

Socialist Outlook

The Paper of
Labour's Left Wing
● CLEAR OUT THIS
TORY GOVERNMENT ●

No. 48.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 22nd, 1952

3d.

Stop Witch-hunting the Bevanites! Let the workers decide policy for the Party

On the eve of the 1945 General Election, Mr. Churchill accused Harold Laski of organising a secret Gestapo inside the Labour Party. Today Mr. A. J. Cummings of the "News Chronicle" informs his readers that Aneurin Bevan and a group of his supporters are secretly conspiring to bring about the early downfall of Mr. Attlee. Both these obvious fabrications had the same purpose,—to discredit the Labour Party in the eyes of the people.

To everybody's amazement, however, this latest story—instead of being treated with the contempt it deserved—has found vigorous support among a small group of Right-wing Labour M.P.'s. Ever since the story appeared in print, they have been busy writing to the capitalist press "proving" that A. J. Cummings is right, and denouncing, in the most vicious terms, Aneurin Bevan and his alleged "party within a party".

Freda Corbett, for example—Labour M.P. for the big working class constituency of Peckham—became so excited about these Cummings "revelations" that she wrote a letter to the "News Chronicle" congratulating the author on "having courageously given publicity to a matter which is causing great anxiety to a considerable number of members of the Parliamentary Labour Party."

It seems she now understands why the Party decided—against her advice—to vote against German re-armament. It was all due to the "conspiracy" of Mr. Bevan and his friends!

Instead of expressing such nonsense in the capitalist press, Mrs. Corbett would have been better occupied in asking some of her

Editorial

constituents in Old Kent Road what they thought about it. She would have discovered that the sort of policies which Mr. Bevan advocates in the Parliamentary Labour Party are not only a reflection of the real feelings of the ordinary Labour worker—but in many cases they do not go half far enough to the Left!

But isn't it a fine state of affairs when a Labour M.P. congratulates a Liberal journalist for having written such nonsense about the internal life of the Labour Party. And what was so courageous about Cummings' effort?

(Continued on page 4, col. 1)

Five months ago we wrote . . .

"Working class opposition to the Tory Government is shifting the Labour Party to the Left . . . It is not easy to carry Right-wing motions . . . the Labour Party is being compelled to re-consider all its old policies (and) we are faced with a serious policy discussion, the successful conclusion of which will require . . . an atmosphere inside the Party free from organisational reprisals and witch-hunts."

WE STAND BY THAT
POSITION TODAY.



ANEURIN BEVAN
at last year's Conference
"Daily Herald" photo

"FACING THE FACTS"

Our next issue will analyse the N.E.C. policy statement and the problems it poses before the Party.

Engineers give a Lead

JACK STANLEY reports on the Annual Conference of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions

THE main discussion naturally centred around the £2 wage increase which had been turned down flat by the Employers.

An Emergency motion which recorded the Conference's "profound dissatisfaction" with this refusal also recommended "that the Executive Council be authorised to seek immediate conferences with the respective employer's organisations and inform them of the serious situation which exists."

The employers have since agreed to meet the Unions (representing some three million workers) on August 22nd, and the Executive Council has arranged to report back to a Conference of Execu-

tive Councils of affiliated unions at York on September 10th.

The feeling of many delegates was that some tentative arrangement had already been arrived at—especially since the Minister of Labour, Sir Walter Monckton, the Industrial Disputes Tribunal Chairman, Sir John Foster and Sir Alexander Ramsay, chairman of the Engineering Employers' Federation, were all present at a social gathering held on the eve of the Confederation Conference!

In any case, the speeches in favour of the resolution tended to support this view—although a number of delegates left no doubt in anybody's mind as to where they stood if something tangible was not forthcoming from the further talks with the employers.

There was a real desire to avoid any split among the 37 unions which make up the Confederation, and for this reason the motion on

wages was eventually carried unanimously.

A SIGNIFICANT MOTION

East-West Trade was the subject of good debate, marred only by the Right Wing opposition playing the well-worn gramophone record of "communist-inspired." But this time to no avail.

The motion calling for East-West trade and the lifting of the American-imposed restrictions was carried 885,039 votes against 322,620.

Such a substantial majority has a great significance because similar resolutions are due to be debated at the forthcoming Trades Union Congress and also at the Labour Party's Annual Conference.

A resolution from the Vehicle Builders dealing with re-armament, civil production and full employment was withdrawn—possibly because the movers feared that if the various amendments should be carried it would have destroyed the whole purpose of the motion with unfortunate results for similar motions to come before the T.U.C. and the Labour Party.

UP TO THE T.U.C.

My general impression of this important Trade Union Conference was that most of the delegates arrived in a mood of challenge—but had the wind taken out of their sails by the "social gathering" and the obvious talks which took place therein. They consequently had to forget for the time being their mandates and follow the lead of the Executive. Nevertheless, on the wage-freeze and on East-West trade, the Engineering Confederation has given a lead to

the T.U.C.

£MILLIONS DOWN, THE DRAIN IN MALAYAN WAR

No 'restraint' for Gen. Templer

WITH cynical disregard for truth, the Colonial Office has made yet another attempt to deceive the British people as to the real state of things in Malaya.

Yet, despite the half-truths and distortions, this document—"Malaya—the Facts"—contains important information which refutes, rather than supports, the arguments of its authors.

The facts given show that more than 40,000 regular troops are fighting in Malaya—25,000 British, 10,000 Gurkhas, five battalions of Malays, two battalions of Kings African Rifles and one battalion of Fijians. In addition, there are 60,000 full-time police and nearly 200,000 home guards. In all, more than 300,000 armed men on the Government's side, energetically supported by units of the Navy and R.A.F.

HOW MANY "TERRORISTS" ?

"There are only 3-5,000 of them under arms", says the Colonial Office. What an admission! Some 3,000 "terrorists" outnumbered 100 to 1. But this is not all. In 1947, we were given the same approximate figures about the "Terrorists" strength, yet 3,642 of them have since either been killed, hanged or surrendered! This means that either the casualties claimed are false (which is improbable) or—the number of "terrorists" is far greater than the Colonial Office is willing to admit.

DEMOCRACY

The document states that this is not a national uprising but a conspiracy of a few "alien Chinese".

Every progressive class in history, when striving for its emancipation, has been accused of the same things: "banditry" and "terrorism". Malaya is no exception. But if the Government is so keen on defending "democracy", why doesn't it arm the workers and peasants to fight against the tiny minority of "bandits"? Why doesn't it grant citizenship rights to the 2,000,000 "alien" Chinese?

Finally, why doesn't it hold general elections throughout Malaya to test the feelings of the Malayan people on such issues as democracy and independence?

The Colonial Office then bewail the fact that the "squatters" provide assistance, information and

By M. BANDA

food for the "terrorists". This is not surprising. One poor Chinaman will never grudge help to another poor Chinaman. That's natural—and human.

If the Government is so concerned about the plight of the poor squatter (only noticed after the Emergency began, of course) then the remedy is simple. Distribute the land of the rich feudal sultans amongst the squatters. This would be much cheaper than building "Re-settlement Camps" with barbed wire, police and all the paraphernalia of concentration camps.

Ludicrous as it may seem, the pamphlet insists that the trouble in Malaya all began way back in 1926 in China. Apparently the suppressed desires of the Malayan peoples for independence, democratic elections, for land, decent wages and full employment had nothing to do with it! Nothing is produced to substantiate this statement—you take it, or leave it.

Fortunately for us, Sir Gerald Templer revealed the truth when he said "I could win this war in three months if I could get two-thirds (!) of the people on my side".

My sympathies are with the poor General—his predecessors after all had four years and also failed to get "two-thirds" of the people on their side.

The pamphlet makes great show of the fact that "leaders" of all communities and "leaders" of Trade Unions have "made public declarations condemning the terrorists". Ten years ago these same leaders were making similar declarations condemning the British and praising the Japanese. As for

(Continued on page 4, col. 3)

LYNMOUTH

The country has been swept with a wave of pity for the Lynmouth flood victims—particularly the parents of the drowned boys.

But few seem to bother about the inhabitants of Korean towns who are daily being burnt to death in napalm (jellied petrol) bombing raids, or about British boys being sent to fight and die there.

If we had a little more imagination or were shown pictures of devastated homes in Asia as we have seen them in Lynmouth, the British people would be demanding the ending of our participation in these atrocities.

Frank Allam.

Does your T.U.
Branch Take
the Outlook?

2/3d. dozen

Post Free

Order from: Socialist Outlook.

Give Morecambe a Socialist Outlook!

DOUBLE THE READERS and £50 IN THE FUND

THE desire for a socialist policy among Labour's rank-and-file is clearly shown in the resolutions submitted for this year's Conference. The ideas which the 'Socialist Outlook' has been for 4 years consistently putting forward are being more and more taken up inside the Party.

We know that many of the delegates this year will be regular readers and supporters of the 'Socialist Outlook' but still too many, especially among the Trade

acquaintance with our paper. This is something that can be remedied if every one of our readers makes an effort.

As one reader writes: . . . "I make it my job to see that I find one new reader every week. Unless I have done that I feel I have not done my bit. . . ." That is the way the influence of socialist ideas in the shaping of Party policy begins to make itself felt.

We have turned the monthly

be satisfied with this small step forward. We must have a weekly. The situation demands it. But for this we must have MONEY and NEW READERS.

The Fighting Fund is vital. On page 4 you will see that we didn't reach our £50 target again this month. And each time we fail to reach our target the weekly gets further away.

SEND THAT DONATION TODAY. We would not ask for

On the Industrial Front

★ **Strike at Fairey Aviation**

SIXTEEN HUNDRED Engineering Workers at Fairey Aviation, Stockport have for 8 weeks been on official strike to prevent their organisation being smashed.

The strike followed a final refusal of 4 non-Union Inspectors to join their appropriate Trade Union. The Management turned it into a full-scale battle by sacking the Convenor, Mr. Fred Hulme, and the Chairman of the Works Committee, Mr. W. Woodall, for 'misconduct'. The 'misconduct' was calling a meeting of the men on the works premises.

Trade Unionists throughout the country will readily see the importance to the whole Trade Union Movement of winning this strike. It is an elementary duty to defend Stewards from victimisation if we are to preserve our organisations. That, no doubt, is why the A.E.U. Executive has officially recognised the strike.

The Engineering employers are

★ **'Blitzkrieg' at Park Royal**

THE theory of the "Blitzkrieg" still lives. Its latest exponent is Mr. Black, Managing Director of Park Royal Vehicles.

"One does not announce one's intention when one goes to war" he stated, thus attempting to justify breaking his agreement with the Trade Unions.

On July 2nd, he sacked 78 men, alleging that they were "redundant". This action, say the shop stewards, was "in ruthless disregard of the existing Trade Union agreement which specifically states that no worker will be made redundant until the Shop Stewards have discussed the matter with the management."

The workers at Park Royal Vehicles had no alternative but to strike in defence of their agreement and organisation—which they did—in an immediate 100 per cent. stoppage the same day, July 2nd. All the Unions involved have officially recognised the strike.

Why, you may ask, should a management deliberately provoke a strike in this way?

The strike committee have answered this one. They point out that last February, Lord Brabazon of Tara (formerly Mr. Moore-Brabazon), when making his Chairman's report to the Annual General Meeting of the Associated Commercial Vehicles

among the toughest in Britain. They need to be faced by a very tough Trade Union Movement.

The workers at the Fairey Plant at Hayes, Middlesex, have now made application to the Confederation of Engineering Unions to call out all Fairey workers in support of Stockport. The District Committee of the A.E.U. is supporting this application.

Meanwhile, however, the Fairey workers at Stockport are making very real sacrifices in the cause of Trade Unionism. All that these workers are receiving is official strike pay of £2 5s. 0d per week supplemented by 10/- a week from factory and Branch donations.

The National Assistance Board has refused to aid some of the strikers.

Financial assistance is therefore very urgently required. Send all donations to: **T. Robinson, 33 Garthland Road, Hazel Cross, nr. Stockport.**

Combine, reported a decline in the Combine's profits, and that the body building arm of this Combine—Park Royal Vehicles—was not showing the amount of profit he would like to see. The Stewards point out that the management, "undoubtedly aware of the sentiments expressed in the Lord's report, have over a period resisted fixing prices (for piece work) in an endeavour to cut them."

"It is evident" they continue, "that the management are launching an attack on wages and piece-work prices. There can be no doubt that Lord Brabazon's report, Mr. Black's delaying tactics and his desire to get 'new' agreements drawn up in P.R.V. have one aim and one aim only. Cut wages—Increase profits."

For over seven weeks these workers have been on strike to defend a solemnly concluded agreement.

The management can end this strike when they like, by simply agreeing to take all the men back and operate agreements by negotiating the outstanding points.

But the workers need and deserve all the financial assistance you can give them. They will send speakers and collecting sheets to branches and shop stewards committees.

Send all the assistance you can to the Treasurer of the Strike Fund: **K. Hatton, 62 Pilgrimage Way, Wembley, Middlesex.**

What Kind of Army Do We Need?

LED by the Socialist Party the Belgian Labour Movement has forced the Belgian Government to reduce the length of service in the armed forces by 3 months. Labour's demand was to reduce it by 12 months, but even so it remains a definite victory and a big blow against the warmongers in Europe.

And how was this victory achieved? By mass demonstrations—in which soldiers participated!—and by a general strike which was 100 per cent. complete.

Here in England a similar opposition to the 2 years service exists—especially among the disenfranchised youth who are conscripted! So great is this opposition, in fact, that none other than Mr. Shinwell—the man who introduced the 2 years service!—is today out in front demanding its reduction to 12 months. That is good. What is required now is for Mr. Shinwell to urge the Labour Party to emulate the fight of our sister party in Belgium and—organise similar demonstrations and strikes.

WHY TWO YEARS?

There is only one argument that can be advanced for the 2 years service—the need to use the conscript soldiers for "overseas commitments" for which one year is not enough. And that can be answered very easily—we don't want these overseas commitments in Korea, in Egypt, in Malaya, and in the rest of the overseas possessions which provide the fortunes for the City of London.

Freedom for the colonial people would at one blow do away with the necessity to "defend" these territories.

Twelve months is quite sufficient to train a man in the use of all arms and to make him an efficient soldier. And, in my opinion, **IT IS NECESSARY FOR WORKERS TO KNOW HOW TO USE ARMS.** Not, however, for the crushing of colonial peoples in revolt, or for the destruction of the Soviet Union and its nationalised property, but for the defence of the nationalised economy which we must hope soon to establish here in Britain.

By all means let us fight to reduce the 2 years period of service—but let us also devise a way of getting our workers trained in the use of arms for socialist and not for reactionary purposes. Can this be done? I believe it can. In fact, the pioneers of the movement long ago laid down a policy on this question which today must be resurrected.

THE CITIZENS' ARMY BILL

In 1908, a Bill, called "The Citizens' Army in the Making", was submitted in the House of Commons by the late Will Thorne, a Labour M.P. In the preface to a summary of the Bill, widely published in the Labour press, it was stated: "... what we advocate is not 'conscripted', neither is it 'compulsory military training', or even compulsory military training under the old War Office system."

THE ELECTION OF OFFICERS

As against the control of the military bureaucrats, the Bill demanded the election of officers by the men in the ranks.

Paragraph 15 of the Bill states: "The first appointment to the lower rank of officer shall be made upon the recommendation and selection by ballot of the men in the command. From these officers, officers of higher rank shall be promoted by merit, subject to

'DEMOCRACY' IN U.S. ARMY

Sergeant C. D. Chase has been convicted by a court-martial of disrespect to General Mark Clark, reduced to private, first-class, and ordered to forfeit 75 dollars (£26) a month pay for six months.

Sergeant Chase wrote to General Clark criticising the Far Eastern Commander's handling of the Kofe Island prisoners' riots as "repugnant and disgraceful." Officers said the sentence was relatively light.—Reuter.

"Liverpool Echo" (21.6.52).

asks Alf Rose (E.C. Member Bebington C.L.P.)

the approval by ballot of the men of the command, and facilities shall be afforded the lower grade of officers of entering a Staff College, and acquiring the necessary military knowledge for filling the highest posts. . . . From the officers admitted to Staff Colleges shall be selected the General Staff and a Commander-in-Chief. These shall be appointed by the officers themselves by ballot. . . . The military administration shall in all cases be carried out by the officers, duly selected by the men of their command."

CIVIL RIGHTS

Today reactionary officers continue to control the destinies of working class youngsters conscripted into the armed forces. Elementary democratic and civil rights are denied. Participation in the activities of political parties is forbidden the troops, and a military bureaucracy operates a totalitarian law inside the forces.

But Field-Marshal Montgomery and Slim can make anti-labour speeches from public platforms without disciplinary action being taken.

Clause 18 of the 1908 Bill laid down that: "Every member of the

Citizen Force will retain all his civil rights, and be subject only to civil law and dealt with by that law, for any offence with which he may be charged under any circumstances, except when actively engaged in national defence, for which the Central Administrative Board (of the Citizen Force, A.R.) will enact a special military code adaptable to such conditions."

STRIKE BREAKING

Mr. Shinwell was to be congratulated recently upon revealing that the present Government's Home Guard Bill would allow the use of Home Guards to break strikes. They cannot now be legally so used. But the regular army can, and, during Mr. Shinwell's term of office as Minister of Defence, were employed in this way.

The early pioneers laid down in the Citizens' Army Bill that: "The force, may not, under any circumstances, be called out to act in any case of civil disturbance."

In the Bill was a concrete and practical alternative military policy of the Labour Movement against capitalist militarism. It provides a basis for socialist policy today.

MURDER Inc.,

CASUALTIES IN KOREA (Incomplete)
Taken from Official U.S. Reports

MILITARY FORCES			
GI's reported to	7-11-51	78,726	
reported to	6-11-52	109,712	
INCREASE to			
South Korea to	6-11-52	30,986	
"UN" Nations to	early 52	301,864	
North Korea and China	April 52	9,926	
Non-battle Casualties	29-4-52	1,355,051	
CIVILIANS			
GI's	3-7-52	401,628	
North Korea and China	3-14-52	328,494	
CIVILIANS			
South Korea	over	4,000,000	
North Korea	over	1,000,000	
TOTAL CASUALTIES	over	7,506,675	

Registered Refugees in South Korea, 10,464,491.

AFRICA FIGHTS THIS BLACK TORY PLOT

By George Craddock M.P.

A SCHEME has been put forward by the Tory government to enforce the federation of Northern and Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland into a single Central African State. The main effect of this scheme will be to subordinate over 6,000,000 Africans to 169,000 white settlers.

Three-quarters of these settlers live in Southern Rhodesia, where after thirty years of 'self-government', only about 400 Africans from a native population of 2,000,000 are registered as voters, due to the excessively high property qualifications. The whole economic, political, social and educational structure is dominated by the colour bar, discriminatory legislation and segregation.

Although the African is primarily a farmer, only one-third of the land is reserved for him, whilst one-half is exclusively for European ownership. All the main features of the Malan racial policies operate in Southern Rhodesia, to the detriment of the Africans. Mr. Harry N'Kumbula, President of the Northern Rhodesian African Congress explains why they oppose assimilation into such a society "both in principle and in detail."

AFRICAN OPPOSITION

"We oppose it because . . . Northern Rhodesia is our country.

THE AUTHOR of this article is also the Treasurer of the Central African Federation Committee whose aim is to conduct a campaign against the Tory scheme of Federation. The Committee needs financial help. Donations should be sent to Mr. George Craddock, M.P. at the House of Commons, S.W.1.

It came under British protection through treaties made between the British Government and our chiefs. According to the treaties, we Africans of Northern Rhodesia wish to retain our land rights; we are looking forward in the immediate future to achieving self-government. The proposed federation is designed to counteract the national aspirations of our people."

Under the scheme, the land and other rights of the Africans are supposed to be safeguarded in various ways, with a final right of veto by the Colonial Minister. However, this does not afford much reassurance when it is remembered how the African and Coloured Franchise, among the entrenched clauses in the Act of Union, have been torn up as scraps of paper by Malan's government. Similar discriminatory legislation affecting Africans has been introduced in Southern Rhodesia despite the necessity for the Colonial Minister's assent to such legislation. Such 'safeguards' are valueless against the determined drive of White interests, spurred on by Big Business as reported in the 'Daily Herald' on 5th June, 1952:—

"Fabulous are the profits coming from the Northern Rhodesia

Copper Belt. N'Changa Consolidated Copper Mines announce a best-ever £9,982,245, which is £5,000,000 up on the previous year. Chairman Sir Ernest Oppenheimer pays shareholders a 50 per cent. dividend."

African opposition is declared to be 'unrepresentative', 'partial', 'ignorant', etc. . . . epithets which could not of course be applied to Tory Ministers and the Oppenheimers! Let Congress President Harry N'Kumbula speak again on this point:—

"The Northern Rhodesian African Congress is fully representative of the African people in the Protectorate, with 75 branches, many in rural areas. Its representative character may be judged from the response to the appeal for funds to enable some of its officials to fly to Britain to put their case against federation to the British public. In three weeks they had raised £3,000.

MASS ACTION PLANNED

The Congress passed the following resolution:—

"Realising that the Tory Government are about to attempt to force through federation against the unanimous wish of the African people, in the absence of normal power to prevent such a move, Congress adopts in principle mass protest action, and resolves to begin immediately a campaign to organise the people for such action. Further, Congress appoints a supreme action committee of nine, including five seats filled by the Trade Union Congress, to plan mass action; this council to be empowered to issue orders for action in the name of Congress up to and including the serious step



of calling for a national stoppage of work.

T.U. LEADERSHIP

The leading role in the struggle is thus being assumed by the Trade Unions, who are the best organised and most capable section of the community to understand the full implications of the government's federation policy. All European Trade Unions should prove their sense of international solidarity by sending resolutions protesting against enforced federation to the Prime Minister, and by ensuring that the true facts in this case are known and understood as widely as possible.

I have conversed with many representative Africans during recent months, and found tremendous opposition to the present government's scheme. It is also true to say they are in favour of a scheme which will have the support of the Africans themselves.

I see no reason at all why the matter should be rushed, and time ought to be given to permit discussions with representative Africans so that a scheme is devised acceptable to the Africans. Surely in this joint partnership between Central Africans and ourselves, it is manifestly unfair for Great Britain to say 'We have produced a scheme which you must accept'.

We now appear Fridays FORTNIGHTLY

NEXT ISSUE
FRIDAY, Sept. 5th

"Fabulous are the profits coming from the Northern Rhodesia

The Great Debate of 1952

Militant Trade Unionist:—Look here; the cost of living is going up fast. Unless I get a substantial wage increase quickly, I (and my wife and family) will suffer a serious drop in living standards. And we don't see why we should. On a national average, each worker now produces a surplus of £4 a week for his employer. We want a part of that surplus as extra wages—NOW.

Employer:—I acknowledge, of course, that there is a surplus, though I cannot agree to the figure. But I certainly cannot afford to hand any of it out as extra wages.

Just look what I have to do with it. I have to pay the shareholders, but that is only a start. The cost of materials is going up, and I shall have to use some of it so that I can buy as much material next year as I have done this year. I've got to keep the machinery in order and allow for depreciation. Then I've got to buy new machines, and even build new factories, to bring in new methods and new products.

Even with present wages, I shall probably have to put up prices if I am to keep going and expand; I certainly cannot afford to put wages up. No! I've at least got to keep them steady.

Mr. Deakin:—Hear! Hear!

Trader:—Too true. What's more, I've got to sell his products and make a profit out of them. If his prices are too high, I shall have to buy a cheaper line—where ever I can find it.

The Chancellor:—I should like to say something about that too. Much of the material the employer uses comes from abroad, and to pay for it we have to sell much of his production abroad. Since other countries pay about the same prices for raw materials as we do, wage rates are now the decisive element in our export prices. Any considerable rise in wages would result in the loss of many export markets; and that would mean cuts in imports of raw materials leading to unemployment, and cuts in imports of food leading to a lower standard of living. We must keep wage levels stable.—(Mr. Deakin:—Hear! Hear!)

Mr. Gaiskell:—With minor reservations, I concur.

Mr. Bevan:— I should like to

The following discussion is purely imaginary but, as our readers will agree, it is honestly based upon the public declarations of the people concerned.

By H. E. Castens

make a major reservation. We surely do not need to cut imports of raw materials for peaceful production, or imports of food. Instead we can cut imports of some armament materials, and divert others to make export goods.

Sir John Boyd-Orr:—I would go even further. We can open up trade with Russia and China, where large markets and large resources of raw materials await us.

Mr. Attlee:—I cannot agree with either of the last two

Arms must be made to protect profits. Profits from both must belong to the boss, with the worker only getting as much as he can wrest by fighting.

Bevan's and Boyd-Orr's suggestions will ease our pain for a time, but they will not cure our disease, as Bevan well knows.

My men are not fools. They know that better machines mean more and better goods. They know that better factories mean better conditions of work. They know



... and this is what it's all about.

speakers. Democracy is in danger of totalitarian aggression. We must have arms to defend democracy, and deny our enemies anything we can deny them.

Mr. Deakin:—Hear! Hear!

Mr. Truman:—I, too, agree. As Mr. Attlee has said elsewhere, the free nations of the world must band together to defend freedom. We must defend De-mock-racy, and destroy its enemies. When this Great Task is accomplished, my Great Nation will have taken its natural place as leader of the Free World, and will bestow on it all the bountiful blessings of Free Enterprise.

Mr. Deakin (loudly, if a trifle absent-mindedly):—HEAR! HEAR!

Militant Trade Unionist:—Free Enterprise—and free profits for the boss! That is just where all this is leading us to. Profits must be made to produce arms.

that neither can be had unless we save part of our production and invest it.

But they insist that the machines should be the peoples' machines, the factories should be the peoples' factories, the investments the peoples' investments, and the choice of imports the peoples' choice.

When this is the case they will set themselves to decide how much production goes to investment and export, and how the rest can be distributed according to need. They will decide how much extra is needed to increase production, and will willingly give all that is needed. And if anyone, from East or West, threatens to interfere, they will decide on the arms they need.

But they are not going to fight a war to defend private enterprise; and so long as private enterprise holds the field and any surplus remains the property of men who claim £5,000 a year as poor pay for themselves but who nevertheless grudge £5 a week to many workers—of men who use the tools of production in their own interests rather than the peoples'—they are going to fight for the largest possible share of the current surplus, and they are going to fight to get

Civil List; the one produced for the new Queen is obtainable from the Stationery Office or any bookseller, price 1/-. You will find at the foot of these columns a comparison between the list for the late King and the new Queen.

Note the terrific increase on amounts already extremely high, and to this must be added other charges that come direct from the National exchequer but which are nevertheless part of the royal set-up, such things as cost of sea and air trips, soldiers, police, etc.

It is therefore safe to say that the minimum cost to the workers of the country is at least £1,000,000 a year.

Mr. Attlee, when welcoming this piece of extravagance, said that few people realise what is actual expenditure on the Monarchy and what goes to state ceremonial. Very well, let us look at the details. Take the figures for 1951 of which we have full details.

Running expenses for the Royal Family cost £192,790 and the ceremonial costs are included in that figure, together with the cost of such items as Food, Drink, Household goods, Fuel and Light, Telephone, etc. Licences, Laundry, Travelling, Gardens, Doctors, Clergy, Books, Art, Cups and Medals, Rates and Rents, Horses, Cars and expenses of parties, flowers, etc. (Incidentally, Food and Drink cost £34,500, Books and works of art £226.)

It may be said, in fact it is said, that these are the costs of the Royal household; but in the new estimates given below you will see a separate item, quite apart from personal allowances, of £185,000 set aside for salaries.

Now take the present personal allowances of the 8 members of the Royal Family listed below and you find it comes to the huge sum of £400,000 after all other ex-

hold of the tools of production.

New Fabian Essayist (nervously):—Yes, yes, of course, fair shares and social ownership. But surely we should go slowly and make careful experiments. And need we really go so far as you suggest? Surely there are many things better run by private enterprise for as long as we can forsee? **Mr. Morrison:**—Quite, Quite, some are clearly not ripe for nationalisation.

Socialist Unionist:—And of course we must remember that the class structure of our society has already been transformed. The idea that the class struggle must be intensified is just an illusion!

The last two speakers in unison, with a chorus of middle class socialists:—And, of course, anything we do take over we must pay full compensation for. Any other course would be opposed to our commercial consciences, besides being unfair to the shareholders.

Militant Trade Unionist:—Rubbish! We do not trust the present bosses and we cannot work full out for them. We insist on taking over the tools, and on the right to distribute the products according to need when we have done so. The present distribution is unjust, and commercial compensation will perpetuate the injustice.

If the bosses and shareholders resist, and some get really poor, they can do what our Old Age



Not Much Change After the Week's Shopping

Pensioners already have to do—they can apply to the National Assistance Board.

We are not going to buy the tools of production, we are going to take them over just as fast as we can get the power to do so.

We will give work to owners who can work and a fair pension to the rest.

And in the meanwhile, we are going to fight for as large a share of the surplus as we can get.

So more wages, please, NOW—and a socialist policy for the Labour Party.

Mr. Deakin:—My God!!!

Magical Money

An American worker conducts an experiment in economics—and discovers all about the "American Way of Life."

BY HARRY FRANKEL

(Reprinted from the American Socialist paper, "The Militant")

The other day I read a column about stock ownership by Max Lerner in the "N.Y. Post". He winds up:

"I have myself never owned a share of stock in my life. But as soon as I can save up some money, I intend to start. Like other Americans, I have been bitten by the great American dream: To have your money work for you, silently and effectively, while you doze in the sun."

Now I'm not much of a dreamer, but for hard-headed practical purposes, that's the best dream I ever heard of. I don't know how you get bitten by a dream, but I had it brother, I had it bad. All that evening, I could think of nothing but money at work: money raising me a fine truck garden, money tailoring a new set of duds for the family, money polishing the car; in short, money making my living for me "silently and effectively."

The next day I laid off work, went downtown and drew my little hoard out of the bank, and set out for the country. I found a shady spot, set out my money in a nice little heap, and sat down to watch it work. It never stirred. So I figured I'd try dozing off; maybe money don't work so good when you're watching it. I woke about two hours later, and that lazy old green stuff was lying there just as dead as before. It never did a lick more than I did.

A DISAPPOINTED MAN

I put the money back in my pocket and went back to town, a disappointed man. The next day when I went to work, I stopped in the office to see my boss. He has lots of money and knows how to make it do all sorts of things: work, talk, grow, etc. I told him my trouble.

He laughed. "Well now, that notion about 'money working for you' is just a manner of speaking. As a matter of fact, when it

penses have been met. If the wages of working men were paid on this basis every working man should have in addition to his wages, free drink, housing, food, heating and light, laundry, travelling expenses, etc., etc. Why not?

In conclusion, wasteful as all this royal expenditure is, its purpose is really to justify similar extravagance by dozens of other families who make up the upper crust of the nation. They are delighted to live up to the standards set by the Royal House, every penny of the cost of all the frippery and waste having to be taken from food and materials which should go to the hard-pressed families of the workers of Britain.

comes to work, money is in the same class as platinum-blond hair, gold diggers and angora cats. All it can do is lay around and look pretty."

"What's the angle then, boss?" I asked. "How do people get so much out of it?"

The boss leaned back and got expansive. I could see he was on his favourite topic. "Money," he said, "is like a perpetual motion machine. The only way to make it work is by magic. You got to change it into something else."

GETS VAGUE

Here the boss started to get vague. He even seemed a little embarrassed, like a man who suddenly realises he's been talking too much. "Oh, you know, stuff and things."

"I get it," I said, "Machinery. You have to buy machinery with the money."

"Well —" his embarrassment hung on.

"And materials for the machines to work on." I thought I was really cooking now.

He hemmed and hawed a little bit, and finally gave it to me straight. "Look, I've been around money, machinery, materials and all that kind of stuff for a long time, and I've never seen any of them do a tap of work. The only item in God's creation I've ever seen do any work is people."

I started to see daylight. "You mean, anybody who has money 'working for him' is really living off the labour of other people?"

There was a sudden change in the boss. "Listen," he shouted. "What d'ya wanta get so smart for? It won't do you any good to know so much. Now quit standing around here. Get out on the floor and do some work. D'ya think I'm made of money? D'ya think money grows on trees?"

He had me there. He's not made of money, but of flesh and blood like me. Money doesn't grow on trees, or anywhere else. Money doesn't work. But I do.

BILL MURPHY'S DREAM

The other night I had rather a queer dream. In it Arthur Deakin was awarded a knighthood.

Shortly after arriving at Court he knelt to receive the accolade.

Upon hearing the words: "Arise, Sir Arthur," he jumped to his feet and indignantly exclaimed: "A rise! Give us a break, you've only just had one."

(Note: Bill Murphy is a Merseyside docker.)

Speaking my mind

On ... The Cost of Monarchy

by TOM BRADDOCK

THE founders of our Movement stood for the abolition of the Monarchy and the House of Lords, and for the repudiation of the National Debt. I take it that no socialist will say that either a King or a National Debt will be part of the ultimate Socialist State. However, since we have just had the money claim of the Monarchy it is opportune to give the matter a little attention.

The usual defence for the institution is that it comes cheaper than a president and that "nobody else would like the job". Neither of these is true, but even if they were they do not justify keeping the outworn relic any longer.

A president irrespective of cost, is preferable for the reason that a man or woman of real ability

for the job can be selected. As for the job being unpleasant, that again calls for its abolition; we have no right to ask others to do that which we would not like to do ourselves, providing no alternative is possible. The world shows us many such alternatives.

That all this is well known to the supporters of the Monarchy is clear when we see the evasions and misrepresentations that are used when a little light is turned on to the mysteries that surround the provisions for the cost of supporting the institution.

On succeeding to the throne almost the first thing the new monarch does is to apply to the House of Commons for money. A Select Committee is set up and produces what is known as the

No wage freeze for THIS family

	1937	1952
H.M. Privy Purse and provision for certain members of Royal Family	£110,000	£155,000
Salaries of Household	£134,000	£185,000
Expenses of Household	£152,800	£196,800
Royal Bounty, Alms, etc. (Note: No increase here)	£13,200	£13,200
Queen Mary	£70,000	£70,000
Queen Elizabeth, Queen Mother	—	£70,000
Princess Elizabeth, now Queen	£40,000	—
The Duke of Gloucester	£35,000	£35,000
The Duke of Edinburgh	£10,000	£40,000
The Princess Margaret	£6,000	£6,000 (when she marries £15,000)
The Princess Royal	£6,000	£6,000
The Duke of Cornwall (3½ years old)	—	£10,000
	£577,000	£796,000

Readers Forum

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

OUR PAPER AND RUSSIA

The "Socialist Outlook" appears to me to be deliberately overlooking the Imperialist character of Russian policy, and the ruthlessly undemocratic nature of Communist regimes.

Today, Russia exacts tribute from her colonies in Eastern Europe on an ever-increasing scale. She is not concerned with the well-being of the workers and peasants in every part of the world, but seeks to use the legitimate grievances of such people for her own ends.

I feel that it is wrong to blame all the ills of the world on America. Your readers would, I am sure, welcome a more objective and impartial "Outlook", (and a little less whitewash!).

Nottingham.

A. R. Griffin.

The Editor replies:

The "Socialist Outlook" never pretended to be "impartial". We are a socialist paper and we take sides. Consequently, we have always tried to defend the socialist movement and its achievements against its main enemy, capitalism. We reject entirely the view that the Soviet Union is an imperialist country. We believe that Russia is part of the socialist movement by virtue of the fact that the Russian workers long ago—in 1917—overthrew Czarism and capitalism and, by establishing a planned economy through the nationalisation of the land and the factories, laid the essential basis for the development of the socialist society. This was, in our opinion, the greatest event in human history to date. It has yet to be continued in Britain.

It is this great conquest of the Russian working class which world capitalism—and especially American capitalism—wishes to destroy and they have clearly announced this aim in the recent manifesto of Eisenhower's American Republican Party. The "Socialist Outlook" will play its role in defeating the reactionary aims of the imperialists and will defend the conquests of the great Russian Revolution—but it is this, and this only, which we ask the British workers to defend.

Such an attitude does not in the slightest degree commit us to defending all the actions of the Russian Government, nor does it involve us in "whitewashing" the undemocratic regime in the U.S.S.R.

Is our attitude really so difficult to understand? After all, socialist trade unionists recognise that the British Trade Unions are a conquest of the working class—despite the existence within these unions of bureaucrats and bureau-

cratic practices. If these unions are attacked by the Tories or the Fascists, workers will defend the unions without thereby becoming partisans of Mr. Arthur Deakin or his policies. In the same way it is possible to defend the Soviet Union from imperialist attack without thereby becoming partisans of the present Russian Government.

It is our firm belief that the extension of socialist planning to all other parts of the world (something which is actually happening in large parts of Asia today) will not only remove finally the threat of war from capitalist society—but will also remove those undemocratic features in the Soviet regime which are, in the last analysis, the product of Russia being too long isolated as the lone workers republic in a sea of capitalism.

* * *

GHOSTS OF THE PAST

In the British Museum I recently discovered a series of Labour Party posters published prior to 1932. One of them read as follows:—

**For the Cost of One Battleship
We Could Build—**
100 Schools
100 Miles of Country Road
10 Large Factories
50 Miles of Main Road
3,000 Country Cottages
500 Combine Harvesters

**Socialism in Action means—
"Peace" Work**

Join the Labour Party

The poster was issued by Transport House. I think that if the rank and file carries the day at the forthcoming Morecambe Conference we shall soon see similar posters on the hoardings again.

Norwood.

D. Finch.

* * *

AN APPRECIATION

Congratulations to you all on the way you covered the Briggs and Ford strikes. It was well received by the dockers here. Also your cartoons—especially the one illustrating Will Morris's pamphlet. Will is a great favourite among Merseyside dockers.

Birkenhead.

Pat McShane.

Note: Many readers have congratulated us for the covering of the Briggs' and Ford's strikes. We are only too pleased to give space in our paper to such struggles and, for this reason we appeal to our readers to keep us regularly informed with reports of the industrial struggle in their own factories.

even among Labour M.P.'s.

This latter fact explains why another of the anti-Bevanites has bemoaned—in the columns of the "News Chronicle"—the re-imposition of Standing Orders for the Parliamentary Labour Party. He blames Mr. Bevan for the re-introduction of what he terms this "retrogressive step". And now we can begin to see what the row is all about. From the point of view of Mr. Jeger and his friends, Standing Orders ARE a retrogressive step. Minorities are now compelled to abide by majority decisions and—here's the rub—today those decisions are, more often than not... decisions which tend to support the ideas of Aneurin Bevan and the Left-wing of the Party.

That's terribly "retrogressive". It has already resulted in a decision to vote against German re-armament. Why, it may soon compel the Right-wing to vote for a reduction in the arms bill!

Clearly, this is what has caused the anger of Mr. Jeger and his friends. As the base of the Party has shifted to the Left, they have become more and more isolated. What they have failed so miserably to accomplish by political argument they are now trying to achieve with slander and abuse.

By poisoning the atmosphere with talk of "organised disloyalty" they hope no doubt, to side-track the discussion away from the main political issues and even, perhaps, prepare the Party for the eventual expulsion of Aneurin Bevan and his supporters. The anti-Bevan witch-hunt is, in fact, a move to split the Party.

LABOUR YOUTH SEEKS UNION AFFILIATIONS

At least one Labour League of Youth has carried out the recent Youth Conference decision to 'get closer to working class youth'.

Cleethorpes League sent a speaker to the local branch of U.S.D.A.W. and asked them to affiliate their youth section to the Cleethorpes, L.L.O.Y. The branch agreed with enthusiasm.

The League urges Labour's Youth in all parts of the country to follow its example.

MALAYA (from page 1)

The Trade Union leaders, they recently negotiated a wage agreement with the employers which enabled the latter to slash the wages of 300,000 rubber workers.

As the "Economist" (22.3.52) commented "there are no real leaders (in Malaya) possessing the confidence of their peoples with whom to work."

WHAT'S AT STAKE

The authors, however, do not belittle the significance of Malaya, economically, politically or strategically. To quote from the document—"a Communist Malaya means that the world's biggest single source of rubber and tin (with the United States as the biggest customer) is transferred from the free nations to the Communist Bloc. Expressed in Malayan dollars this would mean a loss of 575.5 million dollars to British capitalism.

It costs the Government £40,000 a day to protect this investment from the "terrorists". Grants, paid or promised, by the British Government toward the cost of the emergency, total £9,000,000—a sum which is in sharp contrast to the meagre £114,200 paid out by the Colonial Development Corporation to Malaya for the period 1946-1952.

PROTECTION

The authors shamelessly assert that "Malaya is under British Protection." As a result of this "protection" Malaya has to import 70 per cent. of its rice requirements—and its whole economy is geared to the American war drive.

"Protection" has meant for the Malayan peoples the use of chemical poisons against food crops, deportation of 14,000 people without charge or trial, imprisonment of hundreds of others, the destruction of over 30 villages and towns and a hundred and one other abominations which have been classified more than once as war crimes under Hague regulations and Geneva protocols.

Some instances of British protection. "On February 5th and 6th", the "Singapore Standard" reported that "a 16 year old girl had been sentenced to five years penal servitude for giving a towel and toothbrush to bandits." A 21 year-old boy in the same case got ten years. A 34 year-old mother of three children received six months imprisonment when found guilty of "being in possession of a quantity of uncooked rice presumably for the use of 'terrorists'; and a widow with a son and daughter was sentenced to five years under similar circumstances. These are typical cases.

It will take more than the subterfuge and deception of the Colonial Office to retrieve the legacy of hatred and suspicion which British Imperialism has left behind in Malaya. Only the withdrawal of the British, Gurkha, and African troops can do this. It is time to get out.

"HE WAS A VERY GENTLE KNIGHT"

General Sir Gerald Templer is reported in "Daily Telegraph", 19/8/52, as saying to a Borneo tracker in Malaya:

"Write me when you have made your first kill. I will come personally to congratulate you."

The splitters must be called to order. The Party must insist—and insist most strongly—that discussion on policy questions be free from all witch-hunts.

What is impermissible in a democratic party is not the meetings of Mr. Bevan and his supporters—but the substitution of personal abuse for political argument as at present being practised by the groups of Bevan-baiters inside the

Dockers call for aid to Labour Left

HOW often do we hear it said among Labour Party members: "We can't do much against the Right Wing because they always have the support of Mr. Deakin's T. & G.W.U." Now its true that Deakin can always be relied upon to wield his block vote against the progressive wing of the Party—but it's also true that inside Mr. Deakin's Union are some of the most militant socialists in this coun-

try, dockers, transport workers, busmen, etc.

To unite the forces of Labour's Left Wing with the forces of militant trade unionism is the only sure way of defeating the Right Wing on both sides of the Labour Movement.

The "Socialist Outlook" has always advocated this course. We have never favoured running away from Deakin by such methods as separating the Trades Unions from the Labour Party. We are therefore well pleased to reprint below an editorial from the "Portworkers Clarion" which forcefully supports the idea of a joint fight against the common enemy.

"THE WIND BLOWS LEFT"

"... For many years the genuine socialists among the Port Workers of Britain have been in the forefront of the fight against the right wing leaders and their anti-socialist policy."

"The Port Workers' strikes of the years from 1944 to the recent Birkenhead strike of only a few weeks ago, were not only battles against the ruling class, but also against the right wing dictators in the Trades Union movement. At the present time when throughout the Labour Party, Trades Unions and Co-operative movement, a great swing to the left is taking place, all serious socialist workers among the dockers must take heed of the connection that exists between this leftward movement and the Port Workers' movement nationally."

"Like the Port Workers' committees, the leftward swing is first and foremost in defence of the living standards of the workers. Union after union is demanding wage increases and protesting at the cause of the lowering living standards of the workers!"

"Like the Port Workers' movement, the efforts of the rank and file meet with opposition from the very same people, namely, the right wing elements who have opposed and hindered the Port Workers in all the strike struggles since 1944."

"Mr. Deakin leads the right wing in opposition to the demands of the mass labour movement, just as in the same way he leads and has led the opposition to the demands of the Port Workers."

"In such a situation the enemies of the Port Workers' committees and the left wing of the Labour Party and the Trades Union movement are the same: first the Tories and their agents, the right wing leaders led by Deakin."

"The Port Workers' committees, being part of the broadening struggle against the Tories and the right wing, must intensify their efforts to expose the right wing in its citadel, which is the T. & G.W.U., of which we dockers are but a small section."

"In the genuine fight for socialism and democracy in the labour movement, the Port Workers must come forward and play a leading role side by side with their brothers of the left wing in the labour movement." ("Port Workers' Clarion," July 1952.)

EDITORIAL (from page 1)

He stood to lose nothing—indeed, he has received the praise of the entire employing class!—and, in any case, he was well-paid for his trouble.

WHAT'S IT ALL ABOUT?

What has really caused this outburst from the extreme Right-wing? They themselves would have us believe that they are moved solely by a desire to protect the Party from the "organised disloyalty" of Mr. Bevan. What a nerve they've got! Why, only a few weeks ago, most of them openly broke the discipline of the Parliamentary Labour Party by refusing to vote against the Tories on the issue of German re-armament.

Without exception, this noisy group of Bevan-baiters—Woodrow Wyatt, George Brown, George Jeger, Freda Corbett and the rest—belong to the extreme Right-wing of the Party. That is to say, they are ardent supporters of the present ruinous arms programme, they favour giving guns and tanks to the German capitalists, and, of course, they are staunch believers in the alliance with the United States of America.

NO LONGER POPULAR

Such policies are, to say the least, no longer popular in the Labour Party—as a glance at the preliminary agenda for the forthcoming Annual Conference will show clearly enough. On the subject of re-armament alone, there are 43 resolutions from affiliated organisations which demand drastic reductions in this ruinous military expenditure. In fact,

1000 Shillings —Make £50

A reader sending 1/- to the Fighting Fund makes this suggestion:

"If you had 1,000 shillings per month it would make up your £50 target. I suggest you advertise this idea in the paper. A thousand volunteers for such a scheme would soon get us the Weekly "Socialist Outlook".

HOW ABOUT IT?

FIGHTING FUND

Edmonton Printers 5/4; Tottenham L.P. members 3/9; Bethnal Green Readers £3 6s. 3d.; R. T. Shelley readers 17/-; Sam 5/-; P. Skellington 5/-; P.G. 5/-; Leicester readers 9/-; Notts readers £1; R. Bullock 5/-; Sympathiser 2/3; P.M. 1/-; Anon 2/6; J. Davis 5/-; G. White 5/-; W. Pickett 2/6; J. Walsh 5/-; Birmingham collecting card 5/3; Anon 6d.; Norwood readers £1 9/-; Battersea reader 7/7; W. London readers £3; D. Lloyd 5/-; 2 Reading socialists 10/-; Bermondsey readers 13/7; Manchester readers £2 9s. 11d.; Sunderland 2/-; J.J. 1/-; Edinburgh readers, £1 6s.; Birkenhead 12/6; ENV workers 10/-; Depford socialist £3; Hackney readers £1 9s.; R. Fagg 1/-; B. Osborne 5/-; Tottenham readers £3 6s. 3d.; Enfield Engineers £1 14s. 3d.; W. Punt collection 15/-; Manchester Engineers collection 8/1; J. Fairhead 15/-; Stratford readers £2 2s. 6d.
Total £31 12s. 6d.

Your own copy sent to you each fortnight by post

Fill in this form now

POSTAL SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Please send a copy of the "Socialist Outlook" by post each issue for.....issues to:—

Name

Address

for which I enclose postal order value £ .. s. .. d.

Send to "SOCIALIST OUTLOOK" 177, Bermondsey Street, London, S.E.1.

Rates:— 3 months (6 issues) — — — 2/3

6 months (12 issues) — — — 4/6

12 months (25 issues) — — — 9/-