

Join the
**LABOUR
PARTY**
TODAY

Socialist Outlook

No. 118

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

WEEKLY

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1954

3d.

Fight The
**Tory Rent
Racket**

(See article p. 3)

WITCH-HUNT CLAIMS ROSENBERG CHILDREN

ATTEMPTS are being made in America to take the two sons of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg away from the care of relatives and friends, and put them in a State orphanage.

After the legal murder of their parents, the children were not long left in peace. The couple in whose care they were first placed, were victimised through a threat to their livelihood. Then the children were turned out of school (where Michael, the elder, had become very popular and top of his class).

Emmanuel Bloch, the Rosenberg's lawyer and legal guardian of the children, found another home for them before he died, a broken man.

The children are now at the mercy of the court, and strong pressure is being exercised to get them into the care of the state, on the grounds they are being "used" by the Communists.

The only way in which the children's names have been used is in connection with the appeal by the committee set up to raise funds for their upbringing. It has now been closed at 50,000 dollars.

Otherwise, every attempt has been made to take the boys out of the public eye and to give them a chance of a normal childhood after their terrible ordeal.

This, however, is not to be. The truth is that these two children, so helpless and so deeply wronged are a menace to the high and mighty American Government.

Wherever they go, their name and their appearance

will stir the conscience of men.

Left at large, the authorities state, their plight may move "susceptible" people. Thank God there are enough "susceptible" people around to make this a threat to the government's peace of mind!

Nobody wants to make a symbol of these two boys or drag them into the political arena. But they are truly the children of the working class, and it is our responsibility to protect them.

When Ethel Rosenberg wrote those wonderfully courageous letters from her death cell to her sons, she did not foresee that the witch-hunt which demanded her life would lay hands on them too.

They have stripped these children of everything but the proud memory of their parents. Let us see to it that they are not allowed to destroy this also.

Janet Alexander



Tories Responsible For The Kenya War

Labour Must Stop This Slaughter

ETON-SCHOOLED Brigadier Lord Thurlow is now in charge of an operation in Kenya which has in four days reported 121 Mau Mau hunted down and killed. This war—for war it is—has now reached a new stage of bloodiness—and still the slaughter goes on.

All the paraphernalia of modern warfare against the knives, spears and home-made guns of the desperately brave men of the Kikuyu.

Responsibility for this dreadful war rests solely with the white settlers and the British Government. Together they have blocked every constitutional, every peaceful avenue through which the Kikuyu might seek redress for

their long-standing and deep-seated grievances.

Their press and schools closed down (schools built out of the Kikuyu's own money to provide education which the white dominated government failed to give); the right of free speech and freedom of assembly abolished; their responsible leaders thrown into jail; their petitions and delegations ignored—the people of Kenya had the same choice which once faced the people of Ireland: remain the half-starved slaves of a foreign invader or—meet violence with violence. Driven to desperation, they chose to fight and Mau Mau is the inevitable result.

WHY THEY FIGHT

To defy the armed might of a great imperialist power is a desperate act—but the Kikuyu are a desperate people. They are not fighting because of some "reversion to barbarism" as the British press ignorantly reports—but because rich (mainly titled) people from England have invaded their country and driven them off the most fertile lands into barren and over-crowded reserves where impoverishment has reduced the majority to the lowest possible level of life.

Those who try to find a new start in the cities go only to swell the 10,000 homeless, jobless African street dwellers of Nairobi or Mombassa. These are some of the reasons why this brave people defy all the planes, guns, and police dogs of British Imperialism.

And don't think for one moment that the Mau Mau has failed. It hasn't. With their blood and their lives, these bitter opponents of the white settlers have at least compelled world-wide recognition of the social problems that exist in Kenya.

Those problems have existed for a long time. Jomo Kenyatta spoke about them in London as long ago as 1930! But only now, only after Mau Mau spears and knives have been wielded against British troops have people in this country

been made aware that Kenya is not peopled by "happy banjoning natives", but by hungry men and women deeply resentful of the privations brought to them by the whisky-swilling aristocrats who have invaded their land.

WHAT THEY FIGHT

But the young Kikuyu have paid dearly for their courage. For sheer brutality, the public school boys who lead Britain's armed forces in Kenya would take some beating. Here are just a few of the pleantries they have devised (presumably on the playing fields of Eton and Harrow) for use

Editorial

against the "terrorists." Scoreboards for killings and bonus payments for the number of dead bodies brought in; police dogs (loaned by Malan!) for tracking down the Mau Mau; suspects roasted alive and others smothered with petrol and set on fire; the breasts of Kikuyu women scalded with boiling water until the skin peeled away; cold-blooded shootings, and beatings to the point of death.

TORY SAVAGES

And still the slaughter goes on—and will go on until we get a civilised Government in Britain which will recognise the right of the Kikuyu (and all other Africans) to lift their faces up to the sun and smell the scent of freedom.

The Tories are the savage barbarians—not the Mau Mau. Faced with this great movement for social and national liberation in all Africa the barbaric Tories have no policy except... to shoot, and to keep on shooting, until (it is hoped) all the malcontents are dead.

With such a policy the whole of British West, East and Cen-

tral Africa will soon dissolve into one bloody lump of misery.

LABOUR'S DUTY

But there is an alternative. The people of Britain can arrange an honourable withdrawal from Africa.

That must be Labour's policy. That must be the alternative. Let the Parliamentary Opposition declare that on being returned to power it will ask the peoples of Kenya (and all British Africa) to elect Constituent Assemblies which must fix a date for the complete ending of the colonial overlordship and the establishment of self-government. After that date the only white people in Africa will be there at the request of the Africans themselves in the capacity of advisers, technicians, doctors, etc.

There is, unfortunately, not the slightest reason to believe that our leaders will on their own initiative adopt such a bold policy. Up to now they have tacitly supported all this blood and terror in Kenya. They are, it seems, as attached to the preservation of the white man's "law and order" as Oliver Lyttelton himself. But somehow, the rank and file of the Labour Movement—which gains nothing at all from these bloody colonial conflicts—must compel our leaders to adopt more progressive policies. It must be done—or the Labour Movement is finished.

As a start, let all sections of the Movement demand that the war be ended! Stop the killings, stop the slaughter!

And it can be ended within three months—if we force the British Government to release the leaders of the Kenya African Union at present in prison.

AN APPEAL

On page four you can read a letter to Mr. Lyttelton from Mr. Koinange, one of the leaders of the K.A.U., who offers the services of the imprisoned leaders to stop the war—provided only that the British Government will give the following elementary assurances: an amnesty for all prisoners, the restoration of freedom of speech and assembly, the re-opening of the Kikuyu schools, a minimum wage to keep the people above the present starvation level, and a firm promise to discuss with the responsible leaders of the Kikuyu the basic question of land rights.

That letter was addressed to Lyttelton in April, 1953.—It has not even been acknowledged—leave alone answered.

In return for peace, the Kikuyu ask only for a return to the status quo ante. God nows the terms are modest enough! Yet Lyttelton has spurned this offer and the killings go on, the beatings go on, and the people weep in despair. What a cold-blooded barbarian is this "educated" Colonial Secretary!

With all the sincerity at our command we appeal to the Labour Movement on behalf of the martyred people of Kenya: make Jim Griffiths and other Labour leaders fight against this bloody war! Make them demand the release of the prisoners! Make them fight for a peaceful settlement of the Kikuyu's absolutely justified grievances.

Give the African some confidence that there is someone in Britain that he can trust: demonstrate that this island is not peopled entirely by sadistic captains of infantry and psalm-singing hypocrites who promise freedom but only give... bullets.

Release Them!

Kenyatta and other leaders of the Kenya African Union being marched to prison. Lyttelton has spurned their offer to restore peace.

(see letter on page 4)

Germany: Recall the Party Conference!

BY the narrow majority of nine votes, last Tuesday's fateful meeting of the Parliamentary Labour Party decided to support German Re-armament. But it was a hollow victory. 104 Labour Members refused to take this further step along a road which will lead inevitably to atomic war with the Soviet Union.

In voting against this monstrous plan to arm the German Generals these 104 members have truly represented the feelings of the great majority of Labour's rank and file. The Party membership, if it ever gets a chance—and it MUST get a chance—will overwhelmingly endorse the stand of the Parliamentary Left Wing.

Entirely spurious are the claims of those who argue that Right Wing support for German Re-armament has the backing of last year's Party Conference. The Margate decision on that question was a compromise between Left and Right—a compromise which has been shattered by the Berlin

Conference. Key passage in the resolution reads as follows:

"Conference urges that there should be no German Re-armament before further efforts have been made to secure the peaceful re-unification of Germany."

Attlee and Morrison and the other anxious re-armers, claim triumphantly that those "further efforts" have now been made. Where? At Berlin—by Dulles and Eden!

Yet everyone knows that Dulles and Eden went to Berlin with the sole intention—openly stated by the less diplomatic Dulles—of blowing up all possibility of reaching a settlement. They insisted on German Re-armament knowing full well that it was completely unacceptable to the Soviet leaders.

ROTTEN MANOEUVRE

Only a hardened cynic could describe that rotten diplomatic manoeuvre as "an effort to secure the re-unification of Germany."

Only men who have abandoned any faith in the Labour Movement's ability to present an alternative to the Tories in foreign affairs, could see in Eden's smug report of failure an excuse to line

the party up in support of re-arming Adenauer's government of big businessmen and fascists.

The Right Wing wouldn't even accept an amendment from Harold Wilson which sought to delay this momentous decision until after the coming Geneva Conference of the Five Powers. Wilson's amendment was defeated—if a majority of only TWO against, gained with

By

John Lawrence

the votes of the entirely unrepresentative Labour Peers and with 18 abstentions, can be called a "defeat."

In fact, the Left Wing—and through them, the workers in the Party—have scored a great moral victory. Morrison's majority is just about the shabbiest, threadbare thing ever seen in the Parliamentary Labour Party.

It is well also to remind the "constitutionalists" that even the poor Margate resolution never had any real backing in the Party. It appeared in a statement of

Foreign Policy which the delegates saw for the first time after the Conference commenced.

Local parties and trade unions had never been given an opportunity of discussing it or amending it, and no amendments were allowed from the floor of the Conference itself—despite the vigorous protests of a large section of the delegates.

Yet it is to this highly ambiguous, and undebated resolution that the Right Wing refers for its authority to commit the Party in support of Churchill and German Re-armament!

LET MEMBERS DECIDE

In reality, it is obvious that the Party has no policy at all on what is perhaps the most important issue confronting the British people. Morrison and his friends have interpreted Margate in one way—and 104 M.P.'s have, together, we are sure, with the great majority of Party workers, interpreted it in another way. In such a situation the duty of a responsible leadership is very clear: it must ask the membership themselves to decide.

Recalling the Party Con-

The Week at Westminster



DEFENCE IS OUR MOST EXPENSIVE PENSIONER

ANYTHING that misleads or deludes the mind, or an unsound argument may be termed a fallacy. Are we again being deluded by the Statement on Defence issued to Members this week? It is not so long ago that an erudite body like the Royal Institute of International Affairs produced a Report on Defence in the Cold War.

In four pages they wrote off the Atom Bomb, said nothing of the Hydrogen Bomb or the Cobalt Bomb and then concluded that there are serious military and political reasons for discouraging excessive reliance on the atomic bomb as a principal means of defending Western Europe of any other areas vital to the free world.

If the thought and fear of the atomic bomb does not pass (and the Report thought it would pass sooner than many think) then far more elaborate methods of Civil Defence than yet contemplated must be taken.

The Study was still for plenty of the conventional weapons and troops together with more and more piston engined planes. It favoured the integration of West German troops into the forces of Western Freedom and favoured the assumption that you can have rearmament without tears if we can get aid from dear old bewitched and bewildered Uncle Sam. There it is, as laid down by the pundits three years ago. Some of us dared to say it was all baloney and could not be done.

Now comes the new White Paper. The Atomic Bomb is to be the main deterrent. It is argued that there would be relatively short periods of atomic attacks inflicting great destruction and damage. This would be followed (beautiful phrase) by "broken-backed" warfare. In this period of "broken-backed" warfare we are told that "the opposing sides would seek to recover their strength carrying on the struggle in the meantime as best they might." Here in black and white is the admission that the Generals would know what to do after a few days of Hydrogen and atomic attack.

Civil Defence is considered as secondary. No wonder! Did you see what that old fashioned Hydrogen Bomb did to the bottom of the Pacific Ocean a year or two ago? As for that island. Where is it now? Not on the map! We know all this but we are going to keep the troops and they are to do their two years' service. Now the question should be asked where are these troops to be used? At the moment they are out in Malaya, Suez, Kenya and Guiana.

It is conveniently forgotten that the trouble in Indo-China, Malaya and Kenya started without the machinations of Stalin or any of his ilk, yet the White Paper seems to condemn us all to a perpetuity of the Cold War. If this is so what hopes have we of answering the problems that Beveridge raised about Social Security! No wonder the Economist said: "In Britain as in America and the rest of the free world, the defence programme has therefore become an expensive pensioner, and is likely to remain one for some time to come."

The other day Lord Alexander told the Constitutional Club that Britain must make a steady build up of military strength so that we could spring swiftly to arms at any time in the next twenty years. Of course he said nothing about the "broken-backed" struggle carried on God knows how, after the first few days of atomic bombing.

by Harold Davies, M.P.



Algernon Sidney was executed on December 7, 1683. He enlisted against the king at the opening of the Civil War and he was wounded at Marston Moor. When the Stuarts returned he was condemned to the block.

He died not for reasonable acts as such but because he wrote and spoke out against absolutism. He wanted Governments for the people, and not the people for the governments. As he went to the block he said: "We live in an age that maketh truth pass for treason." Who is there now to preserve the people from the apotheosis of the useless, namely a short, sharp period of Atomic War? If Labour fails to meet the challenge who then is left to search for the truth?

THE BOYS OF THE OLD BRIGADE!

Those are the ones that we sing about in sentimental mood. But

both the Boys of the Old Brigade and the Girls are not having such a rip roaring time if they happen to be on Old Age Pension.

I gathered this in the sedate atmosphere of the House of Lords as Lord Beveridge was telling their Lordships that pensioners and others receiving national insurance benefits were not having enough to live upon.

Last December there were nearly 1,250,000 people in receipt of the full National Insurance benefits who found them inadequate to live upon and therefore had to seek Public Assistance.

Beveridge added: "Inadequacy of benefit rates, including, of course, pension rates, for subsistence is the immediate problem which is facing hundreds of thousands of people in this country today, and many millions in prospect in the near future." Lord Beveridge objected to a means test as an admissible or tolerable form of treating poverty. The nub of the question was the cost of all this.

As Beveridge indicated, the problem for the people and the Government is to meet the growing cost of retirement pensions. He estimated that the deficit in 1977-78 will be something like £417 millions.

One solution Lord Beveridge put forward to lighten the burden on the taxpayer was to lengthen the working life of the Old Age Pensioner. This solution meets with little opposition during a period of boom but what a hue and cry there would be if we were bang in another slump like that of the "Thirties." The younger man would accuse the older of taking the bread out of his mouth!

This brings us to the point where Foreign Policy, Arms and Commitments catch up with the whole question of the amount of Social Security that we can offer.

Mr. Lyttelton Is At Work Again!

THE constitution of Mauritius provides for a Legislative Council of 19 elected members, 12 nominated members, and 3 officials; the Governor presides. Last August, there was a general election at which the Labour Party won 13 of the elected seats; 4 independents were elected, and 2 members of the right-wing Ralliement Mauricien Party.

After the election, came the nomination by the Governor of the 12; and to the disgust of the Labour Party, he went to the commercial and agricultural interests for the whole dozen.

Nomination of 12 capitalist members to the Council was especially galling to the Labour Party because through its President, Mr. Guy Rozemont (who topped the poll in the capital, Port Louis, where the business vote is strong), it had suggested to the Governor that in view of the election results it had felt that there should be an overall majority for Labour in the Council, but that the nomination of three members from the trade unions, or co-operatives would be fair, leaving nine seats for the capitalist opposition.

Theoretically, the Constitution is to lead the island to responsible government; to that end, a system of liaison officers has been instituted. These officers are members of the Legislative Council selected by the Governor as departmental

heads, their task being to learn the art of government and administration by assisting to frame and carry out certain departmental policies, e.g. in the sphere of education and the social services.

One of the liaison officers acts as Labour Liaison Officer; with duties analogous to our Minister of Labour. The obvious choice for his post was Guy Rozemont, who is President of the Mauritius T.U.C. as well as of the Labour Party; a worker himself. But no—as Labour Liaison Officer there was chosen a Mr. Andre Nairac, one of the nominated members. He is an ex-President of the Chamber of Agriculture, and a representative of Mauritius employers and capital!

ENTER LYTTELTON

Record sugar crops during the last four years (and Britain buys under guarantee all Mauritius' sugar that is available for export) have made the island prosperous. This prosperity is reflected in the social services which have been developed since the war; coinciding with the rise of the Labour Party in the Legislative Council after the extension of the franchise under the 1948 Constitution (which granted adult franchise subject to literacy or business qualification in place of the previous property qualification).

In August last, the Governor submitted to the Colonial Secretary for his approval the 1953/54 Budget. Mr. Lyttelton's reply was laid before the Legislative Council on November 10th. In the reply, Mr. Lyttelton criticised the level of social services expenditure. The Mauritius Financial Secretary (an official member of the Legislative Council) had also criticised the high level, and had suggested 31 per cent as the maximum that ought to be spent, but Mr. Lyttelton thought that this figure was too high to be kept up for long. He also said that Mauritius' prosperity is more apparent than real, and expressed anxiety about the grave financial situation of the island.

The Council greeted Mr. Lyttelton's fears and anxieties by receiving them and at once passing to the second reading of a bill which has since become law

Danger! Railway Cutters are on the Job

HAVING been forced to grant a meagre 6 per cent wage increase, the Railway Management are preparing to unload the cost on to the general public in the form of an increase in freight charges, and on to railwaymen in the form of an "efficiency drive."

For the Transport Commission the problem is that of pouring the quart into the pint pot. How to get out of revenue enough money for the much needed renewals of outmoded equipment, wages and, of course, the yearly interest bill to the shareholders of £32 million.

The problem of increasing efficiency, with a strictly limited expenditure on modernisation and limits on the use of steel into the bargain, is really something. But it is being solved in the well known way, previously practised by the greatest slasher of them all, Josiah Stamp of pre-war fame. That is what is behind the agreement reached with the Unions over Xmas, for greater efficiency. Like all such essays in the past, it has always meant for the rank and file loss of some hard won rights and conditions.

In the early 30's, cuts in wages were forced and men were sacked. Those left were often reduced in grade and sent all over the country to work as porters, lamp men etc—with no extra in the pay packet to pay for lodgings.

Many railwaymen can now tell of those days when they were put back portering and had to sell the bike and articles of furniture to make ends meet. Since 1948 in the name of efficiency the callers-up and van attendants have been abolished and rest days and holidays have been worked. It is doubtful if any of these measures contributed to the better running of British Railways. So that now-

adays when the management mentions efficiency you can bet they are out to filch something, and railwaymen will be well advised to watch their pockets.

In fact, the rationalisation of the railways has been going on ever since nationalisation in the form of modernisation, intensification of work and the dove-tailing of jobs. In this area, where I work, a large amount of lucrative coal and iron ore traffic is handled in addition to general goods. Here diesel engines have already replaced steam for shunting in the main yards and this alone has eliminated some 30 firemen so far

tion at a joint consultation meeting with the men's representatives, presumably to get them to sign on the dotted line.

The union leaders seem to have put our heads on the efficiency block and the management are very obligingly coming along to chop them off, all in the name of a better railway system.

Railwaymen want better wages, better welfare, better working conditions and a decent pension and sick pay scheme, and only having got these can we talk about efficiency.

Rank and file railwaymen are of course in favour of an efficient transport system but they are not in favour of hanging a noose around their necks to get it. If the management's efficiency drive is going to mean misery and privation then railwaymen want none of it. By all means let's have an efficient transport system and let us start with a rank and file conference to show the management where the cuts are needed. The unions should demand and organise such a conference and present their own proposals to Sir Brian Robertson and his N.C.O.s.

Such a conference would undoubtedly produce a different plan to that now being put into operation and there would be more than a few managerial office chairs-vacant if rank and file railwaymen had their way.

The unions should demand that the £32 million shareholders' interest be diverted for vitally needed expenditure to bring railway work and working conditions up to modern practice.

By

Bob Shaw
(Nottingham)

absorbed by shortage of staff. The amount of traffic being worked from the area by fast freight trains is being progressively increased thus imposing a heavy strain on the shunting staff which still remains at the same strength as before. The organisation of train journeys has been reviewed and jobs have been dovetailed thus eliminating train crews. Many other schemes are also on hand, including a scheme all ready to operate involving several shunting yards. Its aim is to save money by eliminating staff, rationalising the work and cutting down on such items as night work and overtime, (the fact that Mr. Allen always includes these items in railwaymen's earnings is by the way).

This is at present labelled "top secret," but the scheme is due to be presented all ready for opera-

Labour's Struggle in Mauritius

as the **Importation of Publications (Prohibition) Ordinance.**

RED BOGEY AGAIN!

Introducing the bill, the Procureur-General said that it was aimed particularly against the import of Communist propaganda, and supporters of the ordinance all spoke of protecting the islanders against the "Communist virus."

The Labour Party voted against the bill, and they were supported by two independents. The officials, all nominated members, and two elected members supported the bill. By 16 votes to 15, there-

By

Peter & Barbara Ibbotson

fore, the Council decided that the best way to deal with an alleged financial crisis was to prohibit the import of Communist propaganda!

This restriction on the freedom of thought and expression that is one of the freedoms guaranteed to all men by the United Nations Charter was defended on the grounds that 33 other colonial territories have similar legislation!

The background to the debate is serious. There is a section of the Mauritian press which regards the Labour Party as a Communist party, and represents all its actions as those of a Soviet-inspired organisation.

"There is," as Guy Rozemont wrote me recently, "something very sinister afoot in this country and, I have been informed, in England also—false and malicious propaganda to make the public both here and over there believe that we are Communists." And it is disturbing to find English Labour Members of Parliament asking Questions in the House which support the Ralliement Mauricien (which is founded on racism, on opposition to a fancied Indianisation of Mauritius) against the Labour Party.

The spearhead of the attack on

the Labour Party is the daily newspaper "Le Cernéen" which refers to its attacks as "Our Crusade against pseudo-Socialism" and denounces Labour Party leaders such as J. N. Roy, Dr. Ramgoolam, and Francis Chadien as Marxist-inclined.

WHAT THEY FEAR

And what is it that the Mauritius Labour Party has done to be so maligned?

It's election manifesto is before me as I write: "People of to-day!" it says, "Vote for those of tomorrow." More homes, one for each family; full employment; more and cheaper food; school meal; free secondary and technical schools for all; a 7-year plan to abolish illiteracy; a free health service; higher old age pensions without a means test; nationalisation of many industries including the banks, distilleries and docks—these are the points of the Labour Party's election programme. Plus, of course, the one point which Guy Rozemont is convinced is the main reason for the anti-Labourites' smear campaign alleging Communism to the Labour Party—the claim for responsible government, based on universal adult suffrage.

This is the rub with "Le Cernéen" and other sections of the press; incidentally one of the newspaper editors (Gabriel Martial of Le Mauricien) is a nominated member of the Legislative Council. Opponents of responsible government in Mauritius say that the Mauritian worker is not yet ready for such political advance.

In other words they're saying, "We've governed you for 150 years and provided you with an education system which has left you immature and unfit to govern yourselves!" Thereby self-condemning their long rule, and making nonsense of the policy of "leading the colonies to self-government."

Responsible government was debated at length last December; after 5 days (the Council meets two days a week only) of debate, a motion, proposed by Guy Rozemont, was carried by 16 votes to

13. Three independents supported the Labour bloc; the 13 against the motion were 10 nominated members, the 2 Ralliement Mauricien, and one official, the Procureur-General. The others abstained or were absent.

The motion called for the Governor to intimate to Mr. Lyttelton "the desire of this Council for a representative delegation composed of both elected and nominated members to visit London early next year to discuss with him the changes called for in the Constitutional set-up of Mauritius which would satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the people of this country towards greater political self-expression." Speakers made it clear that what they had in mind was indeed responsible government based on universal adult suffrage; but, says Guy Rozemont, "Will Oliver Lyttelton receive a delegation? I am very pessimistic."

Speaking in the debate, Mr. Bissoondoyal (Independent) referred to the lack of interest in matters Mauritian showed by the British press, and wondered what treatment the delegation and its demands (or aspiration) would get from our papers.

Guy Rozemont is understandably pessimistic; Mr. Bissoondoyal shows an unfailing knowledge of our press and its attitude to colonial problems. Individual Socialists should write to the Colonial Office and to their own M.P. pressing for justice to the Mauritius Labour Party and supporting the demand for responsible government. We shall thereby be encouraging our colleagues in a little-known corner of the Commonwealth, colleagues who are fighting for social justice in the teeth of bitter personal and political attacks, and who deserve all the encouragement they can get.

Socialist Outlook

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

Editor: John Lawrence

"Socialist Outlook" Conference (Wolverhampton)

SUNDAY—FEBRUARY 28th—2.30 p.m.

How To Get Rid Of The Tories

Speakers: **John Baird, M.P.**

★

John Lawrence

Norman Dinning

WOLVERHAMPTON LABOUR CLUB, LITTLES LANE

Visitors Welcome

ADMISSION 1/-

The 64 Billion Dollar Question

Can America Avoid Slump?

By Harry Braverman

An American socialist writer answers the question which all the world is asking. The article is reprinted from the "American Socialist."

alter the economy. It creates new institutions. It redistributes income. It shifts demand from one industry to another. It changes the whole economic pattern...

Professor Albert G. Hart of Columbia University, at the recent forecasting sessions of the economists' professional associations, expressed the universal feeling among economists when he said: "A serious recession... will come some time in the next few years, whether or not we have one in 1954."

And the top planners of U.S. capitalism worry. They dread the disappearance of social stability, and the growth of labour-capital battles in this last stronghold of capitalism.

will the amazing growth of Soviet economy be to capitalists here now that American production has stopped expanding and started contracting. Ten years of that and the U.S. lead in industrial production will be pretty near shot!

What then are the capitalists going to do, if the "slump", "readjustment", "downturn", "recession" or call-it-what-you-will becomes serious, as it well may?

On February 17, 1950, shortly before the Korean War, the

A Plot Exposed!

"Evidence pours in from nearly every European capital from Tokyo, Washington and South East Asia that the economic framework of the non-Communist world has an alarming tendency to melt in any atmosphere slightly less frigid than the 'cold war'.

The real Soviet plot exposed! Russia won't go to war with U.S. capitalism, thus threatening the West with "a serious and perhaps fatal economic condition."

authoritative U.S. News and World Report printed the following significant words:

"Armament can always be pushed if private activity slows. War scares are easy to create, are nearly sure-fire producers of money for more and more arms.

Do these words, which foreshadowed so accurately the Korean War and the big armament build-up which liquidated the slump of 1949, apply today to the slump of 1954?

Industrial Front

By Bill Hunter

TROUBLE BREWING ON THE DOCKS

IN the London docks the employers are faced with a coming showdown if a threat to suspend dockers for refusing to work overtime is put into operation.

For several weeks now members of the Stevedores and Dockers' union—the "blue union"—have been operating a ban on overtime. As previously reported in the "Socialist Outlook," they are fighting against the employers' interpretation of the Dock Labour Scheme (Regulation of Employment Act 1947).

The dockers contend that overtime must be voluntary. Those I have spoken to left no doubt that there is a big feeling throughout the docks on this issue.

Last week, members of the Watermen, Lightermen, Tugmen and Bargemen's Union joined the overtime ban. Their action it appears has brought about complete paralysis in the port from Tilbury to London Bridge, after 5 p.m. every week-day.

Officially the ban is operated by 11,000 men but, unofficially they are being supported by thousands of members of the T. & G.W.U.

Now the port employers have announced that men who operate the overtime ban will be reported by them to the Dock Labour Board for failing to carry out the terms of the Dock Labour Scheme. It is possible for this procedure to take another month, but should action then be taken against these dockers there is no doubt that there will be bigger trouble on the docks.

Although the fight so far is be-

ing waged in London, other ports are also forced to work compulsory overtime and it is clear that it is only a matter of time before this becomes a national issue, if the employers do not change their attitude.

The militant docker puts the issue plainly; the employers are not prepared to grant to the docker freedom to book for a show or use his leisure time as he likes after eight hours work. Yet when there is no work and thousands of dockers are signing on, the employers never lift a finger to raise the docker above the bare subsistence level of £4 8s. 0d., or even the £2 8s. 0d. which is received by light duty men who have been injured in the industry.

Investigation shows that the conciliation machinery has been used to the full. Discussions on the right for overtime to be voluntary have been going on for at least the last nine years! The stage has been reached now where the men are taking action to fight for the same right to control their leisure time as exists in most other industries.

HANDLEY PAGE DRAUGHTSMEN RETURN

Handley Page draughtsmen and technicians are returning to work after fifteen weeks of strike. On February 19th, an agreement was signed between the Handley Page management and representatives of the Association of Engineering and Shipbuilding Draughtsmen.

The strike of these "white collared" workers has been a model of solidarity and organisation which could well be copied by any of their overalled brothers. They go back now as solid as they came out.

Once before—a fortnight ago—they returned having achieved an agreement which gave them a partial victory—the achievement of a minimum rate. One-and-a-half hours in the factory convinced them that the management was attempting to victimise members of their strike committee and they came out again to a man—and woman.

Now they have returned with another agreement. It states: "there shall be no recrimination or discrimination arising from the dispute." However, while they have gained certain points these workers are going back as watchful and as full of fight as ever.

When they met on February 19th and decided to accept the new agreement they unanimously resolved to "resist to the full any action... contrary to the spirit of the agreement or prejudicial to the interests of our members, individually or collectively." They decided, again unanimously, "to resist, if necessary by a complete withdrawal of labour, any attempt by the Company to dismiss any of those of our members affected by Clause 4 of the Agreement."

These draughtsmen and technicians deserve the admiration of all trade unionists for their firm stand in what has been one of the most important struggles in their union's history.

Labour Must Fight Rent Bill

By Councillor John Goffe

THE Tories are getting worried. Their bill to raise rents has run into heavy weather and they have introduced the guillotine to cut short discussion, prevent amendment and enable them to fulfill their promise to the landlords.

Prior to the introduction of the bill a White Paper was produced with the title "Operation Rescue." Since then the bill has been shown to live up fully to this title for it is a genuine effort to rescue the landlords from their responsibilities and to help them pay their super tax.

The bill enables all landlords to raise controlled rents if "the dwelling is in good repair, and is reasonably suitable for occupation" and if "the landlord has produced satisfactory evidence that work to the value specified... has been carried out."

BURDEN OF 'PROOF'

Should the tenant dispute the amount the landlord has spent on repairs during the last three years (or 12 months in some cases) he must apply to the county court within 14 days of receiving notice of the increase. He then has to prove that the landlord has not spent the money (a very difficult task—it is always much harder to prove a negative).

If he loses the case he will then have to pay all his own and the landlord's costs which could easily amount to about £60.

If the tenant considers that the house is not in a good state of repair he can apply for a "certificate of disrepair" but should the County Court subsequently decide that the "house was in a good state of repair" when the certificate was issued the rent increase is applied retrospectively!

From the above examples it can be seen that the scales are heavily weighted in the landlords' favour. In the case of the increasing number of unscrupulous landlords such

as the elusive Mr. Brady, who has been breaking the law with impunity for years, they will have no compunction about signing "statutory declarations." As for the big property companies they will hire expensive lawyers and thus face tenants contemplating litigation under the bill with enormous costs, the results of which may be the increase in rent plus the selling-up of the home to pay the costs.

PERMANENT SLUMS

In order to make the bill more palatable certain "window-dressing" clauses were introduced to give the illusion that slum clearance was to be seriously tackled. An illusion indeed!

The only provision relating to slum clearance provides that local authorities shall submit a plan to the Minister. It is well known to everyone with the smallest knowledge of housing and local affairs that only a vigorous national plan with interest-free loans or full financial grants from the Exchequer can tackle this problem. As the Tories have no intention of doing this they have introduced a scheme for the "patching" of slum houses in clearance areas, that is of houses that have been condemned by the Medical Officer of Health as "unfit for human habitation"

The new definitions in this Bill as to what is "unfit" is qualified by the following statement "a house shall be deemed to be unfit if and only if it is so far defective in one or more of these matters that it is not reasonably suitable for occupation while in that condition." With a Tory interpretation many houses condemned under the 1936 Act will not now be so condemned.

LOCAL COUNCIL BURDEN

Presuming that a house is condemned, if it "can be rendered capable of providing accommodation of a standard which is adequate for the time being" it may be reprimed and be "patched." In this case the Minister will pay a subsidy of £3 a year for fifteen years as long as the local council makes a similar contribution to-

wards the cost of "such works as may from time to time be required pending the demolition of these houses."

This financial provision marks a fundamental break in housing practice. In all post-war municipal housing the Minister has paid three quarters of the cost and the local authority one quarter. Indeed in this same Bill, for what are called improvement grants this ratio is maintained. It is clear that the Minister wants local authorities—particularly those that are labour controlled—in the major towns and cities, where this problem is most acute, to become slum landlords! Then they will be faced with the necessity of drastically increasing rates and the rents of the slums to meet their financial obligations.

This is further attested by the clause giving the Minister power to withhold the £3 if the expenditure of the local authority is "un-

duly low." (This is after making it compulsory to pay £3). It is not surprising that Labour members of Parliament are as Mr. Bevan said "exposing it (the Bill) for the landlords ramp that it is."

Increasingly all those in the Labour movement who have studied the Bill are moving against it. At its last meeting the Camberwell Borough Council carried a motion spotlighting the principal defects of the Bill. The Bermondsey Trades Council, after protesting against the Bill, decided to call a conference with the Labour Party and other organisations in the Borough to explain the provisions of the Bill.

Campaign must be developed along these lines in every town and village until the government and landlords are made aware that no tenants will pay any increases under the Bill and that the whole Labour movement stands four square behind them. The plans of the landlords' government must be brought to nought.

-in Scotland it's even worse!

Says Jim Cook

THE Scottish Council of the Labour Party are calling for the withdrawal of the Tory Rents and Repairs Bill.

The Tory rents policy for Scotland is in some ways worse even than the one they are imposing on English workers. The Scottish Bill permits landlords to increase the rent of a controlled house by 8s. in the £ where the landlord is responsible for all repairs, and by a proportionate amount where he is only partly responsible.

In a 2d. pamphlet the Scottish Council declares that landlords in Scotland will receive an additional £4,800,000 each year. The pamphlet states that "not a single penny is to be given to local authorities to carry out a REAL slum clearance programme."

"It is no good waiting until the

Tory Rents Bill becomes law," said Councillor Kane at a public protest meeting called by the Edinburgh City Labour Party against the Housing Repairs and Rents Bill. Councillor Kane went on to say that the issue affected every single citizen. He believed there would be a wave of protest which could bring down the Government once the implications were fully realised.

The Bill would mean that the rents of all rent-controlled houses will go up by 40 per cent in Scotland he declared. "Slum houses would be put in a state of repair so that they could be occupied for 15 years or more. The landlord who had sucked the house dry of profit for years, was to be compensated for having the burden taken off his shoulders. Ratepayers were going to make a huge gift to the landlords."

Mr. James Hoy, M.P. for Leith,

told the meeting that an "amazing amount of heat would be generated by thousands of people once the Bill became law and its implications were understood."

A resolution was carried unanimously by the meeting. It protested against the Bill for "making no financial provision for an attack on the slums; perpetuating the slums and placing them under public ownership; raising rents of privately-owned, rent-controlled properties, but failing to protect adequately the tenants against exploitation; failing to ensure that the increased rent would be spent on keeping the houses in a good state of repair; and for freezing owners rates, thereby placing the extra burden of future rate increases upon the tenants of privately-owned, municipally-owned, owner occupied and business premises."

The resolution called for immediate withdrawal of the Bill.

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.

What is 'Intelligence'?

★ A Plea for the Comprehensive School ★

By

Tom Locksley

and that their skills often change in emphasis. Any sound system of education ought to be on the look out for such changes in the child and suit itself to them.

EFFECT OF COACHING

A recent report by the National Federation for Educational Research made after investigations carried out in conjunction with L.E.A.s. is of particular interest to us.

Records are given of a number of interesting experiments concerning these examinations. Thus, 20 children who had failed at the Common Entrance examinations were given practice and a little coaching and then tested again. The result was that 12 of the 20 obtained scores which would have justified passing.

Of another experiment it is said "... of 54 children, whereas three only reached this level at the beginning of this experiment, no fewer than 22 had reached the level at the end."

These facts are startling enough, but even more alarming is the statement that in tests made after the children had been 12 months at a secondary modern school and were allowed to take the exam. again, their scores showed a decline. "The decrease was significant for all ranges of ability, but appears to be greater for the brighter children."

On the other hand, children who remained another year in the primary school and took the examination again showed increased scores.

PLACE FOR FAILURES

As the great majority of children will go to modern schools we cannot overlook the fact that this may mean that there is an actual fall in the level of education throughout the country. Is this not due to the emotional effect on all children in the modern school? Far from "parity of esteem" the modern schools are recognised, both by the pupils and by many of the teachers, as the place where all the failures go.

The hopelessness extends to the parents—who are usually not in a position to judge their children's scholastic ability and who, until they are shown that these tests are not reliable, may accept the verdict that their child is without any significant academic powers.

The N.F.E.R. also says: "in the primary schools, particularly in the top class, there are usually several bright children who set the pace for the others and incite them to rivalry. The modern school lacks this stimulus; the pacesetters have passed on to the grammar schools."

It is obvious, as the Norwood Committee said in their report on Secondary Education, 1943, that

Tom Locksley is a Coventry schoolmaster and Secretary of the Coventry branch of the National Association of Labour Teachers. He is also Labour's choice as prospective parliamentary candidate for the Stratford-on-Avon constituency.

the 11 to 13 years is a period of transition. They went on to recommend that there should be a lower school to discover the bent and interests of the scholars with an eye to specialisation in the upper forms.

COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOLS

This is clearly reasonable, but with the tripartite system we have at present, quite impracticable. Here surely lies the argument for Comprehensive Schools where transfers from one type of instruction to another are much more simple.

We can be sure of one thing, the present system must be changed if the spirit of the '44 Act is to be carried through and "Secondary education for all" achieved.

Our hope lies in the fact that now, for the first time in our history, there exists a public which is capable of deciding for itself; a public which is not easily hoodwinked and flattered as it was before the war. Let us trust its wisdom to give a chance to the ordinary child of this land.

KENYA: This is peace offer which Lyttelton Spurned

... The Kenya African Union of which I am delegate in the United Kingdom sincerely wishes to serve the cause of peace.

In order to help restore peace in Kenya and bring about an atmosphere of goodwill between the Africans and the Government, I am suggesting that the Kenya African Union be approached for its services and good offices in appealing to all peoples in Kenya, to stop acts of violence. To achieve this, however, it will be necessary for the Government to give us certain assurances. We do not want the Government to misinterpret the psychological effect upon Africans and non-Africans of these assurances.

We feel confident that once such assurances are guaranteed, we can succeed in achieving our purpose. As soon as possible after peace and an atmosphere of goodwill have been established we propose that a Round Table Conference of representatives of all the racial communities and Government should be held to review the economic, political and social grievances and disabilities suffered by the Africans, such as the absence of universal adult franchise, of compulsory education and of security of land tenure.

Cypriot Tailors Strike

CYPRIOT families, desperately trying to avoid the chronic unemployment and poverty of their homeland, make big sacrifices to send sons and daughters to England to work.

Once here the young Cypriot must find a job and from the wages received not only pay for food, clothing and lodging, but repay the loan raised for the fare and send a little money back to the family in Cyprus.

Employers are ever ready to take advantage of such a situation. To exploit the difficulties of such workers. We have seen it so often, for example, in the exploitation of young Irish workers who have been in almost identical positions. The only effective reply is—trade union organisation.

This the Cypriots recognise. What is more they are prepared

EAST SALFORD LABOUR TELLS N.E.C.: — SUPPORT WAGES FIGHT

The General Management Committee of the East Salford Constituency Labour Party at its meeting on February 17th adopted a resolution urging the N.E.C. to associate the Labour Party with the struggle for wages in the industrial field.

The resolution was moved by Cllr. Bernard Moylan, (E.T.U.) who had just participated in the E.T.U. strike and seconded by Harry Ratner, (A.E.U.). It was carried with only one vote against out of over 50 delegates present.

to do something about it. One hundred and forty of them, employed by the firm of Hebe Sports, City Road, London, are now on strike for recognition of their right to organise in a trade union.

A spokesman for their strike committee explained that the firm, which makes quite highly priced ladies costumes, employs some 250 workers—of whom about 200 are

Reported by
Fred Emmett

Cypriots. Last spring an attempt was made to organise into the Tailors and Garment Workers' Union, but the time was not opportune. Trade was slack, and the firm threatened to sack those who joined up.

A few weeks ago however, the Union held a special meeting for Cypriot workers in the London clothing trade—and the Hebe Sports workers once again began to organise.

A committee was elected, shop stewards appointed, and the management approached on Friday, February 12th for recognition. The Firm's reply was to throw down the gauntlet. Just before knocking-off on Friday night, the elected stewards were given a weeks' pay in lieu of notice and sacked on the spot. The workers had no alternative but to reply to this clear cut brutal provocation by strike action.

This will not be an easy strike to win. The firm is trying to break the strike, for it has much to lose.

Rates being paid are well below those paid in organised shops for similar work. Hours worked are longer. The "dinner hour" is only 40 minutes—the "hour" is made up by counting 10 minutes morning and afternoon tea breaks.

The workers themselves have severe financial handicaps. Because of low rates they have been unable to build up any reserve of savings. They have hanging over their heads the knowledge that if they do not send some money back home to Cyprus their people there will suffer.

Many live in lodgings where the "landlady" will not let them carry on for long without paying for their keep.

Under these circumstances trade unionists can show their solidarity by means of quick and effective financial help. Send money and send it quickly to:—

Hebe Sports Strike Committee,
c/o Tailors and Garment Workers' Union,
16 Charles Square, London,
N.1.

Waging Peace 1920—1954

"A member of the Cabinet talks confidentially... about the necessity of Cuning in Defeating the Opposition of the British Working class—that is the majority of British people—to the killing of our soldiers and the spending of our taxes."

—Manchester Guardian (1920)

"We see Mr. Churchill conspiring with Kolchak to pursue an active campaign against a country with which we are not at war... What is the Government going to do about it?"

—The Star (1920)

"We must be cunning" said Churchill—

This Russian disclosure is bad: Financial Leaders are restive, And the Working Classes Are Mad.

It's no good "Hanging the Kaiser,"

That little stunt is played out; There's only one permanent cure Without the slightest doubt, And I'll put all my money On Lead.

I'll arrange another "Little War" With Turkey; And dress all our soldiers In Red;

It will cost a few more millions, But we can always blame Lenin and Stalin, And put up the Price of Bread.

"What about Peace?" said the Premier;

In chorus the Cabinet replied: "Peace! There can be no Peace;" And gazing upon the Dead, Peace veiled her wistful face, And shuddered, and sobbed, And Fleed.

Percy Allott.

NOTE:— This little poem was written in 1920. It might well have been written today.

IS ANYONE — parent, teacher or councillor—still left with complete faith in the intelligence tests, which determine, at the early age of 11, the future lives of our children? Critics are everywhere, and so many are the arguments against the present system of selecting children for secondary education that it is difficult to know where to begin to state them.

One thing, however, ought to be made clear; nobody is being dishonest. Psychologists who devise the tests try to make them as efficient as it is possible and the real difficulties are not under their control. Education committees are trying to be as fair as they can in making the present system work. Nevertheless it must be affirmed here and now that no reliable method of testing has so far been discovered.

If injustice and dreadful mistakes are to be avoided we ought to abolish the entrance examination at 11 plus.

The use of intelligence varies throughout life in an entirely unpredictable way. It is safe to say that a boy or girl of 11 has already developed a fixed and unchanging quantity of noses, ears and arms, but it is not safe to say that children of 11 have developed the use of all their intelligence.

BORDERLINE CASES

Another factor is the extreme difficulty of defining "intelligence," and if you can't define that which you are testing, of what value is the result of your test?

It is true that at this age you can pick out the exceptionally bright child and, at the other end of the scale, those who are obviously backward. But for the vast majority of children who are not in either category there is a judgement which seems—and is—highly arbitrary.

How arbitrary can be seen when it is realised that less than one-tenth of one per cent. separates the successful child from the unsuccessful. These are the children in that heart-aching category called the "borderline cases." And every educationalist knows just how wide that "borderline" is.

So we select at the age of 11 plus, although not a single expert examiner dare say that it is possible to select all children at this age.

Every teacher knows that children change and that "late developers" who looked hopelessly backward at 11 years old grow into adults of remarkable capacity

You Can Help E.T.U. Strikers

THE magnificent strike of the contracting electricians is now in its seventh week—but these "guerillas of labour" are undaunted. All the employers are hoping the E.T.U. will be defeated so that the wages struggle in other sections of industry will be weakened.

It must not happen. The electricians must not be left to fight this battle alone. What have YOU done to get resolutions of support from your trade union branch and local Labour Party?

Send all resolutions and money (which is urgently needed) to W. Stevens, General Secretary, E.T.U., Hayes Court, Hayes, Kent.

JUST PUBLISHED!

An Indispensable Source Book in the current discussion of his place in history

LEON TROTSKY
The First Five Years of the Communist International
Vol. 2

12s. 6d. Postage 6d.

Speeches and Writings 1921-1923

Never before published in English

Order from

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

A Reminder from the Co-op.

"THE cost of living provides the blackest chapter in the record of the Conservative Government," declared Councillor A. J. Rogers (Islington) at a London Co-operative Party meeting in Acton last week.

"It opened with Lord Woolton and Mr. R. A. Butler saying that the Conservatives would not reduce Food Subsidies and closed with Mr. Butler slashing them by £160,000,000."

"Soon Mr. Cube had to be paid back," he continued, "the price of sugar was allowed to rise and more short supply dollars were found so that more sugar could be sold. But it was worth it to the Conservative Party for Mr. Cube's anti-nationalisation campaign."

"At the turn of the century," said the speaker, "when Britain ruled about a quarter of the world; when her industries were supreme, and her riches so great that millions of pounds could flow to any part of the world at a few moments notice, the workers had a hard struggle to get a few shillings to live on.

"People lived in vile conditions: the ebb and flow of poverty was such that there were 690 pawnshops within ten square miles in London—every Londoner made an average of five visits a year. Hours of labour were twelve or more a day.

A Coroner's verdict recorded "Death from overwork" on a man who had been working 18 hours per day!"

Councillor Rogers stressed the part played by the Co-ops. in helping to check the worst evils of this system. He explained how groups of ordinary men and women came together, first in small groups and then in ever increasing numbers, to practice mutual, non-profit making trading.

"Today far too many people are unaware of the great debt we owe these inspired Co-operators," he concluded, "without Co-operative societies prices would be much higher. Private enterprise is only interested in making profits, co-operation is interested in serving the people. The Co-ops are one of Britain's most formidable checks on soaring prices."

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