are those who would retain Order 1305 because, through the Conciliation Officer, it provides contact with managements of non-trade union firms, and (in theory) enforces conditions "*not less favourable than those obtaining in the district generally.*" This is the resort of the lazy Trade Union bureaucrat, who doesn't want to be bothered with organising the unorganised firms. From this point-of-view, Order 1305 serves to perpetuate non-organised firms, and, as an accessory to Government policy, condemns the organised workers to the *status quo* of wages. Without it we can win wage increases and these will bring the unorganised workers to us.

We need wage increases because the cost of living has risen, is rising, and will continue to rise. Our standard of living is being undermined by rising prices. Until the Government introduces the planned sanity of a Socialist policy, we have no alternative but to fight for higher wages. In such a fight the unions must be free. Government intervention on behalf of the employers must be ended. **1305 must go!**

accordingly that is where it went. But before this was done our President, Bro. Jack Tanner, showed what a militant fighter he was. Addressing a public meeting in Acton to recruit new members to the Union, he said:—

"I hope none of you is expecting the Arbitration Tribunal to give you the £1 because you will be disappointed. They have never granted the Union's claim in full. We may get four, five, or six shillings—I don't know." He added that it was no answer to say that the increase could come out of profits because that was a "very complicated question."

If anything was sure to weaken our case in the eyes of the Tribunal, it was this miserable statement of the President. The E.C. repudiated his statement—but the damage was done. Now the Tribunal has produced its findings and, as was to be expected, even if they are implemented in full, the majority of engineering workers will get little or nothing.

Lots of members have expressed their disgust with these actions of Bro. Tanner and they will soon have a chance to do something about it because he is coming up for re-election next year!

We Need a Programme

What the A.E.U. needs is a militant programme and militant leaders who will see that the wishes of the membership are served.

Continued on page 3, col. 1

High Prices and Equal Sacrifice

by HARRY SHINDLER (A.E.U. and Bethnal Green L.P.).

THERE is no need for me to try and prove that rising prices are fast undermining our standards of living. Every housewife knows that only too well. The question is—what shall we do about it?

In the first place, the organised workers must see that wages keep up with this disastrous rise in the cost of living. By all means let us put in claims for absolute and substantial wage increases—but to protect these increases we must insist on a clause in all wage agreements establishing an AUTOMATIC increase in wages with every rise in prices.

That is an essential and elementary safeguard for this period of inflation which the war preparations have unloosed upon us. The point was well made and explained in the last issue of the *Socialist Outlook* by Bro. Norman Dinnings, another member of my Union.

But, at the same time as we fight for a rising scale, we must recognise that the Labour Movement, through the Government, is now in a position to introduce fundamental measures, both in the economic and the political field, to ensure an equality of sacrifice. It is up to the Left Wing of the Party to see that these measures are put into operation.

Engineers Have a Programme

Our Labour Party members who are also members of the Amalgamated Engineering Union are in a favourable position to do this because our Union is on record for just such a programme. Here it is, as presented to the last Trades Union Congress:—

TANNER

(Continued from Page 2)

We need men who will fight against that obnoxious piece of anti-working class legislation, Order 1305; men who will press our claims for wage increases and who understand that the right to strike is the only effective weapon we possess in the struggle against the employers; men who will insist that our claims be met out of the profits of the employers and who, when the employers say they "can't afford it," will demand that the workers themselves take over and then run the industry in accordance with the declared aim of the Union.

And also we need men at the top of our union who will agree that all officials should be subject to immediate recall if they do not carry out the demands of the rank and file.

We in the Left Wing of the Labour Party know that the success of our fight for better wages and conditions depends on our ability to construct a socialist society here in Britain. And we want leaders who also recognise that fact and who will assist us to carry the Union's fight into the Labour Party itself.

I think it is time we studied carefully the programme and the records of the various men who present themselves to us for election—and support only those who stand on the sort of militant programme I have attempted to outline above.

"This Congress declares that in consequence of the Economic Crisis, a greater burden has fallen on the workers than on the Employing Class.

"As a step towards an equality of sacrifice, Congress demands:

"(a) The suspension of interest payments on compensation in Nationalised Industries, except in needy cases to be determined by Committees established by the Government and Trade Union.

"(b) The prevention of Tax evasion and the hiding of profits by the opening of all Company books and Expense Accounts to inspection by elected Trade Union Committees.

"(c) The pressing forward of the Extension of State Ownership of all the basic industries, and the elaboration of a plan of production based on the needs of the people, and not on the needs of the Capitalist market."

It's a good programme and would, if carried out, do a great deal to ensure real equality of sacrifice. Why should a Labour Government go on paying tens of millions of pounds every year to the ex-owners of the nationalised industries?

Our post-war credits have been suspended until "better times" and the same thing should apply to the unearned income which the coal-owners and railway shareholders still get in the form of compensation.

As for the demand to open the company books, it is a simple piece of industrial democracy, but if it were operated we should all have a much better picture of just how much of the proceeds of our labour goes to keep all sorts of people in idleness. And when we can get those kind of facts we shall soon know what to do about them!

The third point is clear enough too. If we want to cut out all the waste in industry and all large slices of unearned income—if we really want to plan—then we must take all the basic industries under State Ownership.

Against War Preparations

There is just one more point which I think must be added to this kind of a programme. That is, to wage a determined fight against all the present war preparations which are the real cause of the inflation which we are now suffering. War against the colonial peoples can be of no advantage to workers anywhere—and without it we could get down to working out a plan for the production of things that the people need, and not a plan for producing terrible instruments of destruction with which to blow our fellow workers to bits.

Well, there's the programme, brothers. What we want now is a campaign in the Union to compel our leaders to fight for it. It's Union policy—but it is serving precious little use until we mobilise all the resources of the Union to make it known to the Labour Movement so that we can enlist their aid to make it Government policy.

Tory Laws in Gold Coast

by MRS. BETTY HAMILTON (Cities of London and Westminster L.P.).

DR. KWAMA NKRUHAH, and other leaders of the Convention People's Party and the Gold Coast Trade Unions, are at present serving prison sentences for a contravention of Gold Coast Ordinance No. 12.

Clause 6 of this Law is identical with the parallel clause in the British Trades Disputes and Trades Union Act imposed upon the British workers by a reactionary Tory Government in 1927 and repealed by the Labour Government in 1945.

The Gold Coast Trades Disputes Act reads as follows:—

It is hereby declared that any strike is illegal if it:—

- (1) has any object other than or in addition to the furtherance of a trade dispute within the trade or industry in which the strikers are engaged; and
- (2) is a strike designed or calculated to coerce the Government either directly or indirectly or by inflicting hardship upon the community; and

It is further declared that it is illegal to commence, or continue, or to apply any sums in furtherance or supply of, any such illegal strike or lock-out.

If any person declares, instigates or incites others to take part in or otherwise acts in furtherance of a strike or lock-out declared by this Ordinance to be illegal, he shall be liable to upon summary conviction to a fine of £25 or to imprisonment for one year or both.

Surely the British Trade Union movement will protest at these Gold Coast sentences and demand the repeal of the Gold Coast "Trades Disputes Act."

MERSEYSIDE

Sixty delegates attended a one-day school held jointly by the Merseyside Socialist Fellowship and the Liverpool College National Council of Labour Colleges, on November 5th to hear Fred Emmett, National Secretary of the Socialist Fellowship, speak on the subject of "Workers Control." The *Socialist Outlook* was accorded a good sale.

With the growth of membership Merseyside has been able to sponsor a number of new foundations. At Southport a Branch has been formed with J. H. Mortimer, 3 Talbot Road, as Secretary, and Peter Cameron (Secretary of Southport Trades Council), as the Chairman. At Garston the local secretary is C. P. Wall, 15 Inwood Road, Liverpool 19, and Bill Sefton (Secretary of the Garston C.L.P.) has accepted the position of Chairman. The possibilities of founding another Branch at Chester are now being examined.

The Merseyside Branch continues to meet on the first Sunday evening of every month at the Stork Hotel, Liverpool. Further information may be obtained from the local secretary, A. Rose, whose new address is:—

54 Bromborough Road, Bebington.

THE AMERICAN POLICE STATE TAKES SHAPE

The Land of Liberty

THE Land of Liberty is rapidly becoming a military-police dictatorship. In order to carry through their reactionary plans for world domination, the American industrialists and generals have got to first tie hand and foot the great American working class. That is the meaning of the **McCarran-Kilgore Act**. In the preparation of yet another war for "the defense of democracy" the first casualty is again—democracy!

Just how rapid is the degeneration in American political life can be seen by contrasting the reactionary **McCarran Act** with the famous **Bill of Rights** upon which the American Constitution is based. We are sure the American workers will fight back against these Nazi-like laws and hound out of office all those who have been responsible for imposing them upon the American people.

Meanwhile, our own Labour Movement should take warning from the events in America. Already we have seen workers prosecuted under the infamous Order 1305 for daring to assert their right to strike, and police spies, under the direction of M.I.5, are entering the unions. As in America, witch-hunting is directed at the entire working class and not just the Communist Party.

A COMPARISON

McCarran Act

It is "unlawful" to "conspire" to "perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment" of a "totalitarian dictatorship." This is punishable "within ten years after" such "conspiracy" by \$10,000 fine or 10 years in prison, or both.

"Communist action" organisations, officers and members and "Communist front" organisations and officers must register with the Attorney General. Failure to register when ordered by a Subversive Activities Control Board is punishable by \$10,000 or five years in prison, or both, for each day of violation.

It is "unlawful" for persons required to register "to conceal or fail to disclose" that fact when they seek, accept or hold any federal or "defense plant" job. "Communist action" members are barred from any "defense facility." No "Communist" may apply for or use a passport. Mailed or circulated matter or radio and television programs of registered groups, must be labeled or identified as "Communist."

Whenever during war, invasion or insurrection the President proclaims an "Internal Security Emergency," the Attorney General is empowered to "apprehend and detain" any person "as to whom there is reasonable ground to believe . . . will probably engage in, or . . . conspire with others to engage in, acts of espionage and sabotage." This includes members of the Communist Party after January 1, 1949.

Appeal for release is only to a Board of Detention Review, then to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, but the Board's "findings of fact" are final. The Attorney General, in appeals, may withhold "the identity or evidence of Government agents or officers" which he thinks "dangerous to national safety and security to divulge."

Bill of Rights

"Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or of the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." (Article I, First Ten Amendments (Bill of Rights), U.S. Constitution.)

"The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." (Article IV, Section 1, The Constitution.)

"The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crime shall have been committed; . . ." (Art. III, Sec. 2, The Constitution.)

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital or other infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury . . . ; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; . . ." (Art. V, Bill of Rights.)

"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed . . . and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense." (Art. VI, Bill of Rights.)

"The privilege of the writ of habeas shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it." (Art. I, Sec. 8, The Constitution.)

"No bill of attainder or ex post facto law (making punishable an act not illegal when committed) shall be passed." (Art. I, Sec. 8, The Constitution.)

U.S. DEMOCRACY

as seen by Morgan Phillips

SPEAKING at the recent Conference of International Socialists in Copenhagen, Morgan Phillips said:—

"Socialist prejudice against the United States must be exposed as out-of-date. For two decades, the U.S.A. has been the most progressive country in the world outside Britain and Scandinavia. At the present time most European Governments are less progressive than the Truman Administration."

—Daily Herald, 5/5/50.

Morgan Phillips, as General Secretary of the Party, is entrusted with safeguarding the democratic rights of Party members. With such conceptions of democracy as he expresses above, party members cannot—at the very least—have much confidence that he will do that job successfully!

Britain Too?

by JACK STANLEY

(Secretary, Constructional Engineering Union)

MUCH has already been said and written about the Home Secretary's refusal to allow into Britain a large number of Sheffield Peace Congress delegates. Sidney Silverman raised the question in the House and, in the main, the Government have not come out of the affair with much credit.

To one whose habit it is to delve into the past sayings and doings of present-day politicians, the following makes very interesting reading. A joint meeting of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress and the National Executive of the Labour Party held on June 25th, 1925, issued a strong protest

"against the harsh and arbitrary interpretation placed upon the Aliens Laws and Orders in individual cases of entry and deportation by the present Home Secretary. It protests against the unreasonable discrimination against persons holding certain political opinions who express a wish to come for short visits. This policy is contrary to the whole British tradition of encouraging intercourse with foreign people and, being often ineffective in practice, makes the British

(Continued on page 5, col. 1)

“New Occasions Teach New Duties”

by TOM BRADDOCK

*New occasions teach new duties
Time makes truest good uncouth
They must upward be and onward
Who would keep abreast with truth.*

—William Morris.

IT is useful to read the old pamphlets, speeches and programmes of our movement. Up to recent times, while recognising one great object, the method of approach to the problem of socialism has varied almost conference by conference. Sometimes the industrial as against the political approach has been favoured, sometimes wage rates as against social services, at other times educational preparation rather than immediate attack. Always the same object in view but a continued variety of method.

This in fact has been of the utmost value. It has led to preparation and attack on the widest possible front and to a detailed examination of all aspects of our peoples’

Britain Too?

(Continued from page 4)

Government look ridiculous.” (Extract from official report of the 1925 Conference.)

This critical statement of 25 years ago referred, of course, to a Tory Government—but it is, unfortunately, equally applicable to our own Labour Government to-day.

Where is Justice Now?

Another example of the Government’s unwarranted interference with the rights of the people who tried to attend the Sheffield Congress was the prosecution of the marathon runner for displaying on his chest what he was doing and on whose behalf he was doing it. He was fined £5.

Again delving back into history, we find **Herbert Morrison**, in supporting a resolution on the Harry Pollitt kidnapping case, saying :—

“whoever did not receive from a British Court the justice to which a British citizen was entitled, it was the duty of the Labour Party to enter a protest and demand just treatment. In the opinion of the Executive Committee it was because Mr. Pollitt was Mr. Pollitt, and because his views were what they were, that a British Court disgraced itself by giving a verdict contrary to the evidence, and which established as the opinion of the particular Jury concerned that a man was entitled to be kidnapped, entitled to be the victim of violence, and a British Court of Justice would not protect him.”

In the same speech, Mr. Morrison hoped that the Labour Party would “secure justice, freedom and liberty to all citizens; that they would do nothing to hinder that justice, freedom and liberty, but, on the contrary, whoever might be the victim, they would protest against it and so uphold the greatest traditions of the British Labour Movement.”

Mr. Morrison seems to have conveniently forgotten those words of 25 years ago—but they remain just as true to-day, and it is to be hoped that Labour Party members will bear them well in mind.

needs and problems. It has been possible because of the great individuality and varied character of the rank and file of our movement and of the democratic manner in which it has been organised. There has been continuous inspiration and discussion of new ideas and new methods.

The Difference Now

Times are not what they used to be. In 1945, *Let us Face the Future* gathered together the inspiration of many years. It was accepted for varied reasons by the nation. The two main bodies of support came from those who supported our labour movement, and from those who were sick of war and wanted a Government that would keep the country clear of that final catastrophe.

The carrying through of this programme, so far as home affairs is concerned, has been done with little difficulty. The Tory party have, of course, hatched up a row. There are problems attached to turning profit-making undertakings into public services, but these things can be dealt with.

We have, however, arrived at a state of deadlock. Our vivid and varied approach has been damped down; election programmes are prepared at week-end meetings in the Isle of Wight or at Dorking; no further socialist measures are contemplated for home application. All we are supposed to do is to consolidate and “bang along” as Morrison elegantly puts it.

With regard to foreign affairs the position is somewhat different. Here we never even *tried* a Socialist policy. We followed Churchill into the arms of the U.S.A.—we had found for us a great national enemy, i.e., the U.S.S.R., and everything has then proceeded on the old and well-known lines that have already given us two world wars and are well on the way to producing the third.

Who Said This?

Not only is it shown that there are limitations to reform under the capitalist system, but, in my judgement . . . I do not believe that you can get an effective re-distribution of wealth within the capitalist order of society Indeed if this were the case, there would not be the strong case for socialism that there is.

We ourselves will have to devote somewhat less attention to reform and pay more attention to changing fundamentally the economic order under which we live.

HERBERT MORRISON at the Labour Party Conference, 1931.

The outstanding thing about all this is that the Labour movement has lost its old resilience its readiness to think out and try new methods and approaches, ready in fact to try anything that will arrive at the required result.

We Have a New Duty

What are we to do? Well, we can take Morrison’s advice and “bang along.” That means that, in the not very distant future, we shall get a Tory Government, and that would of course mean that we should be free to oppose the foreign policy we are now persuaded, by appeals to our loyalty, to accept. The question is, can we, dare we, allow this to happen?

We cannot, the position is much too dangerous. With the Tory party firmly in the saddle, America would feel confident that the war could be fought in Western Europe with this country used as an aircraft carrier. The war might then be kept away from the American Continent, therefore, “let the battle begin.”

A Tory Government could be relied upon to use fascist methods to dragoon the workers to war. They would never take it from a Labour Government. Therefore, it follows we must win the next election and that with a big majority. This means that we shall need a different programme to that which we can expect from Transport House. This different programme will shortly be issued for the consideration of the Movement by the *Socialist Fellowship*. It will be found to be a realistic, up-to-date document calculated to revive Socialist fervour and unity throughout the ranks of all types of workers. Look out for it comrades, discuss it, and ACT.

Wandsworth Witch-Hunt against Socialist Outlook

We understand that Wandsworth Central Divisional Labour Party have imposed a “ban” on the sale of *Socialist Outlook* inside the local Party. This most undemocratic decision was, we were informed, carried by a narrow majority with a large number of abstentions.

When the facts are understood by the delegates to the Management Committee of the Party we are sure they will reverse the decision—as they so rightly did when the local executive disbanded the League of Youth!

The *Socialist Outlook* is produced by members of the Labour Party. Its point of view is widely supported in the movement—a movement which has developed on the free democratic exchange of ideas. To attempt to “ban” it by such witch-hunting methods is therefore, to declare that none other than the official policy—and the official thoughts!—can be expressed inside the Party.

For that reason we are sure that this action will be condemned by the Socialists and democrats in Wandsworth and throughout the Party.

Our Readers Write



Correspondence should be as brief as possible and addressed to The Editor, 177, Bermondsey St., London, S.E.1

THE PACIFIST CASE

It is good to see so many protests against the policies of rearmament and conscription in your paper, but is not positive individual action called for in order to influence both our fellow-workers and the powers-that-be?

For example, a downright refusal to make arms. This kind of protest is unmistakable and serves several purposes—to oppose the colonial wars, to express our desire for the limitation of arms, and our scepticism that great armaments and peace can ever go together. This latter idea is very popular especially in the Foreign Office, but we all know who must pay the price if, in spite of (or because of) the efforts of Mr. Bevin, the world drifts into war.

Similarly, conscription would end overnight if 20% of the lads refused to go whatever the consequences. I realise that the choice cannot always be easy for the individual, but I feel that the alternatives are even more unpleasant, leaving aside all questions of what is ethically or morally more desirable.

Manchester.

A. W.

♦ ♦ ♦

THE HUMANITARIAN CASE

Three hundred bombers have just turned a Korean city of 100,000 people "into a flaming ruin."

It needs little imagination to realise how men, women and children have been burned to death or mutilated.

But we may not all be aware that the remainder, who are now homeless, have to survive in a land where the average January temperature is 20 degrees below freezing point.

This is what "liberation" means. Surely this cannot be the way to peace?

The alternative is for Britain to give the lead to the world and declare publicly that, while wanting friendship with both the powers struggling for world domination—America and Russia—we will not fight for either.

There would be an immediate response from India, Scandinavia and Jugoslavia. In the end we should be followed by the common people of every country, even of America and Russia.

Manchester.

(Mrs.) Lilian Allaun.

♦ ♦ ♦

THE ? . . . CASE

Lately the *Socialist Outlook* has taken up a position which can lead to only one destination—to be on the left flank of Stalinism.

In the September issue, for example, you speak of the New Society. The "spread of communism" may indeed be a new society (unless it is but another variant of capitalism), but it is a class society: the working class are still exploited and oppressed. You have equated this octopus of misery with the struggle for socialism, but in so doing you can only aid reaction. To take sides with either camp

in the "cold war" between two imperialist blocs cannot help in the fight for a New Society.

To end exploitation, oppression and bureaucracy and to attain Socialist Democracy we need more than our traditional opposition to the evils of capitalism. We know that capitalism is bad, but reactionary international Stalinism, too, must be vigorously attacked and exposed.

Stalinism is *not* a socialist tendency. It must be the task of socialists to combat every vestige of its influence among the working class; to point out that the policies of Stalinism serve only the Kremlin oligarchy.

It is true that *Socialist Outlook* has mildly criticised the foreign policies of the U.S.S.R. But you have not analysed Russia's internal social structure, nor have you recognised the U.S.S.R.'s foreign policy as imperialist and hegemonic. The so-called Eastern Democracies (including Yugoslavia!) are fast moving towards the same system as Russia—a society of vicious exploitation, where the working class is deprived of all freedom. Is there any real difference between a Soviet Trade Union and an American Company Union, set up to serve the employer? I think not.

Where is *Socialist Outlook* going? Will you go on until there is no difference between you and the *Daily Worker*, or can you retrace your steps and turn to International Socialism—the hope of the working class? It is up to you.

Birmingham.

G. T. Weil.

EDITORIAL NOTE :

In accordance with our policy of giving expression to all points of view within the left wing of the Party we have printed the above two letters in the belief that they will stimulate discussion. We do not agree with the points of view presented and readers can find the attitude of the Outlook expressed in the Korean Supplement and the Editorial in the August issue (copies can be had on application). The Editor has replied at some length to the letter of G. T. Weil because he makes a direct attack on the policy of the paper.

THE EDITOR REPLIES

Mr. Weil is very angry with the *Socialist Outlook*. He says that we "aid reaction." Why? Because we have taken sides in the civil war which is now raging in Korea, in Malaya, in Indo-China. Because we have declared our complete support for the workers and the poor peasants fighting against the imperialist-protected landlord-capitalist cliques of Syngman Rhee, Bao Dai, and Chiang Kai Shek. We "aid reaction" because, unlike Mr. Weil, we have refused to characterise Russia as "imperialist" and have continued to maintain that it is a non-capitalist country wrested from the imperialists by the greatest event in human history, the 1917 Russian Revolution.

If the propagation of such ideas "aid reaction" then the reaction itself is singularly unaware of the service we do them, for they are now threatening the Treason Acts against anybody who declares his support for the colonial peoples and the Soviet Union in the war that is now on and in the much bigger war that is now being prepared.

It is perfectly true that there are many things in the Soviet Union which are obnoxious to socialists—just as there are many things in the British trade unions which are obnoxious to trade unionists. But he would indeed be a miserable kind of trade unionist who refused to take sides in a battle against a reaction which had declared its intention of smashing the trade unions. Declaring one's "neutrality" in the coming struggle between the imperialists and the Soviet Union is just as bad as to stand with folded arms and watch the reaction smash the trade unions. The existence of Stalin in Russia no more excuses such an attitude than does the existence in the British trade union movement of a bureaucrat like Arthur Deakin.

Of course, this abstentionist attitude might be justified if it is considered that Russia is "imperialist." But in that case, it is

TRADE UNIONISTS DEMAND AID TO YUGOSLAVIA

The following resolution has been received from the Camberwell Branch of the Amalgamated Engineering Union:—

We, the members of the Camberwell A.E.U., are extremely perturbed by the famine now in existence in Yugoslavia and desiring to assist our Trade Union Brothers in that country, we call on the Government to make an unconditional loan to Yugoslavia immediately, a loan with no military or political strings attached to it.

necessary to explain to the workers how it is that "imperialist" Russia can under certain conditions, encourage the expropriation of the landlords and the capitalists (as in Eastern Europe, China, and Korea) while imperialist America and Britain sends armies to restore these reactionary forces to power.

There are certainly grave defects in the political structure of the Soviet Union and the people most acutely aware of these defects are . . . the Russian workers themselves. Any accounts that have to be settled with the bureaucracy in Moscow will be settled, first and foremost, by them. If the job has not already been done it is because the Russian workers are very conscious of the fact that Russia is the product of their own revolution against the capitalists and landlords. They have, up to now, feared that the internal and international reaction would profit from any domestic upheavals.

But to-day the situation is changed in favour of the workers. Except in Spain, fascism no longer holds the European workers in chains. Japanese imperialism no longer

(Continued Page 7, col. 1)

End the Cold War

by OLIVER STAPLETON. (National Union of Public Employees.)

THE cold war continues. The U.S.A. in its pathetic fear that capitalism is slipping has ordered the stepping up of war propaganda. It has now become almost a crime to even talk peace. American capitalism is resorting to measures inseparable from neo-fascism. With the immense natural resources of the American Continent we must not expect that these measures gradually being foisted on the American people to fail—at least not easily. Nearly all the vehicles of thought and expression are in the possession of those who would at any cost retain the present inequitable system that gives the glittering rewards, not to the deserving, but to the cunning and often the unscrupulous.

Do not let us delude ourselves that the British capitalist is any different from his American counterpart. The problems facing those sincere people in the U.S.A. who believe that "peace is indivisible" are quickly becoming our problems, and the steady march to the right of the Labour Party is not going to make things any easier.

Correspondence

(Continued from page 6)

stands on Russia's eastern borders. Capitalism in Eastern Europe has collapsed. The Chinese people have liberated themselves from both imperialism and internal reaction — and throughout the Far East the people are in revolt. A victory for the anti-capitalist movements in Korea, Indo-China, and Malaya is therefore, not only progressive in itself, but is also the greatest possible encouragement to the Russian people to fight for the re-establishment of that democratic soviet system which existed in the early, heroic days of the Russian revolution.

To stand four square for such a victory is to be, therefore, "anti-stalinist" in the socialist meaning of the phrase.

But to sit on the fence, to be "neutral" in this international civil war, meanwhile lecturing the Russian workers on the crimes of its government, is to be "anti-stalinist" in an entirely reactionary sense. Our readers will judge for themselves into which category of "anti-stalinism" Mr. Weil should be placed.

John Lawrence.

* * *

SANITY AND REASON

I find this number of *Socialist Outlook* (November) expressing so much that I feel and believe. There is also a sane and reasonable atmosphere about it with no mud-slinging. I hope this will continue.

I enclose a cheque for 18/- with names and addresses of six people to whom to send copies for 12 weeks. I did not cut out your application forms because it meant mutilating valuable articles!
Cambridge.

H. K. Adams.

We are virtually bound economically and militarily to the American "way of life" and one false step in either Korea or Indo-China might mean the end of everything we hold dear—particularly in view of our position as the fixed aircraft carrier in a war of ideologies! One cannot feel comfortable in the thought that our destinies might be left in the hands of the truculent McArthur.

Is There a Solution?

Is the United Nations Organisation as at present constituted capable of dealing with these threats to peace? Is it possible for East and West with their conflicting outlooks to live in peace? An answer must be found and quickly to these questions.

In the last analysis everything boils down to the economic, to the prime necessities of life and the means of obtaining them, and until these are assured for all the long suffering masses, particularly in the East, there will always be trouble.

These are no longer abstruse problems, but very real and important questions we have to determine with all possible speed.

I would like to believe that there are men and women in the Labour Government with vision and determination to put world politics in their perspective, but the Government's record in foreign affairs, except for one or two singularly bright spots, is but a wretched and feeble continuation of Chamberlain's *laissez faire*.

I contest the point of view that the way to safety is through re-armament. Past experience has shown only too well that the provision of efficient national armed forces renders imperative the same conditions in other countries. More and better armaments beget—more and better armaments! We

should have learned by now that armed strength does not necessarily discourage aggression.

Of course there is a solution and I commend it to the Labour Government—*vigorous not vacillating socialism*. Compromising with capitalism can only end in disaster, and history is strewn with examples of this.

A few more measures like the *Iron and Steel Bill*, a few more open attacks on the bastions of capitalism, and the socialisation instead of the nationalisation of all essential industries plus the land, will equip us for the final overthrow of capitalism and will do much to restore the faith that is so necessary to our cause.

ADVERTISING RATES

Small Ads.—1d. a word, minimum 1/6d.—remittance with order.

Displayed Advertising Rates on application.

JUMBLE SALE

JUMBLE SALE on Saturday, December 16th, commencing 2 p.m. Y.M.C.A. Hall, Cobden Street, RADFORD.

Clothes in good condition, household goods, books, electrical equipment, radios and a variety of XMAS GOODS. All profits in aid of the *Socialist Outlook* and *Socialist Fellowship*.

All Low Prices.

Admission 2d.

THE SOCIALIST FELLOWSHIP

Is an Association of members of the Labour Party pledged to work for the early attainment of the Socialist Society.

Its Purpose

The fulfilment by the Labour Movement of the Labour Party's object—which is to secure for the workers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry.

Are you in touch with your Local Fellowship? Write to FRED EMMETT, 36, Gilbert Road, London, S.E.11

Watch Out for a Real Socialist Policy Statement now being printed

"FROM LABOUR TO SOCIALISM."

WHAT IS DEC. 17th?

Publication Date for First Issue of

SOCIALIST YOUTH

The New Monthly Paper, Price 1½d. for young Socialists.

Produced by Members of the Labour League of Youth

All Orders and Enquiries to
AUDREY BROWN,
67, ST. ALPHEGE RD., LONDON, N.9

THE CONSTRUCTIONAL ENGINEERING UNION

4th NATIONAL BIENNIAL CONFERENCE

to be held in

MORECAMBE

MAY 22nd, 23rd, 24th, & 25th, 1951

Further details later

JACK STANLEY, General Secretary
140, Lower Marsh, Waterloo, London, S.E.1

The Arts and Sciences must work for Peace & National Independence

A meeting for all cultural workers (amateur & professional)

Opening Statements by:

Harry Pollitt - Alan Bush followed by questions.

ST. PANCRAS TOWN HALL,
Sunday, Dec. 10th, at 7 p.m.

TICKETS FROM THE ORGANISERS
LONDON COMMUNIST PARTY
75, Farringdon Road, E.C.1.

League of Youth Conference

We Can't Avoid the War Question

by BERT PENFOLD (Wandsworth L.O.Y.)

The details are at last available of the first League of Youth Conference for 13 years and Transport House is keeping itself very busy issuing directions that will ensure, they hope, that "Filey" will not be repeated.

Nevertheless, the conference can be a great opportunity for Labour Youth to show the Party, and through it the millions of unorganised young people, the Socialist way out of to-day's very serious problems. We can do that successfully if conference is allowed to, and encouraged to, discuss the wider questions of policy—particularly in relation to the war situation, which affects youth most of all.

But any question of war inevitably raises the question of Russia—what it is, where it is going, and what should be our attitude to it. Unfortunately, however, the official witch-hunt policy prevents this subject being regarded as a suitable one for youth discussions. Yet it ought to be discussed at conference, and, I hope, will be discussed.

Editorial

(Continued from Page 1)

great uneasiness in Government circles. Nehru looks nervously to the Tibetan frontiers as Mao Tse Tung's armies advance under the banner of land to the peasants!

It would be the worst possible mistake to imagine that this great revolution in the Far East is the product of Moscow's deliberations. It has a dynamic of its own. It is a genuine revolution embracing hundreds of millions of people—the greatest event, in fact, since the Russian workers threw off Czarism and capitalism in 1917.

It is the intermeshing of these three factors—the inevitable crisis of the capitalist system, the conflict between Russia and America, and the eruption of the mighty colonial revolution—which has created what is, in fact, an international civil war.

The reactionary side in this civil war fights under the flag of the United Nations Organisation. Already it has fluttered over the devastated towns of Korea. The French are calling for its protection in Indo-China, while the G.I.'s, in Puerto Rica, having shot down the attempted nationalist rising, hoisted this flag of reaction over Government buildings.

We are on the Wrong Side

We believe that there exists a fairly widespread recognition—especially in the Labour Movement—that we are on the wrong side in this international civil war; that our alliance with America is an alliance with reaction against the forces of world progress.

In a pale sort of way, the parliamentary motions of the 70 M.P.'s, reflect this understanding. But they only reflect it. They do not give a lead to the movement.

And yet the way out is as clear as daylight. We must insist that the Labour Government breaks all the alliances and treaties which

What Is Russia?

The workers successful revolution in Russia in 1917 swept away a type of society—capitalism, production for profit—that is to-day still existing in Britain. Serious efforts were made to crush the new regime, efforts that were defeated not only through the magnificent struggles of the working masses of Russia but also by the assistance given by the international working class movement.

We must continually remind ourselves that the victory gained by the Russian workers gave, and is still giving, tremendous confidence to the movement throughout the world.

We must also remind ourselves that the smashing of the first workers state and the reinstatement of production for profit would be a most bitter defeat for the workers of the world.

What Of Russia's Leaders?

A major reason why the producers elsewhere in the world have not yet completed the job

have entangled the movement in war against the colonial peoples and pledged it to war against the Soviet Union. Such an action would transform the present international situation.

Deprived of its only real support in Europe, the land of the American capitalists would be compelled to think hard and long before embarking on any further aggressive actions against the international working class. The alternative is to continue the present disastrous drift to war and all that it means to the livelihood of our people.

To sum up, the job will have to be done by the movement itself. Just as rank and file pressure restored some of the housing cuts, ensured the passing of the Iron and Steel Bill, and secured a national conference for the League of Youth, so now it must be brought to bear in the field of foreign affairs. When that happens—and we are sure it will—a real socialist and internationalist foreign policy will be assured for our great Labour Movement.

A Case of Mistaken Identity

The Editor has received the following letter:—

"I have read your November Editorial on the Peace Movement. But why does the editor, John Lawrence, spend most of his time travelling about Europe in connection with another Peace Movement, the National Peace Council? I don't know how he does it. If Mr. Lawrence is not bewitched, then at least I am slightly bewildered.

London, S.W.11.

R. Thompson.

The truth is that the Editor is not "bewitched" but "bothered"—by several letters which arise from this case of mistaken identity. The John Lawrence who succeeds in getting into the news in Europe happens to be . . . a different person altogether.

Editorial Board.

that was only started in Russia has been the wrong policies of her leaders.

In 1939, for example, Stalin signed a pact with Hitler which, although the signing of pacts as such cannot be excluded, nevertheless was accompanied by propaganda that peace could be assured between two fundamentally opposed social and economic systems. This confused and disorientated the working class—especially since a few months later the war broke out!

The same approach has been adopted on the question of Korea. Again the Soviet leaders talk of peace through capitalism. They no doubt justify their refusal to give the required aid to Korea on the grounds that that would have precipitated an open clash with the mighty U.S.A. Be that as it may, it does not justify the confusing of the *political leadership* of the Korean and other workers, Internationally as to the solution to be sought.

"Peace Through U.N.O."

Russia's entire propaganda machine was, and still is, centred on the theme of "Peace through U.N.O." As in 1939 and earlier, the working class is disarmed in the real fight against war. The "peace" proclaimed is peace with, and through, capitalism.

Other examples could be drawn upon to show that the writer holds no brief for the policies of the Russian leaders. But that in no way means we should countenance war against the first workers' state. We must prevent the attack on Russia by assuring OUR victory.

In short, let the L.O.Y. Conference discuss real policy questions as affecting the youth. That means discussing the present war situation and our attitude to Russia generally. We must be able to show those young workers whom we wish to attract that we can take our own decisions and, having done so, make our voice heard as responsible Party members in the adult movement. This is an essential for a live organisation. There must be no rigging of the League Conference.

Subscription to "Socialist Outlook"

Enclosed please find P.O. for 3s. for

12 issues starting with.....

Name

Address

Date

"Socialist Outlook,"

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

Labour Parties, and Trade Unions please note: Special rates for bundle orders. All orders of 12 or more for "Socialist Outlook" will be supplied at 25% discount. Take advantage of this offer and order your copies to-day. Please cross /& Co. all cheques and postal orders.