

Join the
**LABOUR
PARTY**
TODAY

Socialist Outlook

WEEKLY

No. 85
[Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper]

FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 1953

3d.

**Labour's
Programme
Analysed**
(See page 2)

Not For Sale

In these few lines Janet Alexander—a member of the Peckham Labour Party—has expressed the anger of every Socialist confronted with the cold-blooded execution of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, victims of U.S. capitalism's filthy witch-hunt.

They walked in honour, to the death
That was for them the last of many,
To speak, to lie, to bear false witness
And life would have been theirs.
That precious coursing of the blood
The beating heart,
So very dear to every man, and very dear to these
Who had two sons.

Our hands had not the strength
To break the walls and pluck them out of hell,
And so they died, and did not speak.

And those who crucified them,
The slayers of Hiroshima,
Held up their dripping hands in piety
And sanctified their crime.

But we will not forget,
And when with blow on mighty blow
We bring down these monstrous masters of the world,
Their strength will nourish ours,
Their agony will not have been in vain.

Consultation or Collaboration

Remarks on the Tory Steel Board By Robert Willis

(Secretary London Society of Compositors)
Member T.U.C. General Council

THE Labour Government, with the full support of the Trade Unions, nationalised a number of industries including iron and steel. The Conservatives, despite the opposition of the Trade Unions, have denationalised iron and steel. The Labour opposition has stated that when they return to power iron and steel will again be nationalised. Up to this point politics would seem to be running true to form; the division of interest and policy is clear. Where, then, stand the Trade Unions?

It is public knowledge that the General Council refused to assist the Government in its plans for denationalisation. It is equally well known that although the Minister's pressing invitation to collaborate in the assassination of a piece of Socialist legislation was rejected, the General Council none the less insisted on its right to consult with the Government on any aspect of the Bill likely to affect Trade Union interests once it had been laid before Parliament.

Now, the Minister has announced that three prominent Trade Unionists have accepted the Government's invitation to serve on the Board of the denationalised industry. It is true that one of these leaders withdrew his acceptance within 48 hours after conferences with his Executive Committee. He has, however, been replaced by another equally prominent member of the General Council.

It is known that the T.U.C. insisted on consultation with the Government. It was surely not known or expected that General Council members would collaborate in destroying the work of a Labour Government based on generally accepted principles within our Movement. Yet that is just what this acceptance means. Sir

Lincoln Evans, Mr. John Owen and Mr. Andrew Naesmith are hoping to demonstrate that the denationalisation of the iron and steel industry is going to work more effectively under private control than under Government control. If their action does not mean this, what does it mean? Surely they are not accepting these posts in order to sabotage the Government's plan; that would be unthinkable. What they are doing, of course, is to sabotage in advance Labour's prospects of renationalisation.

In what a starry will a future Labour Government find itself! Could the services of Sir Lincoln be retained after renationalisation? Could it be argued that he would serve a nationalised industry with the same fervour with which he would seem to serve private interests?

It must be remembered that Sir Lincoln refused to serve on a nationalised Board; it should also be remembered that the big steel magnates themselves refused, when invited by the Labour Government to assist in the nationalisation of their industry—an attitude which was at least understandable and from their point of view, honest. One of them stated at the time that Labour would find no quillings in their ranks.

It is not without significance that the headlines announcing the appointments emphasised the association of Trade Union leaders with the new Board. "The Times" in a leading article described the Minister's appointment of three Trade Union leaders as a "shrewd political stroke". It admits that Mr. Beard "had second thoughts", but remarked complacently that "he was rapidly replaced by Mr. Naesmith" and argues from their acceptance "that they believe that a Board of this kind can be a success". The "Observer" remarks that "the inclusion of two members of the T.U.C. General Council gives it as much of a non-party

On-The-Spot Report of E. Berlin Strikes Workers Fight Party Bosses

From Wilhelm Sprenger

Berlin, Monday, 22 June.

SINCE June 16th, a big wave of workers struggles has hit Eastern Germany. Successively, the Berlin building workers (June 16th), most of the Berlin building, metal and transport workers (June 17th), and workers in most of the industrial towns of the whole of Eastern Germany stopped work and organised big demonstrations to demand better working and living conditions and political freedom for the Labour Movement.

The Sunday edition of "Neues Deutschland"—which is the central organ of the Government Communist Party known as the Socialist Unity Party of East Germany (S.E.D.)—has admitted strikes in the following plants:—

The Leuna chemical plant at Merseburg where the workers seized the radio station and through it transmitted appeals to join the strike; the Buns synthetic oil plant at Halle; the Neptun shipyard at Rostock; the optical instruments plant of Zeiss-Ikon at Jena; the mining districts in Saxony around Leipzig; the former Krupp-Gruson metal plant at Magdeburg; the steel plant at Brandenburg and many other smaller plants.

All these have been admitted in the official government communist press of East Germany.

WHO IS TO BLAME?

In an appeal on June 22nd to the East German workers, the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party—while continuing the stories of "fascist provocateurs" starting the strikes—nevertheless admitted the following things:—

- (1) that a large part of the working class participated in these actions.
- (2) that it was the just grievances of the workers which permitted these strikes to spread to such an extent.
- (3) that there is now an estrangement between the workers and the Socialist Unity Party.
- (4) that this estrangement is the fault of the Socialist Unity Party's wrong policy.

"We must create such economic and social conditions", says this appeal, "that the party cannot commit a second time, errors of such dimensions toward the just grievances of the workers."

WHAT THE CAPITALIST WORLD WOULDN'T PRINT

The main demands of the workers were perfectly formulated by an unknown building worker addressing the crowd before the Government Buildings in Prinz Albrechtstrasse on June 16th, during the first big demonstration in Berlin.

The whole world capitalist press has failed to print these demands—obviously because they expressed the high degree of socialist consciousness of the strikers of Eastern Germany, and gave no comfort at all to the Western capitalists.

Here are the demands as they were given to me by several people who were present at this meeting.

- (1) Immediate reduction by 10 per cent. of the production quotas per head. (Note: Piece-work is general in East Germany).
- (2) Immediate reduction of the prices of food and other consumer goods by 40 per cent. in the free market government shops (HO).
- (3) Dismissal of the Ministers and Government functionaries responsible for the errors admitted by government speakers.
- (4) Democratisation of the Party and the Trade Unions. (the Magdeburg workers also demanded the legalisation of the Social Democratic Party).
- (5) A campaign to be initiated by the East German Government for the unification of Germany—without waiting for the initiative of the Bonn Government. Tear down the barriers between the two parts of the country.
- (6) The East German Government to call for general, free and secret elections and prepare a workers' victory for them!

From these demands it is clear

that the strikers never once permitted their actions to become a tool of the reactionary government of Adenauer. The wonderful socialist spirit shown deserves our salutations!

WHO ARE THE PROVOCATEURS?

It is true that during the second day of the Berlin demonstrations many rowdies from West Berlin started to create riots and in this way provoked and facilitated the intervention of the Russian Army. But the big majority of the strikers did not participate in these riots. The communist press, "Neues Deutschland", admits this itself.

All the more scandalous is it, therefore, to call the uprising of the East German workers fighting for better living conditions and political democracy a... "fascist provocation".

The real provocateurs were those East German bureaucrats who, as the East German press again admits, created unbearable living conditions for the workers through the "forced development of heavy industry at the cost of the consumer goods industry", ("Neues Deutschland", 17 June) and transformed the trade unions into "executive organs of the management" ("Neues Deutschland", 17 June).

I am convinced that the German workers will learn how to finish with incompetent and criminal "leaders" of this type, while continuing their magnificent and conscious fight for a socialist economy and political democracy.

Berlin workers use stones against Russian tanks in the recent demonstrations.



flavour as could be expected at present".

When it is possible for the Press to write like this, it is necessary to ask "where is the T.U.C. going?" It is to be hoped that we shall not be nauseated with the old story about safeguarding the worker in the new set-up. What chance have three men out of 11, and a possible 15, of making their presence felt? In any event, the opposition of the Labour Movement to denationalisation is well known, to accept these posts in face of this opposition, is of itself a repudiation of the policies advocated by the Labour and Trade Union movement in recent years.

★

If their acceptances are of any value, it must be for the jolt which they have given the Movement. Leadership is of value only when it serves the interests of those whom we would lead. The Trade Union Movement has made considerable progress from the days when recognition was a right to be

U.S. Collusion in Korea?

WAS there collusion by the American Command when Syngman Rhee released 27,000 North Korean prisoners?

Consider the evidence. 25,000 POW's were released on June 18th. The London "Evening Standard" of that date reports: "The 16,000 South Korean guards helped in the

bitterly contested. In these days of peaceful negotiation, of round-table talks, joint consultation is to be desired. Let us be on our guard, however, to ensure that it does not become, as in the case of the Steel Board, joint collaboration.

[Reprinted from the "London Typographical Journal" with the permission of the London Society of Compositors.]

mass walk-out. The 4,000 American guards were powerless to stop it."

How came 20,000 men to guard 25,000 prisoners? What innocent is going to believe that American officers were not aware of the massing of South Korean guards and their purpose?

"A fortnight ago", wrote the diplomatic correspondent of the "Manchester Guardian" on June 19th "it was widely talked about that President Rhee might do just what he has done." The plan of Rhee was well organised. Prisoners were dispersed among private homes and given civilian clothing. How can all this happen in a country under military control and in a network of American military intelligence? How else but with the cooperation of the real auth-

ority in Korea—the American High Command?

THE PLOT IS CLEAR

American responsibility is clear. The activities of Syngman Rhee are directed toward breaking down the peace talks! An aim shared by American militarists with their crazy schemes of a drive to the Yalta and into China to push back the tide of Asian revolt and give back to those twins of corruption—Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai Shek—the peoples of North Korea and China to be exploited by their reactionary regimes and imperialism.

The prisoners of war are once again expendable pawns in this game. Those who have been released will now be tasting the full

● Continued col. 6 page 4

Labour's New Programme

Presented With Some Suggested Amendments

The Key—what is said about... Our Place in the World

1. Labour's aim is economic strength and independence.

2. Economic independence can only be achieved through joint planning with the rest of the Sterling Area and in co-operation with Western Europe.

AVOIDING CRISES

3. To avoid recurrent dollar crises we must, in concert with the other members of the Sterling Areas:

Increase exports which earn us dollars or gold;

Keep imports which cost us dollars or gold pegged down to the minimum required for full production;

Tighten currency controls.

4. To assist closer co-ordination of policies of the independent members of the Area, Labour would favour the setting up of a permanent Sterling Area Organisation on the lines of the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation; this could only work with the full support of other members of the Sterling Area.

5. The Sterling Area countries must try to reach agreements with the United States to keep world raw material purchases and prices steady.

6. The credit arrangements of the European Payments Union ought to be revised to avoid the need for sharp and sudden import restrictions by one European country against another.

GENERAL LINES OF ADVANCE

7. Labour believes that Britain and the rest of the Sterling Area can, through joint planning and vigorous efforts, earn more dollars by exports; but that the dollar gap will not be closed unless more dollars are saved too. This will require a deliberate policy of discrimination against dollar goods.

8. A co-ordinated Sterling Area Development Plan is needed in which members know exactly what contributions to dollar earnings and dollar saving are expected over a given period of years.

9. Further development of dollar saving and dollar earning projects in the Commonwealth will depend primarily on the provision, and financing, by Britain of large supplies of development goods and equipment.

10. To ensure that the flow of British capital to the Commonwealth is used to further our common Development Plan, Labour will seek an agreement whereby all Sterling Area countries would operate a co-ordinated control over capital investment.

11. Labour will use long-term purchase agreements, guaranteeing quantities and prices, to encourage overseas primary producers to expand their production boldly.

12. Labour will endeavour to maintain and expand East/West trade within the limits imposed by the Cold War, and constantly seek means of lessening international tension in order to widen these limits and allow a reduction of the arms burdens.

13. Britain has a duty to help countries in Asia and Africa to combat hunger, poverty, ignorance and disease. Labour will work to strengthen and extend international machinery for assisting development in the backward areas of the world.

14. We must ensure that our manpower and material resources are used fully and to the best possible effect. The rapid expansion of the economy in the particular directions required cannot be achieved without an extension of Socialist planning and public ownership.

"Challenge To Britain" is the title of the Labour Party Executives' suggested programme of action for the next Labour Government. Although it falls far short of the imaginative socialist programme demanded by the last Annual Conference at Morecambe it is nevertheless an advance on previous policy statements issued by the National Executive. In any case, the rank and file can now play a decisive rôle in improving this important document. Before it is finally adopted at the Party Conference in October, local parties and affiliated organisations have an opportunity to discuss it and submit amendments. These amendments must be in at the latest by August 14th. There isn't much time.

Therefore, in order to assist local parties in the serious study of the document, we have devoted two whole pages to re-printing its most important sections from the official text together with our own comments and suggested amendments. The passages taken from the Party document are always printed in black type.

Britain were to call a conference of all these countries, including the non-capitalist states of Russia and Eastern Europe, and were to make an honest offer to co-operate with them in planning a joint co-operative venture along the lines as indicated above great strides could be made almost at once.

China, Burma, Indo-China, Indonesia, even Malaya and Iran would respond once their initial doubts and suspicions of "imperialist" Britain were overcome. That is, once they were assured that Labour Britain had genuinely broken with the imperialist past.

And even in the countries where the agrarian revolution is only beginning such a prospect would enormously hasten developments, and in a few years they also would be in a position not only to accept our manufactured products and machinery but would be able to supply in ever-increasing volume the raw materials and foodstuffs required by Britain and Western Europe in general.

British industry plus that of any other Western European countries which decides to co-operate (and we believe all of them will do so; if not to begin with, then certainly as soon as the workers in these countries understand and appreciate what is being done) will not be able to carry out this programme as efficiently as is desirable and at the same time, continue the arms drive on the present scale.

But as long as the aggressive American capitalists threaten war on every progressive movement defensive measures are imposed on us. But that is not the only difficulty, even if the main one that will face us.

We are not so sanguine as to consider that there will be no other hardships and difficulties to be overcome in going ahead in the way outlined above. We are

well aware that what we propose, initially at least, will present many problems some of which will test the goodwill and political intelligence of both sides to the uttermost. But it does provide a solution. On the other hand, the ideas and policies proposed in this section of the document by the N.E.C. are foredoomed to failure. Continued and ever-worsening crises are inevitable if we go on in the same old way.

If Britain is to be able to feed, house and clothe her people by her own efforts—which is what we understand is meant by the "economic independence" referred to in the document—co-operation with the producers of the raw materials and foodstuffs necessary to her is vital. The days of force and exploitation of colonial peoples are over.

Finally, by associating British economy in joint planning with the non-capitalist world the Labour Government will in no way endorse the brutal police dictatorships which exist in so many of the countries of the Soviet Bloc. On the contrary, it should, through the great moral weight of its own good example of real workers' democracy, stimulate the movement already developing in those countries for democratic control by the workers themselves.

Our suggested amendment to this first and very important section of the document is to leave point 1 as it stands, re-write point 2 as follows:

"Economic independence can only be achieved through joint planning with the peoples of the former colonial and semi-colonial countries, the non-capitalist states, and those countries of Western Europe which are prepared to co-operate."

The rest of the section down to and including point 14 should be deleted.



Nye Bevan addressing last year's Conference
Have Morecambe's decisions been included in the new programme?

Advances are made on the... Nationalisation Front

This is the first time that the Engineering Industry has been seriously considered for nationalisation by the Labour Party—a very welcome development.

The industries listed for varying degrees of public ownership are Machine Tools, Mining Machinery, Aircraft Industry, Heavy Electrical Engineering, and Shipbuilding and Ship Repairing.

We do not propose to enter into a discussion at this stage as to whether these proposals of the N.E.C. are adequate. We don't think they are. What is more, the Confederation of Engineering and Shipbuilding Unions go much further in their "Plan for Engineering". It is to be hoped they will submit this plan to the Conference in place of the N.E.C.'s proposals.

In our opinion, the main point is that the document should make clear to the public that the next Labour Government will nationalise all the major and essential

industries as rapidly as possible.

This was demanded by last year's Trade Union Congress and Labour Party Conference and must be inserted in this programme.

The capitalist press has already sent a threat to private enterprise in this section of the document—and they are right. It only remains now for the Party to openly admit it—and thus rally the voters on a clear programme of nationalisation and socialist planning to serve the ends we have outlined in the first section.

There is also an important omission in this part of the document. The Morecambe Conference demanded that:

"Vigorous action should be taken, legislative if necessary, in nationalised and private industry to increase democracy in the workplace."

This must be included in the document.

Again we return to that... Problem of Dollars

15. Export earnings must be increased by expanding those sectors of industry, for whose products world demand will rise. These are mainly goods which depend for their production on experience and skill, scientific development, new techniques and expensive capital equipment.

16. Labour will spend more on scientific research, on technical education and on the study of industrial techniques and management.

17. Dollar imports must be reduced by further development of 'dollar saving' industries in this country, such as oil refining, engineering, chemicals and—most important of all—agriculture.

18. Labour proposes to overhaul the planning machinery within the Civil Service, to reorganise and strengthen it and to see that enough specialists in the fields concerned are attracted.

Points 15, 16 and 18 are acceptable as they stand, but in context with our suggested amendment above would have a somewhat different meaning. As regard point 17, "dollar saving" would no longer loom so large in the Labour Government's calculations.

24. To encourage the expansion of capacity in the engineering industry, Labour will see that there is an adequate supply of risk capital at cheap rates. Labour proposes to set up a Commonwealth Development Corporation which can place long-term orders with British firms on behalf of the whole Commonwealth. Labour will also set up an Export Promotion Organisation to forecast foreign demands, study foreign sales techniques and assist British firms to develop their sales in foreign markets. A Labour Government will itself take direct action where necessary to achieve the expansion required.

The programme envisages the continued existence of a considerable sector of private enterprise and therefore there will be a need for an "adequate supply of risk

capital at cheap rates." The "Tribune" has proposed that the programme include the setting up a National Investment Board which, together with direct Government control of raw materials, will ensure that capital and materials are directed to the right industries. We agree with "Tribune's" suggestion.

The proposals to set up a "Commonwealth Development Corporation" and an "Export Promotion Organisation" "to forecast foreign demands etc." presupposes, as in the first section of the document, the continued existence of both British capitalism and colonialism.

It is Tory policy and should be eliminated from the programme entirely in favour of the idea of international planning and co-operation which we have tried to outline in our criticism of the first section of the document.

Here we may anticipate a possible objection from those who will perhaps argue that international planning is impossible except among fully socialist countries and therefore cannot be applied to countries like India, Egypt and the former colonies which will be, in essence, capitalist.

It should be remembered, however, that all of these countries are non-imperialist and that some of them, China for example, have carried through a revolution in land tenure which now permits the widest use of all sorts of machinery which Britain can supply.

Furthermore, the revolution against feudal land systems is sweeping across the Far and Middle East. The positive proposals of a Labour Government—its concrete plan for the exchange of mutually beneficial goods—will assist the process. That is something that all socialists desire. It will be our positive contribution to the world fight against poverty and backwardness.

● (Continued on page 3)

We cannot advance without... International Planning

WE have printed this section of "Challenge To Britain" in full because in our opinion, it is the key section of the whole document. It sets the aim and determines the course. It deserves serious study by all who intend to amend the Party document in line with socialist principles.

Tied up in this section is an acceptance of the present position of Britain in the world situation with her economic stranglehold on other countries as sources of valuable raw materials like oil, tin, rubber, bauxite, chromeite, copper, lead, cobalt and manganese and, of course, as markets. In short, an acceptance of imperialism and the so-called benefits of imperialism which, in fact, no longer really exist in the world of today.

Iran, for example, has expropriated the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company's properties within her territories. The attempt to hold on to them by Britain has resulted not only in the loss of the properties and the oil as well, but also the loss of the Iranian market for everything British.

B'ham Has Right Idea

THE Birmingham Borough Labour Party is presenting the following resolution to the next Labour Party Conference:

"That this conference, recognising that there can be no peace where a policy of White supremacy is maintained, calls upon the Labour Movement to conduct a campaign for the full and unconditional freedom of all colonies and countries under British jurisdiction. As a first step in this campaign, demands should be made for the withdrawal of troops from Kenya, Malaya and Egypt."

In Malaya the cost of the civil war is probably greater than the value of the tin and rubber, great as that is. And even if the war is finally won the political struggle will be continued and the end result will be the same as in Iran.

Egypt is going the same way and in Central and East Africa the situation is worsening every day: worsening economically that is, aside altogether from the loss of life that is entailed.

Investment plans, in the economically backward areas, which could provide a favourable market for as long ahead as can be foreseen, such as the Colombo Plan, are virtually a dead letter because of the fear of confiscation by the revolution in these countries.

All these things are the price we have to pay for the attempt to continue in the old imperialist tradition of trading practices implicit in this section of the document.

What is wanted is a fresh approach with a different attitude to these countries and peoples.

We have to trade with them as equals. We can supply them with the kind of goods they require, in the form of both manufactured goods and industrial and agricultural machinery which they can pay for with the raw materials and foodstuffs which we lack.

They require not only the machinery, but technicians as well. We can supply both, but the colonial peoples must be in control of their own territories economically and politically.

To take full advantage presupposes an agrarian revolution in these areas, and in vast sections of the old colonial and semi-colonial world this agrarian revolution is under way. In China, for example, and in other areas such as those mentioned above, as well as in India, Burma, Indo-China, Indonesia and some of the South American countries it is on the order of the day—in fact in many it has already commenced.

If a Labour Government in



Lorries and Steel Back Again... But On What Terms?

The proposal to renationalise these two basic industries is of course, completely acceptable to the Party rank and file with one important amendment concerning compensation.

The document at present reads: re-nationalisation "on such terms as will prevent private owners from profiting at the expense of

the nation." This is too vague. Last year's Annual Conference decided that:

"No further sums of compensation shall be paid in respect of these industries being renationalised."

This must be included in the policy statement on both Transport and Steel.

Continued from page 2

The Consumer Industries but... Where Are the Co-ops?

36. Labour will encourage industries to set up Development Councils or similar bodies.

37. Reliable quality and lower prices can be achieved in many cases by standardisation and long production runs. Labour will seek to secure these benefits for the consumer by Government ordering and other methods.

The most surprising thing about this section is that the Co-operative Movement has been com-

pletely left out of account! Yet they have a vast experience in both the retail and wholesale sides of the consumer industries.

The document should express its complete willingness to assist in every way the development of the co-operative idea. It should ask the Co-operative Movement to submit a plan for the extension of co-operation to cover all the consumer industries.

Investment Board & 'Big-Five' take over missing from Financial Policy and Controls

51. The maintenance of full employment is one of Labour's main objectives. This means that the level of production and demand in the economy will be kept high.

52. Full employment does not mean that everyone can be guaranteed security in the job he holds. Some changes of job are inevitable. Advance preparation will be undertaken to see that transitions are as easy as possible.

These two points really concern the role of the trade unions in a planned economy and their relation to the State.

A Labour Government will have to change the pattern of industry to suit the needs of its general policy of expansion and planning with the non-capitalist and former colonial world. This will mean the closing down, or restriction of certain luxury industries like expensive clothes and furs, luxury foods, jewellery, flashy cars, yachts, houses, etc. The skilled labour employed would be transferred to more essential work.

The Government must give a definite undertaking that no worker will suffer any financial loss through being transferred to another industry or another district.

It should also charge the Trade

Unions with the task of protecting the workers rights and conditions in all such matters. The Trade Unions will, in fact, not take part in State Planning (although many of their members will, of course).

The essential function of the Unions will be to defend the workers against any excesses of the State or any of its Planning authorities.

The remainder of this section deals with various measures of financial control and budgetary

Who wants... MONOPOLY

38. Labour will strengthen the Monopolies Commission, and insist on the publication of cartel and trade association agreements.

Once the idea of nationalising all the essential industries is accepted, this point assumes less importance. However, until the economy is fully planned and nationalised the point itself is valid and should be accepted as it stands.

manipulations. In the main document on page 19, we read: "No major problem arises in the publicly owned sector, because urgent investment can be pushed ahead as a matter of Government policy."

We agree. It follows, therefore that with the growth of the nationalisation programme the problem so far as investment is concerned will gradually become of less importance. However, as long as there is a private sector of industry there is a problem, and this we consider could be dealt with by adopting "Tribune's" suggestion of a capital gains tax. But so far as the control of credit is concerned we don't consider the complicated method suggested in the N.E.C.'s document is at all necessary.

Instead we propose—as was previously attempted by the Australian Labour Party—the nationalisation of the Big Five Banks.

This, together with the already existing nationalised Bank of England, would place all the main levers of financial control in the hands of the Labour Government. Tory resistance to this measure would be no greater, and far less effective, than it will be to the complicated measures of financial control proposed in the document.

This is YOUR job

What amendments is YOUR local party submitting to the new programme?

Let us know and we will print your amendments. This will show other parties what yours is doing—and prevent wasted effort by many parties submitting the same amendment.

What do YOU yourself think of the programme?

Write and tell us. We will print as many letters as possible—but keep them down to 200 words if possible.

How Labour will get those... Badly Needed Houses

There is no problem more directly affecting the needs of the people than Housing and Building generally. We therefore print this section of the document in full.

HOUSING

77. Labour will maintain a balanced building programme; factories and schools as well as houses.

78. Many new houses must be built but the existing stocks of houses can also be used more sensibly. Labour will extend the municipal ownership of rented dwellings and will instruct local authorities to submit schemes for gradually taking over and modernising blocks of rent-controlled private properties.

79. Labour will set up a National Housing Corporation to build extra houses in areas where new industries are being developed.

80. Labour will again make it financially easier for those who wish to buy their own houses.

81. Labour will fulfil its pledge to give leaseholders the opportunity of purchasing the freeholds of their houses.

82. Labour will make an energetic attack on restrictive practices in the building industries.

Point 78 introduces an important addition to Labour's housing policy. The existing stocks of houses are to be more sensibly used.

This will obviously require the granting of wide powers of requisitioning to Local Authorities—including powers to requisition both empty and under-occupied property.

This is implied in the programme—but it should be made absolutely specific.

We like the idea of a National

Housing Corporation as expressed in point 79—but we do not see why its scope should be limited to "areas where new industries are being developed."

Such a Corporation based on direct labour would go a long way towards transforming the Building Industry into a Public Service.

To these six points however, there must be added the nationalisation of the Building Supplies Industry—cement, bricks, castings, etc. The nationalisation of rented land which we have suggested for agriculture applies also to housing and will do much to keep down rents.

Agriculture

There are twelve points dealing with agriculture and they can be still further summarised into the one idea that more food must be produced from British farms. This is obviously sound policy for a Labour Government but all experience shows that it will never be done while all farming land is in private hands.

We therefore support the stand of the "Tribune" which has suggested that the programme be amended here to include the nationalisation of rented land.



Social Security, Education and... A FREE Health Service

This is probably the best section of the document. Not only is the Free Health Service to be restored and all charges removed, but valuable suggestions are made for increasing and improving hospital services. The cost of essential foods are to be kept down by the reintroduction of food subsidies.

EDUCATION

This seems to us to be a good section of the programme—the establishment of the comprehensive school and the more or less rapid closing down of public schools.

However, we think that the document should state positively that before any legislation on education is proposed it will consult and be advised by Labour specialists in this field like the National Association of Labour Teachers.

SOCIAL SECURITY

69. Labour will ensure that benefits paid under the National



DESPITE all the power of the words arrayed against us in the past fifty years our vote keeps on increasing at General Elections.

Remember again, we only picked up 2½ million votes in 1918 and at the last Election in 1951, that had grown to almost 14 million. More votes than the present Government received.

As "Challenge to Britain" says: "Behind all its proposals and underlying its analysis of the situation in which the nation is placed, lies the abiding faith of our organised movement in the moral and spiritual ideals which inspired its pioneers and founders."

Our enemies will never understand that at the very basis of Labour's strength lies the fact that creative criticism is kept alive by the rank and file. It is unfortunate for the Tories that we keep asking "What is truth?" So the Executive Statement will be discussed throughout the whole Movement and with us, because we base our faith in the people, the great British public can listen in on our Debates. We do not hide our strength. Our Balance Sheets are public property, whereas no one knows who contributes the whole of the Tory funds.

The great secret of the Labour Party is that it knows that unity is based upon the toleration of variety. Our colour, our imagination and our vigour depend upon all this.

LABOUR AND EDUCATION

We have the right to claim that Labour has enhanced human dignity. Today we see our Health Services and our Educational opportunities being whittled away by a Party that makes a great song and dance about entering the New Elizabethan Age while at the same time it throws greater burdens on the aged and sick and the children!

The "Challenge to Britain" in its chapter on the Social Services approaches the problem of Education with determination. The Party is out for a radical reform of our schools system. It says:

by Harold Davies, M.P.

who here writes mainly on Education

"There is a special reason, too, why a radical reform of education is an integral part of Labour's new plan. One of our main handicaps in keeping abreast of Germany and the U.S.A., our principal competitors in export markets, is the disastrous shortage of scientists, technicians and engineers."

We are now training twice as many technical students as in pre-war days because of the reforms that Labour introduced when in power.

In this discussion pamphlet Labour maps out a ten-year programme which concentrates on three things:—

1. To improve the quality of education by reducing the size of classes.
2. To get rid of educational segregation in our state-aided secondary schools.
3. To bridge the gap between science and industry by expanding technical education as soon as possible.

QUESTIONS TO ANSWER

We want to abolish the 'eleven-plus' examination and thus allow all children between the ages of eleven and fifteen to share the social and academic chances of a secondary school. If a child wants to go on at school after fifteen we must get rid of any financial difficulties that might prevent this.

There will be many important points for us to discuss within the Movement. How now do we visualise the future of the Comprehensive School? What tests, if any, would we need to give a child further secondary education? That the Labour Party intend to scrutinise more carefully many of the so-called Private Schools which, as they say, provide "only a travesty of Education" is indeed an important point for discussion.

A SCANDAL EXPOSED

The Select Committee on Estimates presented us this week with its searching report on Britain's Schools, and brother, it pulls no punches! Listen to this from the Committee: "At every point they were confronted with overcrowding, lack of schools, heavy transport costs, a shortage of teachers and often rapidly deteriorating and even dangerous school buildings."

The Committee indicates that nothing has been really done to meet these needs in the past year

Problems of... Local Democracy

This section proposes an investigation into the existing structure of Local Government, and a full review of Local Government finances, including the possibility of the rating of site values. Everybody will welcome such an investigation.

We would only add that the next Labour Government should undertake nothing in this field without first having fully discussed the matter in conferences of Labour local authorities.

It is also proposed to "repeal the derating clauses of the 1929 Local Government Acts." Another welcome step.

To end with... Equal Pay

This is nowhere mentioned in the document despite it being declared Party policy. We must therefore assume that the N.E.C. will not oppose an amendment to include this point.

or two. The high birth rate between 1944 and 1948 has swollen the population in primary schools beyond what might be regarded as an average expectation.

The defence programme has impeded our school building projects because the demand has been so great on the supply of materials and labour.

Schools are not keeping pace because, too, of the Tory cut in capital expenditure.

Of 204,753 classes in 1951, 67,604 (just under one-third of them) exceeded the permitted maximum of children per class. In London 39 per cent of primary classes and 51 per cent of secondary were overcrowded last January. In Birmingham the average size of classes is between 43 and 45 children. In Scotland over 2,000 classes are overcrowded.

The Estimates Committee say: "Makeshift classrooms are being sought to accommodate the surplus children and hired halls, medical inspection rooms, church halls, miners' welfare institutes and a variety of other buildings have to take the place of what should be properly designed and thoroughly efficient schools."

Is this the way to enter the New Elizabethan Era?

NEXT WEEK

Peter Ibbotson, Hon. Secretary of the National Association Labour Teachers will comment on Labour's new educational proposals.

★ Star Letter ★ On The New Programme

The weakness of the Labour Party National Executive's policy statement just issued is that it hedges.

The rank and file member of our Party likes courage—and so does the electorate.

So the National Conference should delete the ifs and buts from the section on public ownership.

For instance the document advocates a publicly organised industrial assurance service as in the 1950 programme. Excellent. But a few lines lower down we are told that the problem should be the subject of a special examination. Why? Haven't we had enough examinations of industrial assurance? What fresh facts could a new one reveal?

Similarly on chemicals. The Executive comes out in favour of a substantial measure of public ownership. Then it spoils things by a suggestion that would mean postponing the take-over until the Labour government had obtained from the industry itself information which would determine the most appropriate sections.

On heavy electrical engineering the statement proposes to review it after the report of the Monopolies Commission has been published. Any reason for delay it would appear.

And on aircraft the document proposes to acquire any firm that falls down on the job. Anything vaguer than that would be hard to imagine.

Socialists are prepared to sacrifice for the Party when they believe it is advancing towards Socialism. The present programme must be amended by Conference to change its conditional suggestions into pledges.

Manchester. Frank Allaun.

READ Britain's only T.U. Weekly Newspaper

The Railway Review FEARLESS, FACTUAL, STIMULATING and packed with information.

Price 3d. Obtainable from any newsagent or bookstall.

The Adventures of Slink & Swill—two Labour Peers



"People must be encouraged to move out of houses or flats which are too large for them, into smaller ones". ("Challenge To Britain"). Our artist gives his idea on how it might be done.

Socialist Outlook

177 Bermondsey St., London, S.E.1. Telephone: HOP 4554 Editor: John Lawrence

That Compensation Question

Our readers write

Comrade Douglas raises some interesting points in his contribution referring to my article "In Defence of British Miners". Perhaps I may be permitted to reply to one or two of them.

He deals with compensation paid to the ex-mineowners, the problem being whether this is good or bad.

Many Socialists would never agree that compensation should be paid for any industry taken over, but we are not at the moment discussing that point. The Labour Party decided years ago (I believe at the 1921 Annual Conference) that compensation should be paid. As Party members we have to accept that whilst at the same time having the right to express our own opinions inside the Movement if they happen not to coincide with official policy.

I certainly agree with Mr. Douglas that the mines should have been paid for by spreading the debt over the whole of the

section of the working population. The fault lies mainly with the present Tory Government, whose policy of cutting subsidies, raising the Bank Interest Rate and other schemes designed to help their own class, has resulted in the cost-of-living going in an ever upward spiral. When the miners and other workers demand a wage-increase they are merely trying, vainly, to keep pace with this dizzy spiral.

Comrade Douglas will be aware, if he has read my recent articles, that I consider nationalisation of the mines to be on the whole an improvement on the old "private enterprise" days. But at the same time I realise it is far from perfect and I also realise that Nationalisation is not the same thing as Socialisation. Socialists are convinced that the salvation of the workers lies in the abolition of the wages-system. Nationalisation as it stands at present does not tend this way. In spite of certain improvements it still leaves the fundamental things pretty much like they were. The exploited working class are still the exploited working class.

Take the mines for example. Before nationalisation the capitalist owners worked the mines by exploiting the miners and extracting surplus profits from their labours. After nationalisation the owners were removed, as a class, from direct administrative control of the pits, but the payment of compensation has meant that they are still exploiting the miners and that the mines are still run mainly for profit.

Nationalisation as it is at present, means not Socialisation but State Capitalism.

Manchester. Price Jones.

Churchill and Peace

Congratulations for exposing the foolish prattle about Churchill's "stand for peace". Nothing is more dangerous than to think that by modifying the struggle for Socialism and supporting Churchill's diplomatic intrigues we can get peace.

The common people everywhere will welcome an end to the Korean slaughter, but if the American Government accepts an armistice today it is only because their European capitalist allies cannot rely on working class support in the event of war.

Another Yalta, in which the Great Powers will carve up the world behind closed doors will be followed not by peace, but by an armed truce preceding an even greater war. Only a government firmly representing the interests of the working people, who have nothing to gain from war can be relied upon to work for a just peace. It is time that the Labour Party said this bluntly.

I am finding no difficulty in persuading local Labour supporters to order the "Socialist Outlook" through their newsagents. Carry on the good work of the last few weeks and you should soon have a mass circulation.

Twickenham. E. J. Eustace.

Councillors and the Coronation

I write to associate myself with the feelings of Councillor Finch. Whilst Socialists cannot support or take part in any of the coronation "Mumbo Jumbo", we must remember that, unfortunately, the majority of our colleagues who work with us in the movement are still carried away. Many still do not see the need to rid ourselves of the "Parasite Class".

Therefore, whilst they are in the majority, we ourselves can refrain from joining in and make our reasons known, so long as we do not lose the respect and co-operation of our colleagues.

To hit out and say to these people: "Why do you support these parasites and the waste attached to the coronation?" puts us in the category of "Misery Martin".

As a councillor, I refused the invitation to the Civic Parade and for a seat outside the Town Hall. But I simply said it was against my principles and left it at that.

Stoke Newington. Jack Pennington.

Refuge From Hysteria

During the past two nauseating weeks of radio and press-organised hysteria, "Socialist Outlook" has remained one of the few refuges of reason and essential news.

To hear so-called Socialists prattling about some primitive symbolical ritual in the Abbey service, and to see the sloppy women's-magazine photos of EIR in the windows of working class homes, is proof of the power of the radio and right-wing press, and emphasises the need for the extensive propagation of Socialist principles.

London, S.W.8. E. D. Cairn.

At the wheel with Charlie Minns A Transport Worker's Diary Constitutionalism

I SHOULD like to thank those Stewards and Members who have sent in money in response to my appeal for Jack Lappin.

Their quick action will be greatly appreciated. They are: **Benhill Road Depot**—£3.14.0d. **Creekside Greenwich Depot**—£2.0.6d. **1/1418 Branch (Perivale)**—£3. and **Bro. Jennings (Cheltenham)** 1/-. I hope other depots are following their lead. I know that at least three other depots have forwarded the result of their "whip round" direct to Bro. Lappin.

* * * **Bro. A. Brierley, of Tower Bridge Depot** writes:

"After reading Bro. Minns's column I feel compelled to enlighten you, or should I say remind you of the glorious fight put up by our so-called militant workers. I remember the Leicester meeting that great meeting where the true militant workers were on the floor of the hall.

"Our leaders had a great send off on the road to fight de-nationalisation, both in spirit and finance. Months passed by before once again another leader—indeed a leader—the Rt. Hon. C. R. Attlee headed the 'Albert Hall' Meeting with all his puppets organising us, the rank and file. The only difference between the two meetings, this was made a class meeting. The demonstrations put on by the drivers, etc. was hushed up and we were shepherded to the top of that great hall. 'Out of sight, out of mind'.

"Other great meetings followed and very strong words were used by our again so-called militant leaders. At the crowded Holborn Hall only 9 cast their vote against industrial action. Surely that should have been enough to convince our leaders that we were whole-heartedly behind them; but then the light dawned through. Instead of us, the rank and file, having leaders to lead us, we found that we were having to push them along the track, soon to come up against the bumpers.

"Now, that glorious opportunity has passed by, through our big and small leaders using words without deeds.

"I would like Bro. Minns to give his version of how and why the 'London Shop Stewards Association' was broken up."

* * * The London Shop Stewards Association was a voluntary coming together of London stewards for the purpose of discussing common problems, and it was frowned upon by our Union Officials, who claimed it was "unofficial" and "unconstitutional".

After the anti-denationalisation campaign, the Stewards were faced with the possibility of reprisals being taken against any Steward who continued to associate with this "unofficial" body. Such a Steward was faced with expulsion from the Union. Officialdom in our Union has already shown that it would be quite ruthless in such matters. Leading members of our Docks section had already suffered this fate.

Rightly or wrongly the London

Stewards decided, after lengthy discussion, that it was necessary to remain in the Union and try to use "constitutional" methods. Whether this policy has been successful or not members will be able to judge for themselves. Certainly the "constitutional" defence of Bro. Jack Lappin has failed to prevent his victimisation by the Road Haulage Executive. And we are informed by our officials that "everything possible" was done in this connection.

What do you think Brothers? Send your views in so that they can be published.

Members will remember that a firm undertaking was given by our General Secretary that a National Delegate Conference would be called as soon as denationalisation became law.

Disappointment has been expressed in many areas that this conference, originally called for July 24th has been postponed. London Stewards have openly opposed this postponement.

When this conference does finally take place, matters such as Bro. Brierley has raised will, no doubt, be dealt with, as well as the next steps to protect our interests as road haulage workers under denationalisation.

It is therefore of vital importance that when you elect your delegates to this conference—as you will shortly be doing by ballot—you should see that he is someone who will voice the feelings of the rank and file. Someone who will voice your feelings.

Fighting Fund

TARGET £100

AMOUNT RAISED £51.16.5

ONLY a little over a week to go and we still need another £48.3.7 to hit our target.

If you have been meaning to make a donation, but haven't got round to it, please do it now.

We NEED this money to carry on the fight for socialism.

The Anti-Fascist Struggle, 1936

Labour's History

How London Stopped Mosley

By Joe Jacobs (A Stepney worker who took a leading part)

WHEN Mosley's Fascists prepared to march through East London on October 4, 1936, many thousands of workers from all over London declared:—*They shall not pass!*

No one could be surprised at this reaction for it was well understood that Mosley was not looking for recruits along the Whitechapel Road. In fact, they stood united and succeeded against powerful forces to stop this march.

The attempt to form a mass fascist movement in Britain was never really taken seriously until Sir Oswald Mosley started the British Union of Fascists along the lines laid down by Mussolini and Hitler.

Almost from the beginning anti-semitism was a major part of their programme. They sought by "radical" phrasemongering and "super-nationalism" which is called National Socialism, to win the most politically backward and cynical sections of the British workers for Fascism.

Mosley already had powerful support of large sections of the capitalist class, including a couple of newspapers—the "Daily Mail" and London "Evening News"—which reported his activities so as to encourage his growth.

Many workers severely disillusioned by the ever deepening economic crises provided a possible base from which recruits could be gained.

The betrayal led by Macdonald, Thomas and Co., which led to the formation of the National Government with its "economy drive" condemned millions of workers to exist on the lowest level.

Mass unemployment, depressed areas, means test and low wages along with some bitter experiences, defeats and betrayals, were skillfully exploited by the fascists.

It was easy to blame "Jewish Financiers" and "Foreigners" for the suffering which was being endured and it was not hard to understand why Mosley worked near the Jewish area in Whitechapel.

Parts of Bethnal Green, Shore-ditch and Limehouse became the black spots where it was possible to make use of latent anti-semitic

feeling, developed by the ruling class for years in their effort to divide the workers and so more easily use their power to exploit Jew or Gentile, Coloured or White workers, alike.

Those at the "centre" of this mass movement had no doubt by the time October 4 came round that, come what may, the workers would die rather than allow the fascists to march.

Recent events in Germany and more recently in Spain gave the issues involved a wider importance than the local considerations by themselves.

After about three or four years of hard work, Mosley had gathered around himself a few thousand followers organised in a semi-militaristic manner with uniforms, motorised units, etc., which could

insisted that it would do so again.

The police left no doubt about their intentions and proposed to give every aid to get the fascists through the East End.

Against all this with courage and a spirit of self-sacrifice the workers were determined that—"They shall not pass!"

Groups began to get together to decide what to do when about 14 days before October 4 the news was spread of Mosley's plans, but there were some doubts and lack of confidence in the ability of the anti-fascists to meet the challenge.

The Communist Party was the accepted leadership and, some four days before the big day, masses of leaflets giving instructions of the rallying points etc. were distributed. Plans were made and much was done on the initiative of those who lived along the proposed route. This initiative was much in evidence on the day itself.

October 4 came, thousands of policemen mounted and on foot were drafted into the area.

Royal Mint Street at the South West end of the district was cordoned off to allow the fascists to form up, ready to march.

The most obvious position for preventing the march through the main thoroughfares was at Aldgate, Gardiners Corner. Here the main force of anti-fascists gathered in their thousands.

They refused to move even after repeated baton charges and many arrests.

Another possible way through was along Cable Street then through a side street into the open. Here at Cable Street was another large concentration of workers.

The police did in fact try to clear this way forward. They were met by barricades stretching across the street behind which the workers, particularly the dockers (many of them live in this district) gave more than they took.

Paving stones were torn up but, more important than weapons was the fact that every house was a refuge for the anti-fascists and a fortress against the police. The people at Aldgate continued to close the road.

In the circumstances the police could do no more and the

fascists had to give up the idea of marching on that day through East London.

This was a proud moment in the fight against fascism. The workers have engaged in many bloody battles against war and unemployment, for wages and in defence of their Trade Unions, for freedom of speech and the right of assembly, against racial discrimination and suppression of the colonial peoples, for their political organisations and the advance of Socialism. It is because all these struggles involving their best interests would be adversely affected if fascism triumphed that thousands of workers were ready to sacrifice so much on October 4.

The complete history of this great working class victory still needs to be recorded and understood. What followed this glorious page in our history may have its good and bad points but nothing can wipe out this lesson of united action which puts so much power into the hands of the workers. No "big names" came out of this struggle as has been the case on many other occasions.

What remains for all to see is the majesty of workers who are willing to sacrifice everything for those things they understand and treasure.

Korea (From page 1)

flavor of Rhee's "democracy"—conscripted into the South Korean army or civilian labour camps.

"Let's clear out of it!" is the reaction of a vast number of British working men and women when they read of the terror bombardments, the napalm bombing, the slaughter of POW's and the activities of Syngman Rhee and those controlling the lives of U.N. soldiers.

The Labour movement can make a real contribution to peace by acting in accord with that feeling.

Mr. Churchill, who naturally denies American collusion in these sordid events, now informs Parliament that Syngman Rhee's actions may mean that... a lot MORE British troops will be sent to Korea!

Labour must never allow it. Let us campaign everywhere to withdraw all British troops NOW. Let the Koreans themselves settle with Mr. Rhee.

Ourselves

With two pages devoted almost exclusively to an analysis of the new Party Programme, we have been compelled to hold over many good articles for future issues.

community. If the nation is buying something then the whole of the nation should pay for it.

Why pay compensation at all? The argument in favour of compensation was that there would be less possibility of friction with the ex-owners if they were paid compensation instead of having the mines taken from them.

Mr. Douglas is quite correct when he says that when the miners demand and get a wage-increase it merely comes out of the pockets of the general public, and that the general public are worse off. That is inevitable as long as we are working under the present system.

He must realise, however, that the same thing happens when any other major industry, say transport, demands and gets a substantial rise. The cost of the rise is added to the cost of the article or service which means that industry and the general public have to pay the increased price. This means that the mass of people are again relatively worse off. But as the worker in the industry getting the rise also has to pay the increased cost of the article or service then he is not getting the full benefit of his rise.

What, in effect, happens is that a certain amount of money passes from the pockets of one set of industrialists, through the pockets of the workers, into the pockets of another set of industrialists. We must also bear in mind that the persons who lose every time are the old-age pensioners and other people on small fixed incomes.

Whose fault is it that miners and other workers are frequently asking for rises these days? It is certainly not, as Mr. Douglas seems to imply, the fault of the miners or for that matter any one

New Readers

Take Out a Special Subscription

9 'Outlooks' For 2/-

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

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

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

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

SOCIALIST OUTLOOK, 177 Bermondsey Street, London, S.E.1