

Join the  
**LABOUR  
PARTY**  
TODAY

# Socialist Outlook

WEEKLY

No. 93  
[Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper]

FRIDAY, AUGUST 28, 1953

3d.

Will There  
Be a Slump  
in America?

(See page 2)

## Order Out Of Chaos

ONCE upon a time America had the Atom Bomb all to herself—and lots of people thought this would compel Russia to hand back Eastern Europe to the capitalists and cause China to hand back her land to the landlords and thus avoid the war. But it didn't happen that way.

Instead, the Russians worked hard until they, too, got the Atom Bomb. But the prophets were not to be gainsaid. Now that they both have the Atom Bomb, they said, this will make all the statesmen in all countries doubly cautious in considering war as a means of resolving their conflicts. But it didn't work out that way.

Instead, America went to work even harder and finally came up

### Editorial

triumphantly with . . . the Hydrogen Bomb! A monstrous weapon of destruction capable of destroying in one blow great cities like Moscow, London or New York. Ah, said all the prophets, now the Russians will have to "see reason". But it didn't work out that way.

Instead, the Russians worked even harder at their research and now—as all the world was informed last week—they too have the Hydrogen Bomb. And what do the prophets say now? Have they learned from experience? Not at all. Just read last week's "Sunday Observer". It says: "It can only be hoped that this will make all the statesmen in all countries doubly cautious in considering war as a means of resolving their conflicts."

What a hope! Already the press is full of detailed reports about new and fantastic weapons to off-

set the Hell Bomb—of intensified research in atomic science in America and Britain—of stepped-up "aid" from America to the countries of the West. And sooner or later all this activity, all this piling up of arms is going to result—as it always has resulted—in one vast explosion. And it is working men, women and children who are going to be blown to bits . . . unless the Labour Movements of the world take a hand in this grisly Hell Bomb politics.

What is the answer? Is it general disarmament? Of course it is . . . but the question to answer first is: who is going to disarm whom?

It is simply useless to appeal to the imperialists to disarm themselves. Two world wars and the shattered League of Nations are sufficient proof of that. The only disarmament which the workers can be interested in—and which can bear any fruit—is the disarmament of all those interested in making war. The arms kings, the oil barons, the generals and the hypocritical capitalist statesmen.

When that little lot is rendered harmless, there won't be any war. For there isn't a worker in any country in the world who wants to make war on his fellow men. There's no future in it—unless a shallow grave in a jungle or a desert can be called a future.

So the Labour Movement must disarm the warmongers? How? By creating Socialist governments which will deprive the capitalists of their ability to make war by depriving them of their wealth and their property. This is the political meaning of a bold nationalisation policy.

By this means, and by freeing the colonial peoples, Labour can initiate mutual co-operation among the peoples of the world and once and for all free mankind from the nightmare of Hell Bomb politics and thus bring order out of chaos.

## Wage Struggles Stop Atom Bomb Plants E.T.U. Challenges Building Contractors

FOR the past six months the Electrical Trades Union have been trying to obtain a wage increase for their members in the Electrical Contracting industry, to meet the increased cost of living. The claim was first tabled last February, and after a month of negotiations the employers, organised in the National Federated Electrical Association, flatly rejected the claim.

The E.T.U. consulted its members at mass meetings held in 17 districts throughout the country. At each meeting the electricians decided in favour of strike action unless the employers were prepared to adopt a different attitude.

On July 23 the Employers were therefore given notice that strike action would be taken on August 25 unless some offer was made. The employers did nothing—so, on Tuesday last more than a thousand men at ten large building jobs struck work in response to the call from their Union.

There are some 40,000 members involved in the pay claim, but all are not being called out on strike immediately. The Union has selected some of the largest sites to begin with, and is prepared to

From Our  
Industrial Correspondent

call out up to 30,000 of its members, that is, all those employed by the larger contractors. W. Stevens, the E.T.U. General Secretary, has stated that more sites will probably be involved by Thursday unless the employers agree to open negotiations on the wage demand.

The first "wave" of sites called out include atomic energy plants at Aldermaston and Capenhurst, the Leyland Tank factory, extension to the Austin Motor Works in Birmingham, two new steel factories, and three oil refineries.

The capitalist press is already trying to make "scare" headlines from the fact that these are all "vital" factories and sites of great importance in the development of the re-armament programme. Particularly as "atom plants" are

involved. Workers, whether involved directly in the strike or not, will undoubtedly answer—so what? The employers could easily have averted the strike by getting down off their high horse and making a reasonable offer to the Union.

In any case, no working man or woman should shed tears because work in these plants have been stopped. Even apart from the atom plants, the majority, if not all, of the output from the factories and refineries that are being built will be used for war purposes. Not for the bettering of the living standards and conditions of working people but on the contrary—for destruction and the worsening of living conditions of common people throughout the world.

The machinery that is to go into them, the workers' time which will be spent in them, is all so much waste. If the tremendous burden of the armament programme was lifted, this machinery and labour could be put to productive use, to make things the people need and, as a result, the constant rise in the cost of living could be reversed. Working people know this.

That is why they will not be frightened by Press headlines.

### Ceylon Bans Socialist Press

Mass demands for the resignation of Ceylon's capitalist Government whose policies have led to unemployment and sky-rocketing prices, have been answered by the banning of the papers of both the Ceylon Socialist Party and the Communist Party.

Troops have fired on workers' demonstrations, killing at least 31.

Below is a picture (taken earlier this year) of a mass meeting (the biggest in the history of Ceylon) being addressed by Dr. M. N. Perera of the Socialist Party. The meeting had been called to express popular indignation at Government rigging of the General Election.



### South Leeds on Workers' Participation

"Challenge to Britain" contains the following phrase . . . "we intend to pay our way in the world and to help under-developed countries. Labour has therefore, a national plan for expansion and full employment".

The South Leeds C.L.P. is asking the Margate Conference to add this amendment:

"With full workers' participation at all levels, from the shop floor upwards, in those industries under Public Ownership."

South Leeds conference delegate is Hugh Gaitskell, M.P.

### No Political Lead in French Strike

IT now seems clear that the great French Strikes, which at one stage involved more than five million workers, are over. First the Socialist Trade Unions called it off and, a few days later, the Communist-controlled C.G.T. instructed their members to return to work "in order", they said, "not to endanger working class unity".

Millionaire Laniel must now be feeling very bucked. His decrepit capitalist coalition Government has apparently survived the biggest wave of strikes since 1933—not because the Government was strong, but because the leaders of the working class parties, the Socialists and Communists, never once issued during the strike a clear call for a united Socialist-Communist Government.

As for our own T.U.C.—they remained as quiet as the grave throughout—in sharp contrast to their noisy declarations of "solidarity" for the East German workers.

But the fight is not yet finished. The arms drive, and the war in Indo-China, are bleeding French economy to death and steadily undermining working class living standards. The creation of a united working class Government in France remains the only solution and, we believe, the French workers will, sooner or later, compel their leaders to recognise this fact.

## Sinister New War Moves in Persia

TO those who confine their reading to the capitalist press, the Persian scene must present an appearance of utter confusion.

On one day of the week Dr. Mossadiq reaches the height of his power; the Shah flees to Rome. Only a few days later the Shah is back in Teheran and Mossadiq is in jail.

In order to understand what is happening in this corner of the globe it is necessary to look at Persia against the backdrop of the world scene. Much more is involved than the struggle of rival factions.

### PERSIA IN THE COLD WAR

Persia occupies a vital strategic position in the cold war. Not only can it supply a large percentage of the oil needed to fuel and lubricate the war machine, but it has a long common frontier with the Soviet Union.

In the days when Britain was the dominant imperialist power, Persia played an important rôle in the intrigues and military calculations of the Imperial General Staff.

Britain's power was exercised, not mainly by her military strength, but because her ownership of the fabulous Persian oilfields gave her almost unchecked control of Persia's economic life.

Out of the huge profits of Anglo-Iranian, politicians were bribed, governments were installed and brought down, and Shahs reigned only at the pleasure of the British oil moguls.

While the pro-British politicians waxed fat and landowners wallowed in luxury, the great mass of the Persian people lived in conditions of almost indescribable misery. The wealth of Persia flowed down the pipelines to the Persian Gulf, where it was loaded into British tankers to earn huge dividends for the City of London profiteers.

### THE REVOLUTION BEGINS

All this came to an end in 1951 when the Persians rose in revolt against the rule of Anglo-Iranian and forced the government to nationalise the oilfields.

Writing in "Reynolds News" on August 23, former Labour Minister Maurice Webb refers to Mossadiq as "that senile rascal" and claims that the recent events have shown "how right Herbert Morrison and the Labour Government were in the attitude they took" in 1951.

In June, 1951, Foreign Minister Herbert Morrison's reaction to the nationalisation of the oilfields was to ostentatiously order an airborne division to the Mediterranean. He talked about "upholding the sanctity of international agreements"—agreements signed by the

By  
C. Van Gelderen

Persians in 1933 under the shadow of British naval guns in the Gulf. This is the policy which Webb now claims was justified—a policy of naked imperialism.

The taking over of the oilfields immediately put a curb on British power in Persia. The new government of Dr. Mossadiq, responding to the demands of the people, rebuffed all British efforts to regain a foothold in the oilfields.

The workers and peasants of Persia became aware of their own power, and thus became a threat, not only to British vested interests in Persia, but to the local landowners as well. The rapid growth of the Tudeh (Communist) Party, which is today the largest political party in the country (despite the fact that it is illegal) frightens the Shah as well as Churchill and Eisenhower.

### UNSAFE FOR IMPERIALISM

With this development, Persia could no longer be looked upon as a safe springboard from which to launch an attack on the Soviet Union when the time comes to turn the cold war into a shooting war. The Mossadiq government, in its struggle against the Shah and the feudal reactionaries, was compelled more and more to lean on the masses for support. There

was a very real possibility that the Communists would come to power. It is for this reason that the Shah has staged a counter-revolutionary military dictatorship and arrested Mossadiq.

The immediate aim of the Shah's Generals is to break the power of the workers and peasants. Until that has been accomplished, it will be difficult to openly associate with the capitalist governments of Britain and America. A reign of terror therefore faces the Persian people.

Washington is obviously very concerned about the state of affairs in Persia. The Americans tried, at one stage, to arrive at a working agreement with Mossadiq. They

were quite prepared to do this even at the expense of their British allies if this could produce a stable government in Teheran amenable to the American point of view. When this move failed, they gave their support to the British. Both Dulles and Adlai Stevenson included Teheran in the itinerary of their world tour.

When one bears in mind the importance of Persia in Wall Street's war plans, it is reasonable to assume American intrigue behind the recent moves. If this is indeed the case, then the removal of Mossadiq means a stepping up in the drive to war. It means that the Soviet Union is in very real danger of an attack from the South East.

## Who Owns 'Socialist Outlook'?

If this is the first time you have seen "Socialist Outlook" you will naturally want to know who owns it, and what are its aims.

The "Socialist Outlook" was first produced in December, 1948. It is owned and published by the Labour Publishing Society Ltd.—a co-operative society registered under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act.

Anyone who is a member of, or is eligible for membership of, the Labour Party can, by purchasing a £1 share, become an owner of the "Socialist Outlook".

The Officers and Committee of Management are elected at an Annual General Meeting, and they appoint the Editorial Board.

The present Chairman of the

Society is Jack Stanley, General Secretary of the Constructional Engineering Union. Tom Braddock is the Treasurer, and Councillor Tom Mercer the Secretary.

The aim of the "Outlook" is quite simple: to assist the rank and file in securing a Socialist policy for the Labour Party. If you agree with this, why not become a shareholder?

# Will There Be an Economic Crisis

## in the U.S.A.?

STRACHEY'S confidence in the ability of capitalism to prevent slumps is based on his confidence in Keynesian applied economics. In his "New Statesman" articles he writes:

"Keynesian and post-Keynesian thinking really have discovered the way in which the economic climate of such advanced industrial societies . . . can be controlled in such a way as will avoid both serious fluctuations and secular stagnation. Sufficiently vigorous New Deal type measures could in theory indefinitely sustain the purchasing-power of the population at a point which would clear the market of the available output of consumption goods and services. . . . I am convinced that the way to turn the trick of economic stability has been found." (p. 572)

His confidence in the economists of today is a good deal higher than the confidence which they have in themselves—or their employers have in them!

According to Strachey, the more you find people predicting an American slump the further you go to the Left. But if you go to the right, and to the serious business people, you read in the "Economist" of March 28, the following definition of the abilities of the practical economists of today. Though more modest than Strachey's, we think it more accurate:

"America is now more amply equipped than any country in history with the material for making crystal balls, and with economists whose whole-time job it is to sit looking at them. This does not mean, of course, that it knows what is going to happen, or that it can ensure full employment for anybody but the economists themselves. The fact that Britain is better equipped with medical men than Borneo does not mean that anybody knows which Britons are going to be ill next year and which the doctors will be able to cure; it merely means that Britons will have more chance than Borneans of being cured of relatively minor ailments (!), and a much better chance—after they have been struck down (!)—of knowing what it was that hit them."

### £53 needed urgently

The Fighting Fund has reached only £47 4s. 1d. so far. August, the holiday month, can be a black time for the paper unless our readers take immediate action.

We know all the difficulties there are at this time of year, with so many of our readers away from home—and very hard up when they return. But the paper has carried on with its vital job during this time which has been so eventful for the world working class.

You have been brought news of your fellow-workers in France, Ceylon and Germany. Your letters tell us how much you appreciate the accurate reporting and international outlook of the paper, but there is a very down-to-earth aspect of all this.

There are rent, printing, wages and telephone bills to be met. If we don't reach the Fighting Fund target this month we shall be in a desperate position.

As soon as you have read this, please dig deep in your pockets and rush a donation to us. We must have another £53 by Monday morning. We are relying on you to come to our rescue.

### A GREEK TRAGEDY

The loss of human life and property in the tragic earthquakes which have devastated the three Ionian islands recently presents an appalling picture.

Among those who were on the islands affected were 215 political prisoners in the Zakynthos Prison and 230 in the Argostoli Prison.

May we therefore appeal to your readers to send donations to the Relief Committee of the League for Democracy in Greece, 19 Beak Street, London, W.1. The Committee aims to purchase the maximum

John Strachey's rather hysterical efforts to deny his Marxist past resulted last May in a series of articles from his eloquent pen in the "New Statesman". Wilhelm Sprenger, our German Correspondent, has written a vigorous defence of Marxism against John Strachey. We understand that the "Labour Review" will publish his reply in full in the September number of that magazine, and they have meanwhile kindly permitted us to print below one section of Sprenger's reply—the section dealing with Strachey's new discovery that "there is no reason why the American economy . . . should have another slump".

Would it surprise Strachey that the same issue of the "Economist", a conservative capitalist paper, devoted 11 pages to the subject, "Will there be an American slump?" at the very same time as our progressive critic of Marxism expressed his full confidence in the future of American capitalist economy?

His confidence in Keynesian economics is based on the assumption that "sufficiently vigorous" spending and investment by the State could clear up any slump in the demand for consumer goods. In his book, "A Programme for Progress", published in 1940, he had already stressed the same point:

"It (New Deal Policy) will only succeed if and when the level of government spending is so large that it will dominate the trends of the other factors, such as private investment and spending in the economy." (p. 255)

#### CAPITALIST GOVERNMENT CAN'T DO IT

From the point of view of Government spending, the political obstacles are the only problem, for the policy means distributing hundreds of millions of pounds to the poorer sections of the population taken out of the profits of the capitalists.

Even there it is probable that, in order to clear up the danger of a slump in the demand for consumer goods, such as existed in U.S.A. in 1933, it would be necessary to take away so much money from the rich that, in order to do so, you would need a Socialist government strong enough to break the resistance of the capitalist class. In that case you may as well abolish capitalism altogether!

But from the point of view of Government investment, there is, under capitalism, an insuperable obstacle.

Why is it not sufficient merely to distribute money to the poorer sections of the population in order to assure that a slump is prevented or quick recovery achieved? For this reason. Even if all the current production of consumer goods is sold, business men and investors

will not invest their profits and capital in buying new industrial equipment as long as there are fairly large stocks of goods available and no possibility of seriously broadening the market.

Strachey recognised this well enough himself when in 1940 he wrote:

"There is no guarantee that corporate and individual rich would spend or invest the whole of the vast incomes which they would receive, if the economy were continuously running at full capacity, even after they had paid their taxes. And if they did not, down would go the economy into depression again. It is all too true." (p. 253)

#### LIMITATIONS OF INVESTMENTS

From this it follows that, under given conditions, only state investments, and on a huge scale, could prevent such a slump. But there exist only two possible kinds of state investments. Either investments in such sectors of the economy as private investment is also interested in, i.e., productive investments, or, investments in sectors in which no private investment is done, i.e. unproductive investments.

#### Capitalism's choice: Slump . . . or this!



In the former case, the private investors do not invest because they feel that the given sector is too large already for current demand. Hence large state investments would only enter into competition with private interests and drive them out of business. As the capitalist class has the power to prevent this in capitalist society, usually state investments in the ordinary sectors of the economy remain limited enough to prevent competition between State and private investment, and therefore also limited enough to be unable either to prevent slump or assure complete recovery after one.

There then remains the second possibility: large state investments in sectors usually not engaged upon by private capital. It could be imagined that such investments could be made for peaceful, unproductive purposes. Indeed, it has been tried. But here again we come up against the same obstacle. The capitalist class and taxpayers in general are simply not prepared to pay dozens of billions of dollars for some completely useless purpose.

Remember Strachey's own formula: a sum of money "so large that it will dominate the trends of the other factors . . . in the economy"! They may as well hand everything over and let the Reds move in! Therefore, only one possibility remains where indeed Keynesian economics can "solve" a slump and even for a period prevent it from breaking out.

This is a huge state investment in the only unproductive sector in which capitalists are prepared to sink huge sums of money—the re-armament sector, the production of means of destruction.

#### SALVATION THROUGH ARMS

The capitalists are ready to invest huge sums in arms only because in that sector the money is not lost, as it would be in some peaceful non-productive enterprise. The billions spent on arms can be and are regarded as a real investment. These sums pay dividends when the commodities manufactured with this capital have actually been used up efficiently, i.e., new countries and new markets conquered by force of arms.

The only possible way which Keynes or any other of the capitalist practical economists of today have found so far really to prevent a slump is . . . a war economy, the only pay-off for these investments.

The record of the 30's and 40's completely confirms these theoret-

The September issue of

### Labour Review

contains a vigorous

### DEFENCE OF MARXISM

(A reply to John Strachey)

BY

WILHELM SPRENGER

Order now from—

NEW PARK PUBLICATIONS  
266 Lavender Hill, London, S.W. 11

ical conclusions. As Strachey himself showed in "A Programme for Progress", Roosevelt's "New Deal" did not solve the problem of unemployment in U.S.A. Millions and millions of workers remained out of a job even in the heyday of the "New Deal", and the "New Deal" itself led to another terrible crash in 1937.

In Britain, and even in Nazi Germany, all types of policies intended to bolster up peace economy, even by unproductive spending, were unable to solve the unemployment problem. This problem was only solved in one way; by re-armament, first in Germany, then in Britain and finally in U.S.A.

All the "Fair Deal" measures of Mr. Truman's economic wizards could not prevent the recession of 1949 and its damaging effects on the capitalist economy of Europe. What prevented a slump in Britain was neither the National Health Service nor the National Assistance scheme; indeed, they both fell partial victims to the recovery. What prevented a slump in Britain in 1949 was the increased scale of rearmament launched by American imperialism and followed by the British capitalists.

If then the trick of economic stability under capitalism has been found, as Strachey claims, it involves a very heavy price, that of getting a war to avoid a slump. We doubt whether the British workers are willing to pay such a price.

Strachey's criticism of Marxism does not seem, therefore, to offer any alternative solution to the classical solutions which the genuine Marxists have formulated for a long time to solve both the immediate and the historical problems which decaying capitalism presents to the working class. The trouble with these solutions is not that they are old. Indeed, they are more up-to-date than ever before. The trouble with them is that they have been so rarely applied accurately and completely, for applying them completely is the condition for applying them accurately.

### Labour's History

### No. 13. Jim Connolly and Jim Larkin

## Irish Workers on the March

By  
Timothy Enright

THE batoning of workers in the streets of Dublin today recalls the historic events of 1913, when clashes between the workers and the forces of the state were a regular feature of the city's life.

The state apparatus has changed hands since then but in essentials it is the same and has its counterpart in India, Ceylon and elsewhere. In that momentous year of 1913 took place the great strike of the Dublin tramway workers, organised by the young Irish T. & G.W.U. A general lock-out of all members of the union followed.

It was the opening morning of the internationally famous Dublin

Horse Show. The gay, well-dressed crowds representative of Irish and foreign well-to-do holiday-makers, were on their way to the Ballsbridge grounds, when suddenly and simultaneously, the trams throughout the city stopped and were immediately abandoned by drivers and conductors.

The arrogance and downright criminality of members of the working class in interfering with the pleasures of their betters—and on that morning of all mornings! It caused deep disgust among the ladies and gentlemen and brought low the name of "Holy Ireland" before her foreign guests.

The strike and lock-out dragged on for almost nine months. They were months of terrible suffering but also of great glory, each day adding a new link to the chain of workers' solidarity. Big Jim Larkin, the lion-like orator, who from the jungle of Irish poverty and slumdom sent roar after roar of torrential abuse at those lick-spittles of British imperialism, the Irish capitalist class; James Connolly, the cool, clear-thinking marxist revolutionary. These were the leaders under whom the Dublin workers were welded into a solid invincible phalanx which made the ranks of the master-class quake for their safety.

Over 400 employers of the city were organised to break the union by William Martin Murphy, the leading capitalist and owner, amongst other things, of the "Independent" newspapers and of the transport system. They "bound

themselves by solemn vows, and by still more binding financial pledges", said Connolly.

The struggle became intense and the atmosphere in the city highly charged. The brutality of the police, which even went to murder, forced a public inquiry, but as usual the masters of the whitewash brush won the day.

Out of the struggle arose the Irish Citizen Army, organised by Connolly from the ranks of the workers to protect themselves from police batons. (This body was later to win undying fame in the annals of the working class when, as an army of social revolution, it took part in the Rebellion of 1916).

George Russel ("A.E."), the Irish poet and artist, wrote his famous open letter to the employers: "Sirs, I address this warning to you, the aristocracy of industry in this city, because, like all aristocracies, you tend to grow blind in long authority, and to be unaware that you and your class and its every action are being considered and judged day by day by those who have power to shake or overturn the whole social order, and whose restlessness in poverty today

is making our industrial civilization stir like a quaking bog. . . ."

Larkin and Connolly suffered periods of imprisonment, the latter securing his release by hunger-strike. There was large sympathy among the rank and file of the British Labour movement and food ships were sent to Dublin. The strong calls for sympathetic strike action were, however, heard with deaf ears by the leaders of the British Trade Unions. The British Labour politicians played their usual rôle.

Connolly wrote bitterly about " . . . that awful spectacle we have seen lately of labour politicians writing to the capitalist press to denounce the methods of a union which, with 20,000 men and women locked out in one city, is facing an attempt of 400 employers, to starve its members back to slavery."

A plan to remove temporarily the starving children of strikers to sympathetic homes in Britain was met with howls of righteous indignation from full-bellied Catholics, who feared for the souls of the little mites. It had to be abandoned.

The struggle ended in a drawn battle, that is if one is only to take into account the immediate aims of the workers. Connolly wrote:

"The battle was a drawn battle. The employers, despite their Napoleonic plan of campaign, and their more than Napoleonic ruth-

lessness and unscrupulous use of foul means, were unable to carry on the business without men and women who remained loyal to their unions. The workers were unable to enforce the employers to a formal recognition of the Union, and to give preference to organised labour.

"When the story is written by a man or woman with honesty in their hearts, and with a sympathetic insight into the travail of the poor, it will be a record of which Ireland may well be proud . . . . It will tell of how the general labourers, the men upon whose horny hands and mangled fair fabric of civilisation, from whose squalid tenements the sweet-smelling flowers of capitalist culture derive their aroma, by whose horny hands and mangled bodies are brought the ease and safety of a class that hates and despises them, by whose ignorance their masters purchase their knowledge—it will tell how these labourers dared to straighten their bent backs, and looking in the faces of their rulers and employers, dared to express the will to be free."

### Socialist Outlook

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

Telephone: HOP 4554

Editor: John Lawrence

### Short-Sighted "Challenge To Britain"

IN my letter which appeared in your columns of Friday, August 14 last the date of the Ottawa Conference is given as 1939 but the Conference to which I referred was 1932 and occurred during the Baldwin-MacDonald period of Government.

This Conference had to deal with the effect of the American engendered slump which had hit the world with such disastrous effects. Historically the decisions made may have been the best, taking a limited view of the needs of the Sterling Area, but those decisions were contributing factors in the chain of events which led to the World War II.

By the same token, events in France, Ireland and Italy today; Spain, Germany and Japan perhaps "tomorrow" will lead to World War III if the solutions in each country follow the same pattern as in pre-war days.

It is true that Keynes, Schacht, Van Zeeland, and others have carried controls and the technique of monetary "adjustments" very far forward from the orthodoxy of bankers, but the fact remains that where monied interests dominate, solution to problems come either by cutting at workers standards or by war. Competition between nations, like the competition between unorganised and unprotected workers of an earlier time, can only result in deepening the degradation of the masses. The policy of Ottawa and the policy of "Challenge to Britain" are too short-sighted.

H. Hodson. Ilford.

# The General Council's "Smoke-Screen"

**A**MONG the most important resolutions carried at last year's Trades Union Congress was one on "Social Ownership", which endorsed the declared intention of the Labour Party to renationalise the Road Transport and Steel Industries. So that you are aware of exactly what the T.U.C. General Council was instructed to do, I shall quote the resolution in full.

"Congress reaffirms its faith in the principles of social ownership, but recognises that if their application remains restricted to a limited number of industries and services the full advantages of social ownership will be lost. It therefore welcomes the Labour Party's declaration that it will extend social ownership.

"Congress therefore calls upon the General Council to formulate proposals for the extension of social ownership to other industries and services... such proposals to have due regard to the "Plan for Engineering" of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions and other proposals submitted by affiliated organisations. Congress further calls upon the General Council to formulate general proposals for the democratisation of the nationalised industries and services calculated to make possible the ultimate realisation of full industrial democracy.

This resolution was carried despite the resistance of the General Council. How has this instruction been carried out?

## ★ T.U.C. Report Dodges Nationalisation ★

By  
**Fred Emmett**

Disgracefully. By the production of a 52 page "Interim report on Public Ownership" which does a masterly job of shelving all decisions on nationalisation.

The report gives no lead to the Unions to extend nationalisation but, on the contrary, it loses every concrete proposal that has been presented to it in a cloud of talk.

For example—Nationalisation of "Investing Institutions" (Banks, Insurance Companies, and Investment Trusts)... "Whether conformity to national needs can be secured within the present framework, or whether further measures are called for, are questions which can only be answered by detailed study which it is the intention of the General Council to undertake..."

**Chemical Industry**... There is need for public control, but in view of the difficulty of obtaining full information about its operations, the next Labour Government should institute an enquiry into the facts of the industry before a final decision is taken on the nature and extent of the control."

**Machine Tool Industry**... "whilst believing that Public Ownership is necessary to make it fully efficient, consider it might be unwise to nationalise the industry before there is greater public control in other sections of engineering... Further consultations will therefore have to take place.

**Civil Engineering and Agricultural equipment**... "The General Council will be examining these problems further."

**Mining Machinery**... "A meeting to discuss the matter with the Confederation (of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions) and the National Union of Mineworkers has been arranged."

**Electrical Equipment**... "Several of these sections have been, or are being, investigated by the Monopolies Commission, and the General Council, together

with the Confederation will be giving further attention to the reports of the Commission and to subsequent Government action."

**Railway Equipment**... "This question will be explored further with the unions concerned."

**Wagon Manufacture**... "This matter also will require further discussion with the Unions concerned."

**Aircraft**... "The Trade Union movement would be unwise to commit itself at this stage to any specific measures for public ownership or for further measures of public control. A more detailed analysis of the problems involved must be made in conjunction with the Confederation before final conclusions are reached."

**Motor Vehicles**... "The General Council will therefore consult the Confederation further on the practicability of their proposals for this industry; the need for effective arrangements cannot be doubted."

**Shipbuilding and Marine Engineering**... "A Development Council is more appropriate than public ownership... the likely attitude of the employers towards it will, however, need further examination."

**Textile Machinery**... "At the least it would seem necessary to undertake a full scale survey of the structure and prospects of the industry."

**Other Engineering**... "must await later attention."

The only exception to this list of postponements and prevarications is **Water Supply!** Here, the General Council state, "there is a clear case for public ownership."

Could they have been influenced by the fact that already a very large part is "municipalised" and that therefore a **big fight with private enterprise would not be needed?**

When we come to the "democratisation" proposals, however, we find none of this indecision. "Only one or two unions", the General Council state, are now officially committed to the support of "workers control". They do not state whether it is one, or two Unions or which Unions they are. But they go on... "although within many of the others there are sections of the rank and file who disagree with the official policy of their organisations". This minority opinion is important because many who hold these opinions "are the active members who hold trade union offices".

"It is not sufficient to wait for time to work an alteration in such

opinions... the great majority of the active trade unionists who do the day to day work of the movement learn their trade unionism from older men in the workshop. Out of date ideas about industrial relations can thereby be propagated for generations. A determined effort ought therefore to be made by education and propaganda to explain current policy more fully than has hitherto been done."

So now you know, all you lads who think that the Trade Unions should control industry—you're suffering from "out of date ideas" learnt from the old codgers who built the Trade Union movement into what it is today. The "modern" idea is to let the employers manage their own affairs so that you can devote more of your time and energy in producing more goods faster and cheaper.

The T.U.C. General Council should not be surprised if someone suggests that a little "education" is necessary for the General Council itself. A few weeks at the bench or at the wheel might help.

If education and propaganda campaigns are to be run, the A.E.U. resolution on the Congress agenda points the way. This "instructs the General Council to initiate a National Campaign of Trade Unions, the Labour Party and the Co-operative Movement for the early defeat and removal of the Tory Government".

But perhaps this too is the result of "Out of date ideas". For, if the workers do not need to control industry, why should they need to control the state?

Therefore it is to be hoped that the A.E.U. resolution will be carried, and that arising from it we shall see a new Labour Government which will not only extend nationalisation, but also destroy once and for all economic power of the employing class by placing control of the industries firmly in the hands of the organised workers.

### Strike-Breaking "Efficiency"

**D**URING the recent General Strike in Ceylon, the scabs who tried to man the railway running sheds were so efficient that they fired an engine without water in the boiler!

The engine that was gutted in this fashion was none other than the special one held in reserve for the use of the Queen on her visit to the island.

(This information comes from the Ceylon Socialist paper, "Samasamajist", which has recently been banned by the Government of Ceylon.)

## Colour Bar Trade Unions

By **Kies Viljeon**

**I**N its historic setting, the industrial colour bar, which excludes Africans from most skilled and some semi-skilled jobs, has meant that the white workers enjoyed a privileged standard of living. For them were reserved all the plum jobs of industry.

The Trade Unions of the white workers regarded it as part of their task to safeguard these privileges against any encroachments on the part of the black workers. Consequently, the "Labour" movement in South Africa was the originator of the "civilized labour policy" which forms the basis of the industrial colour bar and which was taken over by the Nationalist Party.

With the development of industry in South Africa, the white workers have, however, begun to lose their former feeling of smug security. The rapid industrialisation of the country, especially during the last war, has meant that there are not sufficient white workers to fill all the jobs which have up to now been their preserves. Industry has been compelled to employ more and more Africans.

Today there are more than a million Africans permanently employed in industry, the great majority of them in industries which were once mainly European, such as clothing, textiles, tobacco and car assembly. The last-named industry used to advertise widely that it was "100 per cent. European".

With this development, the Malan Government has seen the red light. It has introduced a new law, the "Native Labour Bill", which makes it virtually impossible for Africans to organise into Trade Unions and makes strikes

illegal. Any African taking part in, or inciting a strike becomes liable to a fine of £500 or three years' imprisonment.

As the sum of £500 is beyond the wildest dreams of even the best paid African workers, every African striker is faced with the certainty of a long prison sentence.

What has particularly alarmed the white trade unionists is that the Bill explicitly prohibits an African from coming out in support of European workers on strike. This they see as a direct threat to their own system of collective bargaining.

A conference held last week of the South African Trades and Labour Council, representing 130,000 workers, mostly European and Coloured, decided to appeal to the United Nations and the International Labour Organisation if the Bill becomes law. Dr. Malan has already given abundant evidence (for example when U.N.O. condemned his annexation of South West Africa) of the contempt in which he holds these bodies. He knows that the United Nations only acts when capitalist interests are threatened, as in the case of Korea.

White labour in South Africa will not be able to safeguard their economic positions by appeals to U.N.O. or the I.L.O. Only by united action with the African workers, by fighting to abolish the colour bar in industry and for equal pay for equal work will they be able to maintain trade unionism in South Africa at all.



MY PROBLEM IS  
DISTRIBUTION - NOT  
PRODUCTION

### Housing: A Very Good Amendment

**T**HE following amendment to "Challenge to Britain" has been unanimously adopted by the General Council of the Croydon Labour Party.

"The building industry has a bad record. Labour will undertake to nationalise the Building Industry and Material Supply Industry and thereby end the housing chaos.

"In the interim to alleviate the immediate situation by restoring requisitioning powers to Local Councils."

## Jack London's . . . Portrait of a Scab

**A**FTER God had finished the rattlesnake, the toad and the vampire, He had some awful substance left with which He made a scab.

A scab is a two-legged animal with a corkscrew soul, a water-logged brain, a combination backbone of jelly and glue. Where others have a heart, he carries a tumor of rotten principles.

When a scab comes down the street, men turn their backs and angels weep in Heaven, and the Devil shuts the gates of Hell to keep him out.

No man has a right to scab so long as there is a pool of water to drown his carcass in, or a rope long enough to hang his body with. Judas Iscariot was a gentleman compared with a

scab, for after betraying his Master, he had character enough to hang himself. A scab has not.

Esau sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. Judas Iscariot sold his Saviour for 30 pieces of silver. Benedict Arnold sold his country for a promise of a commission in the British army. The modern strikebreaker sells his birthright, his country, his wife, his children, and his fellowmen for an unfilled promise for his employer.

Esau was a traitor to himself; Judas Iscariot was a traitor to his God; Benedict Arnold was a traitor to his country. A strikebreaker is a traitor to his God, his country, his wife, his family and his class.

A real man never becomes a strikebreaker

# Some Thoughts on Milk and Water

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

**I**'VE just had over an hour of long discussion with a farmer who was grumbling about his water supplies, costs, prices and bad roads. He wanted me to tell him how to get all that extra output without an adequate water supply, without electricity and with roads that knock his machines to hell every time he lurches through the farm gate.

I don't even know how he voted, I just listened to the grumbles. One thing though that I know is that I am sitting by a powerful little stream within no distance of a hamlet that is waterless. So, while we worship at the shrine of the higher mysticism of science marvelling at the wonders of destructiveness in the atom bomb, nobody seems to have the gumption even to stick a little petrol pump in this stream to pump up a little water to enable the farmer and the hamlet to have all the water needed!

In 1944 the National Government published a White Paper entitled "A National Water Policy". There it was stated that the problem is not one of resources but of organisation and distribution.

In those days the demand for water per head per day was between 20 to 30 gallons. We have enough resources to supply five times that amount in Britain—and yet still about 30 per cent. of rural Britain is without piped

water. By the Act of January, 1945, Local Authorities are required to ensure that mains are carried wherever practicable. But it is now time that a real drive for better water supplies was made.

### COST—ONE GLASS OF BEER A WEEK

At present the cost of bringing piped water to households is often only about the cost of one glass of beer per week. A nation busy on huge arms production ought to be able to slack off a little for this job.

I have often seen milk churns left in mucky ditches in the summer to keep the contents cool. In one of my villages, where now the mains are nearly completed, only a year or two ago a midwife told me that she had been forced several times in the winter to gather snow to boil up for hot water during a confinement. Pure water and an adequate sewerage are absolutely necessary for high quality milk supplies.

It has been estimated that nearly one million gallons of milk are rejected each year because of premature souring. A large proportion of this is due to the lack of adequate water supplies.

A cow on winter feed may need anything up to 10 gallons of water



per day and I know farmers in my constituency that have to carry this amount per cow every day because they have no supplies near the farm.

Roughly, it works out that we should make available, without absurd toil, four gallons of water for every gallon of milk produced.

Often the ponds and ditches from which cows are forced to drink contain effluent from other farms and cottages and thus are a potential source of danger in the spread of disease on the farms. Still amidst all this muck and mysticism the "duck-backs" yell "We can't afford a National Water Scheme!" In less than one genera-

tion we should see that the scheme would pay for itself.

### THE SOIL AND SOCIALISM

England's soil must support more of us if our standards are to go up and if we are to solve the problem of the dollar gap. For years now we have been raping the soil, mining it—not farming.

The rich earth can only pay out in an edible form what man endeavours to put into it. While we are all pretending to be so busy running up escalators, the process of attrition of our soil continues. The Labour Movement must give more and more thought to our countryside. In its years of power it really did do more for our farms than any other government hitherto. Because farmers are not supposed to vote Labour is no reason why we neglect the problems of our countryside.

**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.

## Is the "Outlook" too rough on the Monarchy?

Audrey Henson cancelled her subscription to the "Outlook" because she "could not tolerate (our) virulent attacks on the Royal Family". We published her letter on August 14 and now publish a selection of the views of other readers. (No letters have been received in support of reader Henson.)

### 'We Criticise what we hope to change'

SURELY Audrey Henson knows the difference between personal attacks and a criticism of the Monarchy as a system or a form of government. If she is still a reader, will she quote us any words you wrote which could be called "virulent attacks"?

Monarchy is a symbol of class rule and was once a dictatorship. It still holds that danger. In saying this, I am not attacking the persons of the Royal Family (they may all have the best of characters). To hand to any family the right to be heirs and to inherit such incomes and estates, as described by Emrys Hughes, M.P., in his book, "The Crown and the Cash", is surely anti-social and undemocratic.

How a Socialist, or a Labour-conscious person, can willingly uphold and support Monarchy puzzles me. Of course, we can only change it by democratic means—but to do this we must have the right to criticise what we mean to change.

T. R. Caren. Birkenhead.

★

### 'We attack all hereditary positions'

I THINK your correspondent, Audrey Henson—who now leaves us with "relief and regret"—is a little mixed up, due no doubt to the mass hypnosis to which I have referred in previous issues.

In the first place, none of us in the "Socialist Outlook" columns has attacked the Royal Family in any way, "virulent" or otherwise. What we have attacked, and will continue to attack, is the system that permits of this useless and uneconomic hereditary position.

The Royal Family, we are told, are a symbol of Empire and are accepted by the peoples of our overseas possessions as the great Chiefs to whom they turn for advice and succour.

In Malaya and Kenya at present we are demonstrating just how much this means—by the use of machine guns and the gallowes. In Malaya, General Templer boasted of his success in getting the co-operation of Malayan villages to give information of "bandits". This co-operation was forced by withholding food from women and children along with their menfolk.

During the last war the Gestapo used the same methods on the French and Belgians who succoured our troops isolated in the fighting and left behind after

# Our Readers Write . . .

Dunkirk. The General must have read and admired "Mein Kampf".

Audrey Henson speaks of the hard life of the Queen, associating it with the life of a miner. Well you miners' families who are waiting for a home of your own while "pigging" in with in-laws will be gratified to know that the Queen's lot is much worse as she has Buckingham Palace, Windsor Castle, and Balmoral, with hundreds of rooms and scores of servants to worry her. Along with all this pomp we have, of course, hundreds of titled spivs and parasites who live on the fringe of Royal privilege—and live damn well!

The Royal Family is subservient to Parliament and has not for many years opposed, the Commons, but the Lords who justify the Royal Family have used their hereditary privilege to defy the will of the people. We Socialists say the Royal privilege should end and only the ballot box should decide the issues of our modern times.

Just one last comment, Audrey, and then you can laugh and laugh and laugh. I don't know of one instance where a worker has been murdered by someone wanting his job, but history records many murders among the Royal Families of the world by envious mercenaries waiting to step in and take over this "hard job".

D. Burgess. Flixton, Lancs.

★

### 'We attack this useless waste of money'

I THINK that I am well able to understand what I read in "Socialist Outlook". I can assure reader Henson that I have never yet read a "virulent attack" on any member of the supposed Royal Family. I have read virulent attacks upon the useless and criminal waste of the taxpayer's money as practised by the Royal Family. Perhaps reader Henson thinks it quite all right to cook up some young man at £40,000 a year for life to a degree of importance necessary to impress foreign visitors?

Regarding the Queen's hard life, may I in replying also answer the columnist of the "Daily Mirror" who found his concern for the Queen was keeping him awake at night? Sneering at the miners (from his very safe chair in the office of the paper founded on the workers' pennies) he said the Queen had 65 engagements in June. But he didn't say that the Queen also managed to put in about ten days racing in that month.

If reader Henson cares to add up the time the Queen, and all her costly hangers-on, have spent on racetracks and at sporting events alone during May, June and July she will have to review her assessment of the Queen's hard life.

She was at Goodwood Races before going to Balmoral, and her husband actually left Goodwood for a week's yachting at Cowes

before a Viking plane very thoughtfully took him up to Balmoral where a new polo field is being built near a new golf-course. Very nerve-racking for Royalty, isn't it?

Reader Henson may feel that a woman who, when all expenses are paid, is allowed £120,000 is an economic necessity. But may I ask her how a new yacht costing £1,600,000 can be justified at a time when a Tory Chancellor is continually raising the cost of living (not to the Queen, mark you) and telling the workers not to ask for higher wages?

In conclusion, I am only sorry that I cannot transfer the editor and staff of the "Socialist Outlook" to the offices of the "Daily Herald".

Paton Dene. Leicester.

### A New Policy on Nationalisation

IN your issue of July 31, you remark that "While there is this determined demand for more nationalisation, there is also a clear realisation that present forms of nationalisation fall very short of the Socialist ideal. . . ."

Such a remark as this cannot but become more common if the present form of nationalisation is persisted in. Party members should insist that compensation and interest come out of the public purse, not out of the till of the nationalised industry.

Under present conditions we see that the capitalist contributes nothing to the cost of nationalisation. The miner hews the coal; the housewife pays for it. She

pays not only for her own coal, but for the coal of the merchant and the industrialist for does not the cost of coal figure in the price of most everything? A rise in the cost of coal and the increase comes to her in a three-pronged attack—through the coalman, the merchant, and the industrialist. The same thing occurs in the other nationalised industries but it is magnified in the case of coal because coal threads its way through the economic system touching everything and everybody.

A Socialist government must switch the smothering blanket of debt from industry to nation. It can be done. The present Government did it. Inserting a notice in the national press they told all holders of Steel Stock that they were now holders of Government Stock; and also, that they were not to forward certificates but to alter them themselves. Could anything be more simple?

Future nationalisation taking the form of the old will drive us all to agree with Tom Braddock when he says that, the "Challenge to Britain" being accepted, we shall be faced with "Two political parties, both of them committed to the preservation of the capitalist system at home and abroad."

As Braddock says: What a prospect!

T. W. Douglass. Sunderland.

★

### Thoughts on the French Strikes

H.R.'s timely comments in your last issue on the political situation in France deserve wide dissemination. Given favourable conditions, they may even begin to restore a degree of mental balance to those of our Comrades who substitute blood pressure for brain where Communism is concerned. (I leave out the far more numerous ones to whom anti-Communism is merely an effective substitute for argument.)

It is undeniable that in spite of the British Communist Party's declining prestige it has one unfortunate achievement to its credit: it has blinded a large part of our leadership to the facts of

life abroad, especially in those countries where a large part of the working class is under Communist leadership. No one should fail to conclude that, except in Benelux, Scandinavia and the U.K., it is simply not possible to build socialism in Europe without (at least) the tacit assent of the Communist parties. This would be true were the Kremlin twice as Machiavellian and intransigent as it is today.

It follows that an attempt to "witch hunt" them out of existence is going to split the working classes, renew the inter-party strife that did so much to assist the Fascists before the war, and cement the existing capitalist regimes in France and Italy. In the case of Eastern Europe it will retard democracy and give any opposition a Fascist flavour.

Such a policy does not strengthen socialism in Europe. It weakens it by giving the Communists a monopoly of the militant leadership, while leaving anti-Communist Socialist parties either helpless prisoners of the Right (as in Italy) or powerless opportunists (as in France). That such a policy does not pay electorally was shown recently in the Italian people's fitting commentary on the "Nenni telegram" episode of 1948.

All this has some relevance just before the Margate Conference, in that at least one local party has a resolution down calling for the "United Socialist States of Europe", to be formed on the basis of a policy "independent of both Washington and Moscow". Such laudable sentiments should not obscure the regrettable fact that quite a lot of Europe's workers still prefer the Kremlin to Transport House. To ignore this is evidence not of Socialist principles, but of political illiteracy.

Brian Thomas. Chairman, Salisbury Labour League of Youth.

Note: This letter is a comment on an article by "H.R." who had proposed a Communist Party—Socialist Party Government as the solution to the French crisis.

Is the "SOCIALIST OUTLOOK" in your Local Library?

If not—ASK FOR IT!

## English McCarthyism

TO those who underestimate the influence of McCarthyism in the country and the extent to which a man's political colouring effects his opportunity to earn a living, I would ask them to study my case.

In June, 1952 I applied to the Ministry of Supply for a position in a local Royal Ordnance factory, and a responsible official declared me technically suitable. Many weeks afterwards, on representations from my Union, I was informed that they had no position to offer me.

The matter has since been handled by the A.E.U. at national level and by the A.E.U. Parliamentary group (Hon. Sec. T. C. Pannell, M.P.) all without result. At no time, have I, or those acting for me, been given any reason for my non-acceptance.

I have been, for 20 years, a well known and active member of the Labour and Trade Union movements in Leeds (except for six years' service in the R.A.F. without blemish). Officials and associates all vouch for my general character

and integrity. The inference, however, that my exclusion is somehow connected with National Security is bound to have a damaging effect on my position in public life.

A charge in a court of law would give me all the safeguards of the British judicial system. I would know the charge and could prepare my defence. Instead I find myself in the hopeless position where everything is secret—the nature of the charges, the identity of witnesses, if any, and the nature of their evidence.

What a glorious opportunity for any one actuated by malice. What redress has anyone against this kind of attack? Yet this is the unfortunate position in which I find myself.

I do not now require employment, but I have a clear conscience and wish for a fair chance to clear my name. The Ministry should state openly whatever there is against me. Its evident reluctance to do so, leads me to the belief that it can, in fact, produce no evidence that would stand up to open examination.

Councillor P. Lake. 37, Wellelose Mount, Leeds 7.

## The Lords and OUR Children

ADDRESSING the International Congress on Home Economies, Lord Home, Minister of State for Scotland, expressed grave concern and anxiety at the ill-effects caused to children by both parents going out to work. "Can anyone doubt" said Lord Home, "that the absence of parental control and authority is the cause of much of the lawlessness and instability of character of the young?"

He conjured up a pitiful picture of the little child returning home to an empty house, "missing the sense of being loved, welcomed and wanted . . . left to his own devices, not in the home but in the streets, with their attractive diversions and opportunity for mischief or worse."

We must admit that this does happen, and when the child gets into "mischief" or "worse" he comes up against adult authority and rebels against it, perhaps gets beyond control. And then? Lord Home's solution to this problem is—to influence mothers to stay at home during the formative years, "it would be to the advantage of society that they should do so." Simple isn't it?

### CHILDREN AND WAGES

I'm the mother of two children, they're both loved and wanted—and I work part-time—I'd like, to put a few questions to Lord Home.

My husband's wage is £7 per week, with overtime he can knock up £7 10s. to £8. Would you, Lord Home, like to keep a family of four on such a wage? Incidentally, we don't smoke or drink, seldom go to the pictures and we haven't got a T.V. And

remember, whilst father is working overtime he can't keep a controlling eye on his offspring.

Lady Home does not go to work, but I presume like other ladies of her station she carries out her "public duties"? Opens bazaars and officiates at charity functions, attends occasional luncheon and garden parties, etc.? Who, Lord Home, looks after your four children (or if they are now grown up, who did look after them)? No, don't tell me, of course there is always "Nanny".

### LAWS FOR THE RICH

Why is it all right for doctors, lawyers, actresses and other professional people who are also mothers to carry on with their jobs? Perhaps because they too can afford nannies, or send their children to boarding school? And why, oh why, are we asked to emulate that paragon of motherhood who leaves her hapless babes whilst she spends three days at Ascot, three or four in Wales and Ireland to say nothing of popping off to South Africa, on pleasure bent, not earning an honest penny, Lord Home, to improve the lot of her children?

But even if economic necessity did not drive us out to work, we working class mothers would still want to go. Because we belong to the working class is that any reason why we should be condemned to the kitchen sink during the best years of our lives?

I have, and do experience the difficult problems of keeping my children usefully occupied whilst I'm at work. But there are a few simple measures which could be taken to remedy the whole situation.

For children under school age—provide enough and adequate nurseries and crèches.

For school children—provide "play centres" after school hours and during holidays with full facilities for recreation and creative work.

These centres should become children's communities, with drama groups, engineering shops, carpentry, sports, athletics—and why shouldn't the children man their own first aid post, run their own refreshment booths, etc. It doesn't require much imagination to see the immense possibilities in such ventures. Why not a Municipal Children's Theatre run on a non-profit basis, by the children, for the children.

Abolish such notices as "Children not allowed in this Park, or Museum, unless accompanied by an adult."

These are a few suggestions to overcome the aimless activities in which our children are often forced to indulge. But of course such solutions would need cash—where from? From your pocket, Lord Home, and the pockets of the rest of your class.

Schemes like these will never be put into operation by you and your ilk—and the problem of aimless and delinquent youth will grow—because it is a social problem. The answer, Lord Home, lies not in mothers staying at home, but in ridding ourselves of Toryism, the rotten system which breeds social insecurity—which legalises cheating, spying, stealing—yes, and even murder. The answer lies in forging a new Socialist society in which children will find a place, a society which will cater for their needs, which will respect them and treat them as important members of the community.

I don't despair too much when my children kick over the traces and "get beyond control". I think perhaps their rebellious spirit may stand them in good stead—will urge them on to fight against the system which treats them with contempt, as outcasts of society.

Mrs. Betty Norton

## 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

## Socialist Outlook

is obtainable every Friday

From Your Newsagent

(Price 3d.)

In case of difficulty write to us at:

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