

Join the
**LABOUR
PARTY**
TODAY

Socialist Outlook

WEEKLY

No. 67.
[Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper]

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1953

3d.

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

YOUTH AND THE TORIES

THIS weekend the Scottish Labour Leagues of Youth are holding their conference. The delegates must surely be disturbed at the seeming inability of the League of Youth to attract and hold young people.

The Filey Conference in June 1952, saw the platform and the delegates agree that a larger and more representative League could and should be built. We decided to launch a new membership campaign. What has happened since speaks for itself.

Despite our efforts, the membership has not increased, but has

By Bob Pennington

(N.E. Leeds L.L.O.Y.)

generally decreased. Not only has individual membership dropped, but, what is more serious, some fifty Leagues have disappeared altogether.

Stale and cynical people will say that this is all we can expect because the youth are not interested in politics and the responsibilities which politics entail. Before we despair, however, what does our League of Youth offer to young people?

THERE'S REASON TO FIGHT

For these last sixteen months, we have had the experience of a Tory Government. Today, the cost of living has risen higher than the young peoples' earnings. They have to contribute more at home, now that the food subsidies have been cut.

Couples who want to marry view with dismay the high prices of furniture. It becomes harder and harder to get loans from the building societies, and where are the houses to rent? Two years' compulsory military service interrupt apprenticeships and training, with a strong chance of service in a colonial war in Korea, Malaya or Kenya.

This is a situation which we would expect to be very favourable to the Labour Party for winning large sections of young people, in face of the Tories' performance. But, instead of attracting recruits, we find that League members nearly always lack self-confidence and have the feeling that they have nothing to offer and little hope of recruiting new members. Yet the reports which the Filey Conference discussed show that the League does have something to offer.

WHAT WE STAND FOR

We discussed positive plans for improving Education, conditions of employment and recreation. We decided to press for Technical Training in the Employers' Time, abolition of night-school fees, smaller classes, more technical schools and the teachers' conditions improved.

We also declared for longer holidays with pay, better working conditions, and collaboration with the unions for improved wages and shorter hours for youth. Bigger grants from local authorities for youth clubs and more sports fields and gymnasias, especially in industrial areas.

These are the demands which really interest young people. If we conduct an agitation for them we cannot fail to attract recruits.

They are demands which do not in any way cut across the programme adopted by the Labour Party at Morecambe. We shall not get more and better schools and playing fields until the building industry and the land are nationalised and the landowners and building contractors can no longer hold up the public to ransom.

Several unions have already

organised Junior Workers' Committees. League branches should establish the closest relation with the unions. Not only can we expect young trade unionists to have sympathy with us, but the union organisers will be grateful for any help we can give them and our joint work will provide valuable experience for League members.

While we turn our attention outwards and offer our proposals to the young people, at the same time we cannot avoid taking part in the controversies which are raging throughout the adult party branches. We are not interested in personal squabbles. We want to help the party to reach decisions on policy which really will help to provide young people with what they want. The League exists, not only to canvass at election times, but to assist in making party policy in Britain.

Youth's Glorious Future?

4,715 soldiers of 15 nations (4,410 of them Americans) lie in this military cemetery near Pusan, Korea. These wooden crosses will flower all over Asia if General Eisenhower is allowed to carry the war into China itself. American casualties have already reached 140,000 since the Korean war began.



No War On China is Labour Policy *But it's deeds that count!*

BY a decision of its last Annual Conference, the Labour Party is completely opposed to the present war-like plans of the American Government against the Chinese people.

And this opposition—at least as far as the delegates to Morecambe were concerned—is not the same as the so-called "opposition" of the Tory Gov-

ernment which fears only for the safety of British capitalist interests in Hong Kong and the Far East should open war with China be declared.

To make this difference quite clear we shall quote in full the relevant passage from the document "Labour's Foreign Policy" which was passed by the Morecambe Conference. It reads:

"The Labour Party recognises that the peoples of Asia are engaged in a historic revolution against foreign exploitation and domestic poverty. It believes that co-operation between Asia and the Western world must be based on the right of the Asian peoples to govern themselves."

"The Labour Government recognised the Peking Government as the legal government of China and pressed frequently in

Editorial

the United Nations that the representative of the de facto government should occupy China's seat. It is clearly a travesty that the delegate from the rump regime of Chiang Kai-shek should speak in the United Nations in the name of the Chinese people who have rejected him, and the Labour Party believes that there can be no lasting political settlement in the Far East which is not based on the recognition that the Peking Government is the effective government of China and, as such, should represent that country in the United Nations."

Nothing could be clearer than that: Labour is opposed to any war on China because we recognise—and, by that token, we support—the historic revolution of China against foreign exploitation and domestic poverty.

Why then, it may be asked, do we call on the National Executive Committee to organise an Emergency Conference of the Party on the events in China and the Far East? The answer to this question is given in a resolution recently carried unanimously by the Blackley Constituency Labour Party.

Reminding the N.E.C. that Morecambe decided "to be on guard against the dangers of supporting anti-working class forces in international affairs", declared its support for East West trade and its "resistance to the use of our military strength as a means of enforcing territorial changes in

Europe or elsewhere", the Blackley resolution concluded:

"The Blackley Divisional Labour Party therefore believes that if the Churchill Government associates itself with the Eisenhower policy on Formosa, Labour must take every step necessary to frustrate the American war plans against China, and as soon as possible the N.E.C. should call a Special Emergency Conference to decide how such a policy can be carried out."

Hundreds of other local Labour Parties, and numerous trade union branches have, we are sure, passed similar resolutions. But so far there has been precious little response from the Party leaders. True enough Mr. Morrison and others have registered the Party's opposition in Parliament but—unlike the members of the Blackley C.L.P.—they show no desire to go any further than that.

Under these circumstances the Movement's protests remain on paper. Nothing is done to frustrate the Churchill-Eisenhower war plan. And that is why we demand a Special Conference—to decide a line of action based on previously adopted policy resolutions.

But when we face up to the task of implementing Conference decisions we shall be immediately confronted with a glaring contradiction in our Foreign policy as decided at Morecambe. For the same document which commits us, quite rightly, to support the Chinese revolution also commits us to support the biggest enemy of the Chinese revolution, American Big Business! "The Labour Party", says the document, "believes that close co-operation with the United States of America is vital to Britain and to the Commonwealth as a whole . . ."

As the rulers of American are obviously hell-bent on war against the "historic revolution" which Labour has recognised, "Close co-operation" with the United States Administration becomes therefore . . . close co-operation with the most reactionary force in the world.

It is this terrible contradiction in policy which inhibits and frustrates the Movement. Our leaders will not initiate any real action against the Churchill Government because they have no desire to disturb Anglo-American relations.

Here then are two good reasons for calling a Special Emergency Conference. First, to implement the Conference decisions on China by mobilising mass opposition to the Tory Government which, however reluctantly, is going along with the Americans in this war plan and, secondly, to free the Movement's hands in international affairs by deciding to break all relations with the present reactionary United States administration.

British Railways Challenge Trade Unions

THE Railway Executive have advised the Unions that any men who participate in "unofficial action" will, "generally speaking, be treated as self suspended or self dismissed".

And in case anyone should think that this is merely the action of some unintelligent Blimp in high places, they are at pains to point out that this decision was arrived at "after due consideration" and "with complete understanding of what the decision entails".

Trade Unionists have a right to expect their Executive Councils to indignantly repudiate this decision and, if necessary, prepare their memberships for action to force its withdrawal. But to date the Executives of the N.U.R. and A.S.L.E. & F. have merely passed the decision on to the memberships as "information". We have no doubt however, that a storm of protest will arise from their branches as they are the unions mostly involved. They will, we are sure, insist that their Executives lead a fight to force the withdrawal.

This is an issue which is of vital concern to all Trade Unionists. It is an attack on the fundamental principle of the right to strike. If British Railways get away with it, Private Enterprise will certainly

not be slow in following the trail blazed for them by a Nationalised Industry.

WHAT IS "UNOFFICIAL ACTION" ANYWAY?

Where does "unofficial" end and "official" commence? Every day throughout the country there are taking place "down tool" actions: some that the Executive's of the Unions never even hear about. They are settled on the spot. Others are settled by local branch officials, or shop stewards, and the Executives are not brought in but, while never "recognising" the action, nevertheless pay out strike benefit.

The capitalist press, the radio, and the films, have assiduously cultivated the idea that the Executives are the Unions. It is high time this idea was exploded.

If local branches, district committees, or mass factory or depot meetings, decide to take action, such decisions are binding on the members concerned and must be considered official—irrespective of whether an Executive—often hundreds of miles away—decides to recognise them or not.

In fact and practice every so

called "unofficial" dispute has to be recognised by the Union Executives. For even when an Executive, opposes an action, almost invariably it has to send a representative or an official to the scene and argue with the men for a return to work. The men having decided to come out, it is recognised that it is the men who must decide to go back. And the Ex-

Reported by our Industrial Correspondent

cutive has to abide by the decision of such mass meetings of the members.

When once the Union Executives admit the "right" of employers to dismiss workers who go on strike it is but a short step to agreeing to the complete outlawing of all forms of strike action. The capitalist class will then have succeeded in doing peacefully what Hitler had to do by knife and bludgeon.

WHAT IS BEHIND THIS MOVE?

Why should the Railway Executive choose this moment to try and introduce such a ruling? We

believe because sections of railwaymen are seriously discussing what they can do to protect their jobs from the attacks which they know must follow from the passing of the Transport Bill to denationalise Road Transport and decentralise the Railways.

The Railway Executive—and at the back of them the Government—know only too well that the only means of opposition left to the railway workers—as with the Road Haulage men—is industrial action.

They hope that by getting this principle of "self - dismissal" accepted before the event, it will be a useful weapon with which to create friction in the ranks. This type of weapon is most effective on the Railways where promotion, stand-offs, etc., are controlled by length of service. Under these circumstances the longer the service the more you have to lose, which can drive a wedge between the older men and the younger ones who are usually in the forefront.

All the more praise therefore to those Scottish and North English branches of the A.S.L.E. & F. and N.U.R. who, in conference last Sunday, and with full knowledge of this threat by the British Railways, carried the resolution reported on page four.

Sydney Silverman M.P.

will speak at the

**Great Rally Organised
by "Socialist Outlook"
Against War
On China!**

**HOLBORN HALL
Sunday, March 15th, 2.30 p.m.**

Other speakers announced later

