

Join the
**LABOUR
PARTY**
TODAY

Socialist Outlook

WEEKLY

No. 78

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

FRIDAY, MAY 8, 1953

3d.

OUR AIMS

"To secure for the producers by hand and by brain the full fruits of their industry, and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production and distribution . . ."

Labour Party Constitution.

INDO-CHINA: FRANCE'S 'DIRTY WAR'

MR. JOHN Foster Dulles, U.S. Secretary of State, has given a new meaning to well-known words. Speaking of the Vietminh armies, who have been fighting to free their homeland from French imperialism for six years, he referred to them as the "invaders" and described the French efforts to maintain this section of their crumbling empire as an "integral part of the struggle of the entire free world against enslavement."

The war in Indo-China is part of the colonial revolution which is swiftly enveloping the whole of South East Asia. For six years the Indo-Chinese workers and peasants, under the leadership of Vietminh, have been fighting and defeating the modern, well-equipped armies of France.

France has already lost 35,000 killed and 43,000 wounded. The war has cost her twice as much as the total aid received under the Marshall plan.

For the working people of France it has meant a staggering rise in the cost of living and increasing misery.

Indo-China, like all colonial territories, is a land where the majority of the people live in conditions of abject poverty. The peasants are subjected to the exploitation by feudal landlords as well as foreign imperialism. As in Kenya, their most desperate need is for enough land to maintain themselves and their families. The revolution gives them this land—and that is why they fight so heroically.

For the Indo-Chinese people there is no other way out but to overthrow their oppressors.

Out of Indo-China's 22 million population, only 800,000 enjoy the right to vote, but even this select few, when given the chance in last year's municipal elections, voted overwhelmingly for the nationalist parties who stood for immediate negotiations with Viet Minh!

A high Viet Nam official summed up the prevailing sentiment as follows: "If the only choice is between the French and the Communists, it will have to be the Communists." ("Observer" 21/12/52).

It is the sheerest nonsense to talk of the independence of Indo-

China. It is a colony of France, and now American imperialism wants to muscle in and get a share of the spoils. That is why the United States spends two-and-a-half times as much on the war as the government of Viet Nam spends.

Frantic lest the French alone cannot hold this bastion of imperialism, Wall Street wants to turn Indo-China into a second Korea.

The Labour Movement must not allow Britain to be dragged into this new imperialist adventure. It must show in unmistakable fashion that it is on the side of the colonial people in its struggle for freedom.

Discussion in Panmunjon, Peking or Moscow cannot negotiate the colonial revolution away. It will go on till imperialism is completely destroyed and the people are really free to decide their own destiny.

BRITISH TROOPS FOR THIS?

French paratroopers rush a hill during recent hand-to-hand fighting in Indo-China.



Extend Nationalisation As Socialist Answer To Crisis

N.E.C. Evading Party Decisions?

THE National Executive Committee have almost completed their discussions on the new programme for the Labour Party. The proposals are not yet known in detail, but all press reports are agreed that *only water is to be a candidate for further outright nationalisation.*

Last year's Morecambe Conference gave specific instructions to the N.E.C. to "extend nationalisation to all key and major industries." *We await with great interest the N.E.C.'s reasons for failing to carry out this clear and definite instruction.*

According to the "Daily Herald" (27/4/53), the N.E.C. will propose—not nationalisation—but "national control of the aircraft and machine tool industries, probably through

the next Labour Government acquiring a majority of the shares in a number of concerns." The first question that naturally arises is: *Why has nationalisation been dropped in favour of such a scheme?*

The business of the Labour Movement is to transfer economic and political power from the present owners of industry to the working class—thus making possible the production of goods for use and not for profit.

Until now, nobody has seriously suggested that this great task can be achieved other than by the method of nationalisation.

BACK TO MORECAMBE

Aneurin Bevan brought the house down when he made this point at Morecambe. His speech is well worth re-reading today. This is what he said:

"Are we seriously as Socialists going to be told that in 1952 we have discovered some royal road, some ingenious way of trying to achieve our socialist purposes which would not lead us through

the old hard agony of public ownership. There is no royal road.

"Unemployment in Great Britain at the present time would have reached millions had not the mines been nationalised. . . . That is why I sometimes get so tired when I hear people making speeches to the British workers always about working harder. Any fool can work harder. Let us work more intelligently . . ."

That Nye Bevan was expressing the deepest feelings of the rank and file was clear to anyone who attended that historic conference.

He continued amid applause . . . "if we are to safeguard employment in Great Britain we have to be resolute about it and clear about it and say that we can only safeguard employment for British workers by socialist planning in Great Britain and socialist planning in other parts of the world. . . . Do not let us be mealy-mouthed about it. Do not let us try to hide our point of view . . . There is no way of guaranteeing employment for British workers except by the means and by the philosophies that the pioneers of the Movement laid down."

Turning to the necessity of a central plan for industry, Mr. Bevan had these pointed remarks to make: "Of course we shall have to discuss that, but how can we discuss the pattern (of industry) with a large number of unrelated entrepreneurs? What is the use of discussing it with large numbers of competitive capitalists? . . . The pattern can only be determined by having central direction and central purposes.

"That is why I say to this Conference . . . that Great Britain is in a critical situation; no more critical, however, than it was in 1945. In 1945 we faced up to it, and we can face up to it again, but only by recapturing the purpose we had in 1945, only by realising that socialist planning at home, socialist planning in the Commonwealth, socialist planning in Europe, is the basis for rescue of the ordinary man and woman everywhere. It is the only answer we can make."

SOCIALIST PLANNING

That is the case for extending nationalisation which has already proved itself far superior in every respect to the jungle of private enterprise. For that reason the Tories are so anxious to undo it—and the transport workers, for example, were willing to down tools in its defence.

We can see little to arouse that enthusiasm in the present proposals of the N.E.C. A Government broker buying shares on the Stock Exchange is not something likely to inspire the working class to mobilise themselves for the great task of creating a socialist order of society.

The Party Will Decide

WHATEVER has been decided by the National Executive Committee in its discussions on a New Programme for Labour must be submitted for approval to the next Annual Conference in October.

The programme will be then open to amendment and addition by resolutions from local parties and unions. It is from that point of view that local parties should now discuss the N.E.C. proposals.

Two tests must be applied, says the "Tribune" in its last issue. "Have the National Executive carried out the instructions of Morecambe? Have they produced a policy adequate to meet the grave and growing crisis facing the country?"

With that method of approach we are in complete agreement.

The defects of the old method of nationalisation are now well-known . . . at least to a majority of workers. They are: the area of nationalisation must be extended to cover all the basic industries; control must be placed in the safe hands of the workers themselves acting for a Labour Government; and the monstrous burden of compensation to the ex-shareholders must be drastically reduced.

That is the only road forward towards our socialist objective—and that is what the Morecambe Conference decided to do.

ENTHUSIASM WANTED

Of course mistakes are bound to be made in carrying out such a tremendous task as this, the transfer of power to the working class. There will, for example be resistance from the ex-owners and a consequent temporary disruption of industrial production. But to counter-act this there will be the boundless enthusiasm of the workers inspired by the concrete possibility of at last getting out of the capitalist jungle.

Austin Strike Was Not In Vain

Important Lessons For The Battles To Come

THE Austin Strike is over. By 600 votes to 500 the strikers decided, on Monday last, to accept the recommendation of their Executive Council to call off the strike and to apply for work at Austins through the Labour Exchange.

Although the strike is defeated, the strikers have nevertheless covered themselves with glory. For 11 weeks, hounded by the press, pestered by all sorts of lackeys, and victimised by the Labour exchange, they have faced unflinchingly and on their own the giant British Motors Corporation of Austin-Morris.

We take off our hats to these

gallant fighters. Let the frightened politicians who say the workers won't fight hang their heads in shame. The Austin strikers have flung this foolish argument in their teeth.

Why then did they lose? Are Austins invincible, and was the strike doomed to failure from the start? Of course not!

The strike was lost because the top leadership of the A.E.U., the T. & G.W.U. and last but by no means least, the T.U.C., sat back and allowed it to be lost. They could, and should, have stopped the whole combine. A serious threat of doing so might even have been sufficient to win the strike.

Austins whole arrogant strategy was based on the assumption that the N.U.V.B. would be allowed to remain isolated. It is a disgrace that the leadership of the British Trade Union movement should allow such a strategy to succeed.

Rank and file support flowed in from all over the country. Few strikes have so obviously had behind them the sympathy of the rank and file of the whole Labour movement. The A.E.U. members in Austins continually pressed, through their D.C., for the Executive to call them out. The workers waited for a lead from their "leaders"—but waited in vain.

Did these leaders imagine the strike would be won if left to the vehicle builders on their own? Did they imagine that Austins would take notice of lawyers prattling at a Court of Enquiry? If so they are guilty of errors of judgement impermissible in Trade Union leaders.

Were they frightened of joining battle with a powerful opponent? Had they no faith in the capacity of the workers to struggle? If so they have no right to masquerade as leaders of the Trade Union movement.

Do they think it is possible to avoid battle for all time? Events are already showing the fallacy of this idea. The Morris section of General Motors Corporation have now "asked" the workers to accept a 10 per cent. cut in piece work prices.

How is this to be answered? Shall we counsel acceptance without a fight? Shall we rely on lawyers to talk the Morris directors out of it? Or shall we fight?

The vehicle builders have shown the way. Their struggle will be remembered. Many an employer, contemplating an attack on his workers will think twice before launching into a twelve week strike. And workers will draw the lessons from the struggle and use them in preparation for the far greater battles that we all know are ahead.

The Austin strikers served us well. They did not fight in vain.

SPECIAL TRIBUNE MEETING

Keep Left for Peace

How can we end the cold war?

What is the meaning of the changes in Russia?

Must Britain always wait for Eisenhower?

PRINCES THEATRE, SHAFESBURY AVENUE, W.C.2

SUNDAY, MAY 10th, 7 p.m.

Barbara Castle

Dick Crossman

Michael Foot

J. P. W. Mallalieu

Tickets: 1s. and 6d. at the door.

Armaments are Big Business

Especially in the U.S.A.!

THE American Government's strident claims of Chinese maltreatment of prisoners of war and provocative offer of bribes to deserting Mig pilots stem from more than diplomatic clumsiness. They are a reflection of the fact, confessed by the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, that American capitalism is "confronted not with a problem but a dilemma".

The present level of armaments expenditure is the decisive element in American prosperity. The whole war drive expresses the economy's imperative need for expansion. The alternative is a depression worse than the '30's.

On September 6, 1952, the American magazine, "Business Week", observed that United States industrial capacity "is so large that it now takes a consumer-goods boom plus a king-sized defence programme to keep everyone busy".

More recently the conservative "U.S. News and World Report", surveying the distribution of defence contracts found that between June, 1950, and June, 1952, the hundred most important arms producing corporations received 43,800 million dollars worth of major military contracts, or 62.4 per cent. of all major contracts worth 10,000 dollars or more. The conclusion was that "arms is essentially big business."

Five of the ten most important U.S. armaments contractors are aircraft companies which received

a total of almost 7,000 million dollars worth of contracts between June, 1950, and June, 1952. At present the entire industry holds about 25,000 million dollars worth of Government contracts and is almost completely dependent on armaments production.

The United Aircraft Corporation, which ranks fifth among the hundred most important contractors, in 1952 transacted 86 per cent. of its business with the Government, an increase of 2 per cent. over 1951.

Whilst the dependence of the aircraft industry on war prepara-

By

Alf Rose

Member Belington C.L.P.

tion is unique, the arms business of a number of industries is still considerable. In the steel industry in 1952 it amounted to 15 per cent. of total business. Last year the U.S. Government took between 50 and 85 per cent. of the output of most machine tool manufacturers.

At the end of 1952, private and public employment, including the armed services, totalled approximately 66 millions. According to Government figures, 7 million workers were directly or indirectly involved in the arms programme and 3,600,000 were in the armed services.

In other words, about 10,600,000 people, or almost one out of every six employed, were concerned with rearmament. What would happen if "peace broke out"?

The "Manchester Guardian" writer says, "There can be no certain answer to this, and it is well to keep in mind that forecasts of mass unemployment after World War II proved incorrect. On the other hand, the Cold War is not World War II all over again. Economic factors which were important during and after the war are not present today, and the contrasts between the two economic situations are both striking and sobering". These contrasts were described in my recent article in "Socialist Outlook" (24/4/53).

Briefly, in 1953 there is not the same reserve of savings nor the same prospect of employing heavy industry in capital expansion as after 1945. Arms production has been achieved by increased capacity—not by limiting the output of consumer goods. Consequently, it is unlikely that consumer demand can be expanded to meet a change from war to peace production. In fact, as stated previously, it is improbable that consumer demand can long continue at its present level.

According to "Business Week", 44 per cent. of all cars in use in

America are three years old or less; 60 per cent. of all refrigerators are post-war models. The output of cars, television sets and home appliances is ahead of demand.

That American capitalism in 1953 is less favourably placed than in 1945 is also shown in the field of employment. Today there is no large labour force of very young workers, housewives or people past retirement age who can be laid off as at the end of the war. Nor, since the Korean War began, has there been any important extension of hours worked in any large section of industry.

The U.S. Department of Commerce states that, "full employment in the immediate post-war period was consistent with a considerable reduction from war-time peaks in the total of military and civilian employment and in working hours—a situation which is present to only a small extent today."

Then how can American industry thrive other than by selling its products at home or destroying them in wars abroad? In demagogic manner Eisenhower has already pointed to an alternative.

Quiet! Idlers at Work

THE "Daily Mirror" (25/4/53) tells us that "The Queen has bought a beautifully made silver model of herself on horseback at her first Trooping of the Colour." Mr. Main of the Royal Jewellers, took it down to Windsor for approval.

The Queen was delighted and on asking the price was told by Mr. Main, "It's £35 cheaper than it was yesterday before the budget." "I'll have it" said the Queen. "The cost? A mere £350.

Now compare that story with this one.

Grocer: "Want all your bacon ration this week Mrs. . . . ?"

Mrs. . . . : "No! I can't afford to buy 1½ lb. on my husband's pay. Just give me one book (5 ozs.)."

Cheaper silver horses, high prices for food. So much for Butler's budget.

But let's have another look at this same Daily Mirror article. It tells us that Princess Margaret's Sealyham dog "is soon to get a dog-mat made of silver brocade that will make him never, never want to scratch again."

And there was a cocktail party to launch and boost the sales of this anti-scratch dog mat. "It was held, of course, in Park Lane. The room was exquisite, oak panelled and richly gilded . . . A couple

The resources going to armaments should be used to raise living standards in the backward areas of the world.

But while Eisenhower's speech might serve its purpose of white-washing U.S. responsibility for the continuation or extension of war it is unlikely to prevent either.

American big business has not forgotten the great markets which might be found in the colonial east and behind the "iron curtain". That's why war throughout the world is already being fought and prepared. Profit-makers are unwilling to risk their wealth in peaceful trade and investment in lands governed independently by the representatives of native national and social forces. Capitalism seeks to crush these movements so that the markets and resources of the world can be exploited for the benefit of private enterprise alone. This aim can only be achieved by war.

When Mr. John Foster Dulles, the U.S. Secretary of State, visited Paris recently for a meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, he told a press conference that N.A.T.O. was going to proceed "as though nothing had happened" (in Korea).

of debutantes were dreamily dispensing publicity blurs, and three elegant young men-about-town, all in tight trousers and dark red carnations. . . .

The champagne, according to the "Daily Mirror", flowed freely. "A girl in a splendidly embroidered black gown came over to me with a serious face, 'Have you got an aspirin' she said.' Another girl was so tired that "she must really sit down."

And this same issue of the "Mirror" carried the text of the letter sent by the representatives of the Coal Board to the miners under the caption "Must do better miners told".

Surely its time these Park Lane idlers were given some useful job of work to perform. Our belief that "He that is of workable age and fitness shall not eat unless he also works" should be made a reality.

These 'elegant young men-about-town' should be given a course of 'roughing up' and they could then be sent to relieve a few of our miners while they have their hard earned two weeks holiday, and thus prevent any loss in production.

And the "tired girl" who wants an aspirin? Our hard pressed nurses would welcome a little help!

S. R. Pearson.

Fair Shares in Housing!

A Policy for Local Councils

NOW that the local elections are over, Local Labour Parties and Labour Councillors must once again face the housing situation.

Parliament can, of course, give powers, but it must rest with local Councils to apply the powers given to them by Parliament. It follows from this that local Party members and Labour Councillors are

By Tom Braddock

in a better position to arrive at conclusions about housing than are Labour Members of Parliament.

In consultation with their members on local Councils, Constituency Parties should therefore formulate proposals to put inadequately housed people into some sort of decent and reasonable accommodation. It can be done.

In recent issues, "Socialist Outlook" has published both short-term and long-term proposals. In this article, I want to revert to the short-term plan which I outlined in our issue of December 19, 1952. It was there suggested that a policy of "fair shares" in existing accommodation should be applied.

Confirmation of the correctness of that policy has since come from most exalted quarters. The London and Cambridge Bulletin of March, 1953, has made similar suggestions, and now "The Economist" of April 25 has come forward with an article entitled "The Houses in Between", based on the same facts.

Naturally, these two journals approach the matter not so much from the point of view of housing people without homes, as from the possibility of improving existing housing and so getting a bigger rent for the landlord. "Socialist Outlook" has, of course, an entirely different approach.

First, we have no use for landlords, and second, in spite of what "The Economist" says, the landlords will not improve their houses. They are doing very nicely now, thank you. While there is a shortage of accommodation they will, by fair means or foul, take advantage of that shortage and cash in on quite good returns for their money. By improving their property they can, at the most, get only 8 per cent. on their outlay. This does not attract them.

But the fact remains that all the

statistics prove beyond doubt that the existence of homeless people is a scandal. We can put all our badly housed people into reasonably good accommodation rapidly and at a low cost in building labour and material—if we are prepared to attack privilege.

"The Economist" in concluding its article says: "The capital investment needed to provide modern amenities for an old house is but a fraction of that required to secure a new house of equivalent accommodation." By the use of a fraction of the building labour and material required to build new houses we can take our existing houses and re-equip them to meet all our present housing needs within a period of five years.

All authorities agree that by present methods we shall not do it in 25 years, and then only at the expense of schools, hospitals, factories, etc., none of which we can afford to forego.

A bold policy is needed for local Councils. We must demand that all houses that can be improved shall be taken over at once, and that labour and materials for their re-equipment shall be a first priority on our resources.

There is nothing impossible about this since the demand will be less than that required for new house building. We shall therefore free labour for school and factory building.

It may well be that you are in a borough where there is little house property apart from working class houses. In that case co-operation with other Labour Parties is called for. Mitcham, Merton and Morden, for example, have little apart from small houses, but they are next door to Wimbledon, Wallington and Banstead, where there are plenty of large houses. Taking over these houses and converting them for homeless and ill-housed families will get a working class support you need to win majorities on your local Councils.

Nightmare

(from column one)

Advancement of Colored People. The N.A.A.C.P. is pressing Jackson's case before a Federal grand jury.

"They knocked me down seven or eight times. Crawford only went down twice and he stayed down. I kept getting up and each time they knocked me back down. I was dazed. I was crying. I hollered. I begged Brennan to stop kicking me but he only told me to shut up. Finally they took us to Roosevelt Hospital. We were there about an hour. My head was aching so that I just passed out."

He was discharged from the hospital without treatment, taken back to the station and another cop started beating him. "The officer said: 'I want some more of him, too,' and he hit me right in the stomach with his fist and I went down," Jackson said. "He told me to get up and then punched me in the jaw real hard. My jaw was sore. My tooth hasn't stopped aching yet. Then they locked us up—my wife, Crawford and me."

Jackson's boss from the Tempesta & Sons trucking firm bailed him out three days later. On his second day back on the job, Jackson collapsed. He was taken to the Roosevelt hospital, then brought back home. He went into a coma for four days, waking up in the St. Clare hospital. The doctors operated twice on his brain to remove blood clots.

He's back on the job now, but as a helper, not a driver. "I'm afraid to drive," he explained, "because I get terrible headaches and I don't want to hurt anybody."

Colour Bar in Britain

In next week's 'Outlook'

Two Million Africans Prepare Resistance to Federation

No Comment!

THE following are extracts from an article in "The Builder" of April 24, 1953. "The visit of the Queen Mother will set the seal on the Rhodes anniversary activities.

"Hundreds of 'pre-fab' double-bedroom and bathroom units are being made, so that there will be somewhere for the visitors to stay.

"When the exhibition is over . . . the visitors will be able to buy the housing units complete with furniture and fittings for a figure that will be around 100 guineas. The 10ft. x 11ft. bedrooms are fitted with two separate divan beds, a portable wardrobe and wall shelves. There is a fine bathroom, with lavatory, bath and hand basin. Hot and cold water is laid on to every unit.

"Salisbury, the capital city of Southern Rhodesia, has the most pressing housing problem . . . about 30,000 Africans are in shantytowns."

A SHADOW hangs over Rhodesia and Nyasaland, the shadow of a white terror and civil war, the same terror that has been unleashed in Kenya.

The scheme for Federation, which subjugates six million Africans to less than 200,000 European settlers, is about to be forced through despite unanimous African opposition.

The Government's intention to proceed was made known in the debate in the House of Commons last March. Since then the referendum of the Southern Rhodesian electors (overwhelmingly white) has approved the scheme, and an Enabling Bill is being introduced in Parliament to permit the Federation to become an accomplished fact by an Order in Council.

In Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia the Africans, after initial demonstrations, are proceeding to resist by peaceful means. Labour is to be withdrawn progressively from the copper mines and other European-owned enterprises. Taxes will not be paid. Civil servants will resign,

and other classic means of peaceful resistance will be followed.

This programme is being advocated and supported by all responsible Africans, the African National Congress, the Trade Union leaders and the Chiefs, who are united not only in their opposition to the scheme but in the steps to be taken to prevent its consummation.

The Southern Rhodesian African Congress and Trade Unions are in full support of their northern brothers.

There is, at the moment, a delay in carrying out these steps because

By
John Goffe

of last-minute hopes that the Government may change its mind. A Petition has been presented to Parliament asking that the Chiefs from Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland be allowed to present their objection to the House of Commons in person.

A scheme was even presented to the Northern Rhodesian African

Jacob Jackson's Nightmare

Re-printed from the American Socialist paper, "The Militant"

JACOB Jackson is a truck-driver, 32 years old, coloured. He's a quiet-spoken man and says of himself, "I'm not a fighter. I like to let people alone and be let alone. I never had any trouble with the police in my life."

Not, that is, until the warm Saturday night of last August 9. Jackson had started in the direction of a grocery store, strolling slowly so his wife, Geneva, could catch up with him. She was coming down the steps of their home at 437 W. 52nd Street, midtown Manhattan.

Jackson noticed a group of men playing cards on the curb. The game suddenly broke up and the men ran past him. The next thing he knew he got a violent shove in the back, a big fist smashed into his mouth and nose and the blood started spurting. The owner of the fist was police officer William Brennan.

"Officer, rather than beat me around in the street, why don't you take me to the station house and find out what right you have to beat me?" said the shocked victim. The cop told him he was under arrest and he was taken to a patrol car.

A man named Samuel Crawford came up and asked Brennan for his badge. He was placed under arrest. Jackson's wife came up and anxiously asked what was wrong. She was seized and hauled off in another patrol car.

At the W. 54th St. Station, Brennan promptly began to beat up the two arrested men. An inspector was in the police station and was heard to tell the policemen to take the two to a hospital. "The inspector went away and we were handcuffed. They started kicking us and shoving us toward the door," Jackson later told a N.Y. Post reporter in the offices of Edward W. Jacko Jr., Chairman of the Legal Redress Committee of the New York Branch of the National Association for the

Continued Col. 6

Socialist Outlook

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

HOP 4554

Editor: John Lawrence

What Is Behind These Attacks On The N.C.B.?

DURING the last few months, the Tory press has been continually wailing about the abnormally (according to them) high cost of producing coal. Many have been the hints of the expense needed to obtain the extra Saturday coal (miners receive time-and-a-half for this shift), and the inference seems to be that the miners 'high' wages are the sole cause of this high cost of production.

I have been wondering. Could all this subtle propaganda mean that the Tories are trying to condition the miners into accepting the idea that in view of the poor state of the N.C.B. finances (again according to them) and of the nations need for cheaper coal, it will be necessary for the miners to forego their 5-day week? Which means, of course, that miners would have to work Saturdays for the same wage that they are now getting for five days.

Some people may think this rather far-fetched, but I consider that it is the next logical step for the Tories to take in their all-out effort to force down all workers standard of living.

The press is also busy 'flogging'

We Made It— but only just!

Fighting Fund

Monthly Target: £70
April Total: £70:13:4d

It was certainly a near thing for the Fighting Fund this month, comrades. As a matter of fact, we only made it at the very last moment through the generosity of one of our good friends in the Westminster Labour Party.

All of us, of course, have been up to our eyes in local election work and that has taken up most of our time. We don't complain. We exist to fight the Tories and strengthen the socialist movement. But if we don't get that £70 every month the fight is badly hampered.

Thanks a lot to all our busy readers who didn't forget us this month.

The following donations are gratefully acknowledged:—

- E.N.V. Workers £1 1s. 4d.; A. Thornton, York, 2s.; S. G. Dixon 5s. 6d.; North Hackney readers £5 1s. 10d.; South Hackney readers £2 0s. 6d.; League of Youth members £1 6s. 8d.; R. & M. £5; Tottenham readers £5 6s. 6d.; Enfield Engineers £2 0s. 9d.; Two London Printers £6; Islington readers £1 4s.; J. A. Goodspeed, Canada, £1; Leeds readers £1 12s. 6d.; Birmingham readers £2 15s.; R. T. Shelley readers 17s. 3d.; Anon. £1 2s. 6d.; Bebington readers 10s.; London Busman 5s.; West London readers £13 11s.; Norwood readers £2 1s. 9d.; C. Denington 6d.; R. J. Johnston, Altrincham, 4s.; Nottingham readers £2 4s. 6d.; Leicester readers £2; Mr. Houchin, Stoke Newington, 2s.; Bethnal Green readers £2 15s.; St. Pancras readers £1 5s.; Platts workers £1 13s.; Platts "Buster" £2 6s.; A.E.U. Shop Stewards (Lyme Hall) 7s. 6d.; Salford A.E.U. members 6s. 9d.; Albert Park Ward members 3s. 9d.; Manchester & Salford readers £1 18s.; J. Wilcock 5s.; Westminster readers £2. Total £70 13s. 4d.

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.



a subject that has become a hardy annual with them. They are working overtime to convince the public that it is inevitable that the 'inefficient' nationalised coal industry will make a loss once again on the year's workings.

Reading some of these assertions led me to examine some past N.C.B. records. I don't pretend to be a financial wizard or a business tycoon, which perhaps explains why I am utterly confused concerning something I read in those records.

In 1951 I was informed that the N.C.B. made a loss of somewhere around £1,700,000. When, however, I examined this statement

Conversation Piece

The North-West London factory of a nation-wide combine manufacturing instruments and components for cars and aircraft is advertising for labour.

A woman employee asked her foreman why the management was taking on more labour. The foreman replied that the management wanted to complete all their arms contracts in case the peace talks come to a successful conclusion.

They were concerned in case of a cease-fire in Korea. "It will be a bad day for us all", he said.

further I found there was actually a surplus of approximately £24,000,000!

But, out of this, the poor ex-coal owners had taken £14,500,000 as their interest for that year (Not bad, really).

Another £5½ million went to pay for American coal imported by the Government (Why should a loss on a deal made by the Government be charged to the mining industry).

Then after all this I was told that the N.C.B. had actually paid £2,000,000 Profits Tax!

What I would like to know is: How can a firm lose in one year £1,700,000 and at the same time pay £2 million Profits Tax.

To the first reader who can give me a satisfactory answer I will give half of my next allocation of concessionary coal—the dirty half.

PLANS!

THE Annual Meeting of the 'Outlook' (details below) is of great importance to all shareholders and friends of the paper.

From a Monthly to a Weekly was last years wonderful achievement. This year we aim to do even better by putting the "Outlook" really on the map from the point of view of quality and circulation.

Come and hear the plans of your Management Committee, see for yourself the paper's financial condition, make your suggestions and . . . meet 'Outlook' readers from all over the country. It will be an evening you will enjoy.

Labour Publishing Society Ltd.

The Owners of "Socialist Outlook"

Annual General Meeting

Saturday, May 30th 6 p.m.

"Three Nuns Hotel"—Aldgate, E.1

B.R.S Men Get Foretaste of Private Enterprise

"GET out of my office! I don't want to talk to you." This order by Mr. Rockman, Superintendent of High Meads British Road Services Depot, to the lorry drivers' Shop Steward, caused long smouldering resentment to burst into strike action on the morning of Wednesday, April 29.

The Shop Steward, Tommy Robertson, and his deputy, Wally Wharmsby, met this challenge to the principle of collective bargaining with spirit and energy. Within a matter of minutes, messengers in cars and on motor-bikes were making the rounds of the wharves, docks and other loading points, recalling drivers of 66A Stratford Group to the depot for a meeting to decide what should be done.

But as the men returned, lorry by lorry, they found that the Manager, Mr. Hainstock, had added fuel to the flames by shutting the depot gates on them. They were locked out! And to make matters even worse, no-one was even allowed into the canteen to eat the dinners already prepared for them, so all that day's food was wasted.

The men decided unanimously that "Rockman must go" and until he did go, they were staying out.

For many months, the depot committee explain, the men have shown remarkable self control in putting up with Mr. Rockman's insulting attitude. "He accuses you of things you don't do. He

insists he's right, no matter what. We're always afraid a driver will 'poke him one' and get three months for it.

"We were attempting to negotiate about a change of trunk. It has always been accepted in ours and other depots that the committee arranges the trunk drivers, and when once a driver is given a particular trunk route—he stays on it.

Rockman was breaking this

By Our Industrial Reporter

agreement by trying to switch drivers and lorries on the Norwich trunk without any consultation.

So the stewards and drivers concerned had gone into Mr. Rockman's office to discuss it, a normal part of collective bargaining procedure. But got ordered out of the office! If he gets away with this we might as well have no Union. So we are determined to see he doesn't get away with it.

At first the management refused to discuss anything unless we returned to work. But as we didn't fall for this one, they then offered to open negotiations within a few hours of a return.

Later still they offered to hold a full investigation into the operation of the depot within half an hour of our resuming. We all welcome an investigation. But the drivers all fear that, if Rockman was still left in charge someone will certainly be provoked into "poking him one" and get three months inside.

Therefore at a meeting on Saturday morning, they instructed Harry Moore, group secretary T. & G.W.U., to tell the B.R.S. they would accept an investigation and return to work—provided that Mr. Rockman is taken out of the depot pending the enquiry.

On Monday morning, Harry Moore reported back that the management refused to suspend Mr. Rockman, claiming that such suspension would constitute prejudging him. He advised an immediate resumption. But the men were adamant that they were

not prepared to start with Rockman on the depot.

A satisfactory settlement was finally reached for a resumption of work at 2 p.m. on the understanding that the enquiry, at which Mr. Rockman would have to be present, would also start at 2 p.m.

The men regard this as a satisfactory settlement, being convinced that the enquiry will show the need for removing Mr. Rockman in the interest of the smooth running of the depot.

The solidarity of the men in this dispute is a sign of their determination to stop all attempts to break down the working conditions and agreements that have been built up under nationalisation.

The Garter Man

Some Observations on Sir Winston by

PATON DENE

SPEAKING of Winston Churchill the "Sunday Observer" says "perhaps the greatest man alive, certainly the greatest living Englishman." In a book I have been reading—"Winston Churchill" by Virginia Cowles—the writer appears to agree with the "Sunday Observer".

Indeed in this purely publishing venture Churchill is presented as a sort of symbolic expression of Divine condescension to the British people. This latest biography of Churchill is an addition to a series of post war expositions of his personality, characteristics and activities, all purporting to show his indispensability as a statesman and his impact as a great personality upon the British nation.

The book is published at 18s. which at once informs us that it was not written with the vast mass of working people in view.

In the introduction to her book, the authoress says that "the earth has had the benefit of Churchill's attention for over half a century". I can only say that that portion of the earth populated by the vast majority of British workers derived such benefit from his attentions that 14 million voted against him at the last election.

The authoress goes on to say: "his dazzling gifts were acknowledged from the very first" and "he now has the mantle of fame securely wrapped around his shoulders".

His "dazzling gifts" have never been used in the defence of the working class of this country, and the service in return for which the mantle of fame has been placed around his shoulders, his wartime leadership, did not save him from the most crushing and humiliating defeat in British political history.

Continuing, Virginia Cowles says: "there is not a trick of the trade he does not know" and, she might have added, which he has not used.

Speaking at Glasgow a fortnight ago, Churchill said: "Over 30 million have benefited from Butler's sixpence off Income Tax". What are the facts?

Ten million earners get nothing at all from the sixpenny tax cut, but they will have to shoulder all future rises in the cost of living.

At the other end of the social scale, 2,000 people, with incomes of over £20,000 a year get an average of £852 a year each out of Butler's budget.

The dazzling gifts of Churchill are still being used to prove that all this is quite in order, and the mantle of fame that the authoress says "is securely wrapped around him" appears to be unsoiled by his callous and hypocritical silence in face of the fact that Butler has ignored the old age pensioners as if they didn't exist.

Latest reports of financial support to the Austin vehicle builders come from East Fulham Labour Party, £2 2s.; Barns Court (Ward) L.P., £1 7s.; Hudsons, Great West Road, London, £1 10s.; and a collecting box at Peckham Bus Garage, £1 1s.

Productivity: The Truth

ON whose side are the leaders of our Trade Union movement? Judging from the public utterances of some of these leaders, the average trade unionist might well ask himself this question.

The Labour movement is definitely committed to a policy of further nationalisation. Both the Morecambe and Margate conferences, last year, re-affirmed the movement's determination to extend the sphere of public ownership. Obviously the delegates, acting on behalf of the entire movement, thought it a serious matter and considered that it was important whether an industry was nationalised or not.

STRANGE STATEMENTS

One would expect a responsible leadership to take note of the declared intentions of their membership, but on several recorded occasions since Morecambe and Margate, they have expressed themselves in terms directly opposite to the decisions of both conferences.

Thus we have Mr. Tom O'Brien, Chairman of the T.U.C. telling the Scottish T.U.C.: "Whether industry is publicly or privately controlled or owned, it is everybody's job to help the nation to earn its living. Today," he added, "it is reactionary to talk of working oneself out of a job."

Then we have Sir Lincoln Evans, general secretary of the Iron and Steel Trades Confederation, saying: "Whether the steel industry should be publicly or privately owned has little relevance to the problem (of increased production)"

And this at a time when the Parliamentary Labour Party is fighting a rear-guard action against the de-nationalisation of road transport!

If all this is true then what has

all the fuss been about in the past? Why has the Labour Party laid such emphasis on nationalisation in its programme, year after year? Was it all a hollow sham, a mock fight? Party propaganda? Playing at "class war" as the Tories say.

Or is it because the founders of the Labour Party and those who comprise the rank-and-file of the Party and the trade unions today know that the question of power is bound up with the ownership and control of the economic resources of the country?

A REMINDER

It is just not true that increased productivity brings an automatic improvement in the living conditions of the workers—the workers have had to fight for every economic advance they have made. Despite the denials of Mr. O'Brien and Sir Lincoln, increased production under present-day conditions does threaten the standard of living of working people.

Production in capitalist-owned enterprises is for the market and when the market reaches saturation

—that is to say when the goods produced can no longer be disposed of at a profit, production is curtailed. Workers find themselves on short time or signing on at the Labour Exchange. The word "redundancy" makes its ominous appearance in the firm's annual report. Down comes the standard of living of the workers with a wallop!

Surely, it will be said, this sort of thing doesn't happen today? Why, there are millions of people

By Tom Somers

in the world who don't get enough to eat; who need textiles to clothe themselves with; or steel to build houses with. There just can't be any talk of working oneself out of a job.

Can't there just? In Lancashire today there are thousands of textile operatives on the stones because there's no work for them. Yet, only a year or two back the

Government was making frantic efforts to get people into the textile industry! Then the warehouses got stocked up with goods which could not be sold at a profit deemed sufficient by "private enterprise". The textile workers had worked themselves out of their jobs.

Now along comes Sir Lincoln Evans—the great advocate of "more productivity"—and warns the workers of a coming glut in steel! He said this at a divisional conference of the Iron and Steel Confederation in Swansea, on April 18. This same conference passed a resolution referring to redundancy which was already affecting several steel and tinplate plants in South Wales.

OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL

Increased production will only bring improved conditions for the workers when ownership and control is taken away from the capitalist class whose sole objective is bigger dividends. Nationalised industry, operating under workers' control, will be geared to the real needs of the people and employment will not be subject to the vicissitudes of capitalist competition as it is today.

So you see, Mr. O'Brien, it really does make a big difference whether industry is publicly or privately controlled or owned.

The capitalist class, of course, welcome these sort of statements from the T.U. leaders and use it whenever they can against the workers. That is why Sir Godfrey Russell Vick, Q.C., representing the Austin Motor Company at the inquiry into the Longbridge strike could accuse the N.U.V.B. of using strike action "at a time when the great Trade Union movement of this country is . . . solidly behind plans for economic recovery and harder work . . ."

We have indeed come to a sorry pass when the public speeches of our Trade Union leaders can be used for strike-breaking purposes.

YOUNG MRS. BROWN

(The New 'Old Mother Hubbard')

Young Mrs. Brown
Pushed her pram into town
To get her poor children some
dinner;
But when she got there,
She was heard to declare:
"With prices like these they'll
get thinner!"

She went with her bank book
Some cash to withdraw;
But deposits don't last
With deductions galore.
She went to the landlord's
To pay him the rent;
But the rates had increased
So more savings were spent.

She went to ask teacher
Whether Willy would pass;
But his chances are small
In so crowded a class.
She went to her mother's
(The fare emptied her purse);
But the old-pensioner's plight
On her pittance was worse.

She went home to her husband
Unhappy and weary.
But he said: "Well—
We spend seventeen-hundred
and sixty millions yearly
on armaments, Dearie!"
(Parody on the 'Old Mother
Hubbard' nursery-rhyme.)
Mrs. F. Gioc.

The Labour League of Youth and War

TOM Braddock, in a previous issue of the "Outlook" explained that the workers can stop the Korean War. His excellent article showed how, by rallying the forces of the Labour Movement, it would be possible to strike a mortal blow at the war plans of imperialism.

Our readers write

John Maclean

The recent death of his widow, calls to mind that great Scottish Socialist, **John Maclean**.

Although not so well-known in England as he ought to be, Maclean led a life that should be an inspiration to every socialist. He devoted himself heart and soul to the cause of socialism.

During the imperialist war of 1914-18, he organised anti-war meetings. He was the first Russian Ambassador to Britain—a symbol of his solidarity with the great Russian Revolution.

In his lifetime he suffered privation and imprisonment but remained unbending in his allegiance to the working class. His zeal and devotion finally took toll of his health and he passed away in 1923. One day we shall see the dawn which he so earnestly strove for.

Keighley.

M. Evans.

★

Akihito

Action by the Labour Party in Newcastle has finally prevented the Lord Mayor of Newcastle from holding an official reception to Akihito, Crown Prince of Japan.

Although the Tory controlled Council defeated the Labour motion which requested of the Lord Mayor not to receive the Crown Prince, the Labour Party carried out a campaign.

In my factory, Vickers, a special shop stewards meeting was called to discuss what should be done, and the management was kept fully informed by the shop stewards.

The Labour Party received a great deal of support on this issue, and the final outcome is very important since it shows that the Party, even though defeated by the Tory majority in the Council Chamber, can impose its will by appealing to and enlisting the aid of the workers.

Newcastle.

Jack Johnston.

★

May Day Blimps

THE Surrey Federation of Labour Party Leagues of Youth, a body which has always been distinguished for its initiative and its militancy, held a highly successful May Day open-air meeting on Saturday last, which I, as an ex-Leaguer still interested in its activities, attended. The meeting was held in the heart of Tory-controlled Surbiton.

During Tom Braddock's speech, the audience was provided with an interesting, and typical, example of the working of the Tory mind. A pompous individual, with a brightly-coloured waistcoat, and

We welcome letters and articles on any subject of interest to the Labour Movement.

Letters should be no longer than 250 words to ensure publication.

Articles should be received by FRIDAY for publication in the following Friday's issue.

carrying a poodle dog, strode into the middle of the gathering, chanting "Good old Sir Winston!" "Vote Conservative!" and other inept slogans. As far as one could tell, he appeared to be about 30, although Young Conservatives are ageless, and his waistcoat seemed to us to be a bright yellow.

The inane interruptions of this "Junior Blimp" continued with such comments as "What do you know about Kenya, have you ever been there?" and "Gad Sir, I was born there."

He was later joined by a confederate, a middle-aged "impoverished gentlewoman", describing herself as an aristocrat, who asked the speaker what he was going to do about "that backbone of the country—the middle classes". **I bit back the remark I wanted to make!**

Barnes.

Peter Evans.

★

Power Still Comes From Ownership

★ A Discussion Article ★

IS it true that capitalism is giving way not to Socialism but to rule by the managers?

Many students of Socialism have been worried by the question ever since James Burnham wrote his disturbing book, "The Managerial Revolution."

Now another American, C. Wright Mills, has made, in a profound study of modern industry entitled "White Collar" (Oxford University Press), a convincing reply to Burnham's argument.

THE THEORY STATED

Burnham's theory in a nutshell is this:

"The control of the world is passing into the hands of the managers. Capitalism has virtually lost its power and will be replaced not by Socialism but by the rule of the administrator in business and government. . . .

"The future government rulers will not be the possessors of wealth but the possessors of technical and administrative skill. Already they alone are satisfied, keen and confident. . . .

"The managers—these administrators, experts, directing engineers, production executives, propaganda specialists, technocrats—are the only social group among

almost all of whose members we find an attitude of self-confidence. They know they are indispensable in modern society."

Burnham claimed that Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany were also examples of the developing managerial society.

HE IS WRONG

To which Professor Mills replies: "The power of property has often become indirect and works through agents. But it is still the final arbiter."

Mills points out that while owner and manager are no longer the same person, the manager has not expropriated the owner, nor has the power of the propertied enterprise over men and markets declined.

"Power has not been split from

they expressed was power made possible by the two billion."

In other words, the really big capitalists have more power—not less.

The powers of property are de-personalised and concealed, but they have not declined. The owners have the power to sack the managers and select men who serve their purposes better.

"The principles they attempt to follow are not the budgetary considerations of those who manage public property but rather that they use their power in the interests of maximum profits."

Managers have not been known to act intentionally against the property interests of large owners. Politically, too, they are "reliable" from the capitalist viewpoint.

WHERE LIES POWER

If private property were abolished the managers' power would have to look to other sources of authority. And, while the top managers don't personally own the undertakings they run they often have such big holdings in them as to become capitalists themselves.

At least two-thirds of American managers' incomes over £25,000 a year are derived from property holdings states Professor Mills. (A similar situation exists in this country, I believe.)

Though Burnham devotes little space to nationalisation in Britain (since he was writing in 1942) he would doubtless claim that this is just another manifestation of managerialism.

And it must be admitted that the danger exists. But so long as we are conscious of it we can avoid the trap. This will require: (1) some form of workers' control (by election, I suggest, of a majority of members of the committees running industry at works, area and national level); and (2) a greater equality of wealth, income and education, so that no separate class or caste of managers can emerge.

That is, the safeguards are the participation of everybody in management and the creation of opportunities for everybody to become a manager.

INFORMATION WANTED

Will the reader who sent a 2s. 6d. Postal Order in an envelope bearing a Stratford postmark, and forgot to enclose a letter or anything telling us what it was for, please get in touch with the Business Manager.

Small Advs.

(1/- per line, minimum 3 lines.)

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST YOUTH CAMP, 1953, Yugoslavia. Films and meeting: "Sutjeska" (Partisan documentary) and "Socialist Youth Camp". Speakers: D. Chesworth, L.C.C., and Yugoslav representative. 7 p.m. May 12, Holborn Hall. Free. **NALSO, 8 Geyfere St., S.W.1. ABBEY 6894.**

PARIS £16 10s.; **Spain** £29; **Yugoslavia** £27 10s. to £37 10s. for 2 weeks inclusive. For full programme send S.A.E. to **Holiday Friendship Service, 5 Goodwins Court, London, W.C.2.**

PEACE OR WAR?

For the facts read

PEACE NEWS

The international pacifist weekly

H. W. Franklin (N.U.R. President) says—

"I can wholeheartedly recommend 'Peace News'. All trade Unionists appreciate the authenticity of its news items."

EVERY 4th FRIDAY

From all newsagents

Send half a crown for nine weeks postal trial to:

PEACE NEWS
3, Blackstock Rd., London, N.4.

The Week at Westminster



THE STARLING THAT CRIED "CUCKOO!"

by **Harold Davies, M.P.**

THIS is going to be a mixture of the Country Life Column and the Political Commentary. Just blame this glorious May Day!

So, here I am with the loveliest day of the year, while thousands are cheering good old Stan Matthews at the Cup Final; just watching a starling that has been kidding me. I would not have believed it if I hadn't heard it and seen it, and I do know the difference between a cuckoo and a starling, but wonder of wonders here in this wood miles from anywhere I have just heard a starling imitating a cuckoo. You don't believe it? Well I'm telling you it is a fact. Now while I am looking for scraps of old envelopes on which to scribble this article a bossy robin is chasing another for trespassing on his territory. I'm finding it very difficult too to steer my mind back to the Lobbies of Westminster, because I feel like a prisoner let out for a few hours in the sunshine.

There are a couple of magpies around quarrelling and chattering like a couple of Tory front-benchers, while every now and then they dive at each other over a brightly coloured rhododendron bush arguing about who shall be the next Prime Minister, but that darned old starling keeps coming back with his new trick of crying, "cuckoo!" Now who cried "cuckoo" in the House this week?

It was on Thursday when Sir Winston, just like a great tit, that's a bird that wears an Edwardian yellow waistcoat, bullied his way through a tough question that **George Wigg** of Dudley asked.

George wanted to know what the P.M. thought of the American gesture to offer dollar rewards for

any Communist jet flyer who would bring in a MiG to Uncle Sam. Churchill had the boys busy. They dug up Oppenheim on International law. He tells us that bribes are not illegal in war. This is just like the bloomin' starling that is pretending to be a cuckoo.

But Sir Winston reached his greatest heights with a new theory of morale. "It is better to be bribed than to be killed." What will the melodrama writers do now? Remember the cry of the beautiful maiden about to be stained by the squire. . . . "Better Death than Dishonour!" Fool, she should have consulted Oppenheim and Sir Winston. It is really getting too much for us to have to listen to this kind of stuff from the Tory front benches these days. When are we going to insist that Britain's voice be heard in these Truce Talks. We can save liberal America from some of her own gauche negotiators.

THE "SQUEEZER" OR "PINCH-GUTS"

There's a path through this wood and I can see at the end of a green tunnel of sunlight and shadows a squeezer stile or what we called as kiddies a "pinch-guts". One of those V-shaped stiles that just allowed you to squeeze through. On Thursdays the Minister of Education just about squeezes through with the maximum of embarrassment by giving us the minimum of information. **Frank Beswick** wanted to know if the lady had made up her mind about the terms of reference of the Committee of Inquiry into Adult Education. Of course, she could not tell us anything new or who the personnel would be that were to deal with the problem!

Then again the Minister of Health is squirming his way through more than a "squeezer" just now. By the time this bright lad has finished with our Health Services we shall be back into the twilight of pre-Lloyd George days.

LEASEHOLD REFORM

I've just been watching a little fella' about thirty yards away. He

has been racing and scampering around the trunk of a silver birch tree. His jaws are incessantly moving like those of a company director at a Savoy dinner. Now and then he stops to wash his funny little face, assured that he has no problems of land ownership or lapsed leaseholds. They tell me there are no 99 years leases or 999 years leases in Nature on rabbit burrows. Anyway, the only guy around here that looks like a lawyer or a rent-collector is a fat and fussy old rook cawing his way out of the woods to the fields from time to time. He has been collecting some toll from the fields. It looks as though he has a leather-jacket in his beak right now. Most of the rook's language sounds like chop logic in support of the leasehold system.

Scotland and Wales were to the front in this Debate on Leasehold Reform and **Dai Grenfell** made a moving appeal for justice and reform in the Welsh coalfields. **Granville West** put the issue thus: "Is the house which the lessee has built his house or the ground landlord's house?" He told us how some of these monopoly landlords forced the unfortunate lessee sometimes into onerous covenants. **Granville** gave the Commons an example where a landlord inserted in the contract a clause to the effect that the lessee of the house would have to forfeit the house if he embraced a certain religion. That is private enterprise setting the people free, brother!

Labour when in power brought out a standstill Act to protect the leaseholder in some of the worst cases. Now more must be done and quickly to protect people from expropriation. Why should this anachronism exist in a modern society? The problem is growing more acute year by year because the bulk of the ground leases are running out. In the next 20 years the issue will be acute. Labour must stop this confiscation of property by landowners. It is a wicked system.

Now, Mr. Editor I have filled all the scraps of paper I possess and that little chap who was washing his face has disappeared long ago. If you are worried whether to put this column under Country Life or What's What in Politics I leave it to you. Just blame the sunlight in the woods on a lovely May Day—the Workers' Day.

'SOCIALIST OUTLOOK' EVERY WEEK (Price 3d.) from your NEWSAGENT

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