

# Socialist Outlook

Vol. 2. No. 8

AUGUST, 1950

Price 2d.

## WITHDRAW BRITISH FORCES FROM KOREA !

An appeal to the Labour Movement by

**S. O. DAVIES, M.P. for Merthyr Tydfil**

**I**T is obvious that as a result of the present conflict in Korea a dreadful fear has gripped the hearts of millions of British men and women. It is the fear, alternating at times with anger, of a Third World War: a war that will destroy all that is great and promising in our civilisation, and at an incalculable cost of human life and suffering. One's imagination reels at the thought of the havoc that would be inflicted by the atom and hydrogen bomb, and the foul consequences of bacteriological warfare. It is admitted by all those best competent to judge that there is no known protection, or defence, against these almost omnipotent powers of destruction. In Hiroshima between 80,000 and 100,000 people died from the effects of one atom bomb! At long last WAR has revealed its inherent, developing logic; it is unrelieved, merciless destruction. Yet there are in this country some individuals, whose souls are so twisted and whose little minds are so bedevilled by fear and prejudice, that they would let loose on humanity these diabolical instruments of death.

### Koreans Betrayed by Allies

The immediate pretext for this awful threat is that of a nation fighting for freedom and independence. The Koreans were promised all this by the heads of the Allied Powers at Cairo in 1943 and it was endorsed by the same people at Moscow in 1945. But what really happened after the war was the division of the country by the travesty known as the 38th parallel. This ignored the fundamental fact that the Koreans were a nation and conscious of their nationhood. It also destroyed the possibility of a balanced economy being developed, for, to the north of the line the country was rich in minerals, while the south was, potentially, equally as rich in food production.

The northern area was placed under the trusteeship of Russia and the south under that of the United States.

### Rhee's Police State

It would be interesting to see how these people fared under these two Powers. Southern Korea, under Syngman Rhee, soon degenerated into a Police State. The immediate associates of Rhee were black-market-eers, collaborateurs of the Japanese, both before and during the war, with a Police Force akin to the Blackshirts of Hitler. The shocking pretence of this puppet of the U.S.A. of Parliamentary Government was revealed on May 30th last by the *New York Herald Tribune* which told us that in the 1948 Elections over 900 persons were killed and wounded.

The story of the Elections in May of this year is grimmer still.

**These Elections in South Korea, which took place only six weeks ago, resulted in the overwhelming defeat of Syngman Rhee's candidates. He and his supporters won only 48 seats while the Opposition candidates captured 162 seats.**

The mystery which the United Nations officials at Lake Success have failed to solve is: *what has happened to these elected members of the South Korean Parliament?* It is known that the day before Rhee fled from Seoul, 13 of these were in jail. On that day Rhee admitted that he had executed more than 100 so-called pro-Communist politicians. It is known that there is grave concern at the United Nations lest the "pro-Communist" politicians shot were in fact members of the newly elected South Korean Parliament. At any rate, nothing has been heard from any member of this Parliament since the fighting started.

The *Manchester Guardian* on the 27th of last month, writes: "*It may be that the Southern Korean Republic, which the Americans eventually brought into being, was not a very happy creation. At the time of the invasion there were 14,000 political prisoners; the assassination of the leader of the Opposition was an ugly affair. Some of the Southern leaders have openly favoured accession to the Northern State, and there have been pro-Northern mutinies among the police.*"

On August 4th, 1949, the *New York Herald Tribune* wrote: "*South Korea is drifting into military rule under the Syngman Rhee administration. The South Korean Army is taking over criminal functions from the police, muzzling the press, and even directing traffic . . . If other countries in the Far East are persuaded by what happens there that their alternative to communism is military dictatorship, they are likely to prefer communism.*"

### THE AUTHOR

**M**R. S. O. DAVIES is the Labour Member of Parliament for Merthyr Tydfil, a mining town in the heart of the South Wales coal-fields. "S.O." has been connected with the mines all his life—as a working miner, a miners' agent, and a member of Parliament for this 100 per cent. mining constituency.

His courageous stand against the American invasion of Korea and his demand that the Labour Government stand by its pledge to respect the rights of all nations to self-determination, has earned him the respect of all true socialists in the Labour Party.

### Our Socialist Duty

As the readers of the *Socialist Outlook* will note, the quotations given above are not drawn from sources that can be remotely suspected of being sympathetic to Communism. They reveal beyond any doubt how corrupt and venal the Government of Southern Korea was, and why the Koreans of the South will not fight against their countrymen of the north. But in defence of that rotten regime the aid of nearly 60 nations is being invoked, and the United Nations Charter hypocritically and mendaciously referred to as their authority. We are asked, that is to say, to subject our country, its men, women, and children, the treasures of our minds and skill, our hopes, affections, and aspirations, to the consequences of a Third World War in this Atomic Age.

**The answer of the British people will be an emphatic "NO!" Insist then, and**

that immediately, for time IS short, upon the withdrawal of British Naval Forces from the affected area; that no British forces, land, sea, or air, shall be used against the Korean people directly or indirectly; that all alien armed forces be cleared from Britain; that if Mr. Churchill's boast is right, to remove from this country the three American Atom Bomb squadrons now stationed around Oxford, and, finally, to make abundantly clear that we, British people, will never be drawn into war either at the behest of the warmongers of the U.S.A. or any other irresponsible nation.

## "I ACCUSE"

**M**ANOLIS PROIMAKIS, who has written the pamphlet, was a former Greek M.P. and General Secretary of the Democratic Union Party, and had it smuggled out of Makronisos concentration camp, risking death or torture by so doing.

It is a striking commentary on the attitude of the British Press, to what is going on in this camp of death and insanity, that when the official Greek Socialist newspaper *Mahi* published details of how foreign journalists were hoodwinked when conducted tours were arranged, not a single British newspaper published the report.

Space does not permit of a lengthy review, and I solicit the support of all our readers for the pamphlet, which costs 3d. and can be obtained from the **League of Democracy in Greece, 89 Chancery Lane, London, W.C.2.**

JACK STANLEY.

## THE PEACE MENACE

"I put peace last"—FIELD MARSHAL LORD MONTGOMERY.

*If Peace should break out tomorrow,  
Profits from War would cease,  
We could not fill the Dollar Gap,  
Yet insane Reds talk Peace.*

*If Peace should break out tomorrow,  
Joy would abound for all,  
We should not fear Atomic War,  
And poverty's grim pall.*

*If Peace should break out tomorrow,  
Science could make us free,  
For all mankind to reap the fruits,  
Of earth's fertility.*

*If Peace should break out tomorrow,  
All Racial Wars would cease,  
There would be food and homes for all,  
But only "Reds" want Peace!*

Percy Allott.

## The Jackals are out again

"Companies whose shares have attracted support in the past week include ship-builders, aircraft manufacturers, and engineers, all of which play a key part in rearmament." "Naturally," says the *Observer* (30.7.50), "buyers have shown a tendency to gravitate towards . . . armament shares." Naturally is right! Where there's blood there's profit!

# Why the Unrest in the Coalfields?

A Lancashire miner, **BILL BIRMINGHAM,**  
provides an answer

**C**AST your minds back to January, 1947. Miners everywhere were welcoming the nationalisation of the industry. No longer were we to be the most exploited workers in the country. Now we had a Labour Government pledged to remove those barriers of privilege and profit which for so long had deprived the miners of the full benefit of the wealth they produced, and the country of the coal it so vitally needed.

We had been promised the Miners Charter of major improvements designed to get the maximum output and manpower. Well do we remember this sort of talk from our leaders at that time . . . "you must put something into the pot before taking anything out" . . . "you will get your Charter when you work for it." Well, we've worked for it alright. Just take a look at the 1949 *Annual Report of the National Coal Board* if you don't believe me.

**In a few years—and with a very much reduced labour force—output has risen from 179 million tons to 203 million annually.**

The Report gives the lie to the Coal Board who, in refusing an increase to the lower-paid men, said that the industry couldn't afford it. It shows a profit of **three-quarters of a million pounds per week**—quite apart from the significant fact that all the industries dependant on coal have also shown increased profits.

And that is not the whole picture of profits by any means. Another **thirteen million pounds** has been given to the former mine-owners in compensation payments, making **forty-three million pounds** in the three years of nationalisation. This is a wonderful Government pension for *doing nothing!*

### The Contrast

Now look at the miner's wages and conditions and you will perhaps begin to get some idea of the causes of the present unrest.

At the moment the industry is losing **1,800 men** every month, and this figure will rise still higher unless the demands of the miners are met.

**What young man is going to work in the bowels of the earth for £5 10s. a week when he can get comparable earnings on the surface in more congenial work and with far less risk of accident and disease.**

Some of the pits are being closed on "economic grounds but the men who are transferred invariably receive lower piece rates, which arouses justifiable suspicion that this is one of the reasons for the closing down of many of these pits.

### Our Old Men

Under the re-organisation and modernisation schemes, men are being sacked. In the main they are the aged miners, men who have inevitably become disabled after a lifetime of back-breaking toil in the pits. Now they are thrown on the scrap heap. Compare the future of these men on **£1 3s. 8d.** a week "redundancy pay" for six months (if they qualify) with the **£800,000** which is, according to the 1949 Report, paid to the ex-officials of the coal owners for loss of office.

It is a disgrace for a nationalised industry to treat our men in such a manner. Even policemen, after 25 years' service, get an adequate pension, and they are also physically capable of other work. But the miner, because of his disabilities, can rarely compete with any success in the open labour market. I'll bet the people responsible for drawing up these redundancy schemes are themselves assured of a good pension *and* plenty of time to enjoy it in when they retire.

### We want a voice

The Coal Board's economy drive—reduction in costs, attacks on piece-rates, redundancy schemes—has produced a mere 6½d. per ton reduction in costs. It has also produced unrest in the coalfields and prosecution for miners who resist these methods. It is time that the miners themselves took a hand in reducing costs.

*Why should we, like the railwaymen, continue to carry the burden of huge compensation payments to the former owners? These payments should be suspended. That is the only way to reduce costs while granting the miners what they were promised and are entitled to.*

### THE PEOPLE'S PROPERTY?

Mr. John Kane, a former miner, in his letter of resignation from the N.E. Division of the National Coal Board, says:

*"It is my experience as a labour officer I have never been in a position to influence the application of the board's policy in the slightest degree, because the present structure and organisation of the National Coal Board prevent any effective and genuine working-class representation at all levels."*

—(*Morning Advertiser*, 4.7.50.)

### Mondism

That Mondism is again being preached by our leaders is shown in the manner in which they are trying to divide the workers into "low-paid" and "higher-paid." Instead of trying to reduce the difference between the miner's wage and the income of the ex-coal owners, which is received for doing nothing, they seem to be more concerned with reducing the difference between *miner and miner*. If this goes on much longer, the trade union movement will lose prestige and even membership. True there is an unanswerable case for the lower-paid man getting an increase—but let it not be granted at the expense of piece-workers.

Perhaps now you have some idea of what is causing the unrest in the coalfields. The 1949 Report shows what can be achieved by a unified industry working under State control, but, it also shows that the industry serves monopoly capitalism and **not** the interests of the workers. Until that is altered the unrest will continue and grow. It can be altered if we make our Labour and Trade Union get back to socialist principles and abandon the appeasement policies of Shanklin and Dorking.

# THE WAY AHEAD FOR LABOUR

End the Wage Freeze and Compulsory Arbitration — Workers' Control — Peace — Behind the Schuman Plan

An article of first-rate importance specially written for the *Socialist Outlook* by

## JAMES FIGGINS

(General Secretary of the 420,000 strong National Union of Railwaymen)

**WITHIN** the next two months the Labour Party and T.U.C. annual conferences will take decisions affecting the future not only of millions of workers but indeed the whole of humanity.

First, I must deal with wages. The N.U.R. opposition to the wage freeze, which it made clear from the very beginning, has now been completely vindicated. Other unions are being forced by circumstances to accept the logic of our policy.

Wages have risen by 5 per cent. since January, 1948, but prices have gone up by 10 per cent. And the cost of living index has been kept at this percentage by selling off stocks at the old prices instead of at the new prices, that is, those which include the increased cost of raw materials since devaluation.

In the months that lie ahead further price increases are inevitable. For the wholesale price index has increased very considerably since devaluation. But this has not yet been reflected in the cost of living index. All this is at a time when wage increases are being refused by employer after employer.

**Yet profits, according to Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, have more than trebled since 1938.**

### Wage Increases for ALL

The T.U.C. has had to abandon its policy and admit that unions are entitled to apply for wage advances in accordance with the cost of living. *We have the right to demand that such advances shall not be confined to those on the lower or middle rates, but shall apply to all workers, whether low, medium or high paid.*

We are now in a much better position for wage negotiations than we have been, as the employers are bound to appreciate that the T.U.C. has abandoned wage restraint. There must be an alteration of their outlook and an understanding that the benefits of increased production should not pass into pockets that have been so well lined since 1945.

### End Order 1305

Secondly, compulsory arbitration as laid down in Arbitration Order 1305 must be completely removed. This Order renders all voluntary negotiations a farce. So long as it continues employers will continue to refuse in full justified wage claims.

If it is good for controls to come off then it is good that this control on the freedom of the trade union movement should be abolished at the earliest possible moment.

**My union has tabled a resolution on this vital matter for the forthcoming congress of the T.U.C. We hope our victory on this issue will not be so long delayed as was our victory over the wage freeze policy.**

### Workers' Control

Thirdly, we are still insisting on a greater measure of workers' control in the nationalised industries. It is quite insufficient to have but one ex-trade union on each of the Transport Executives. We who have won nationalisation after a long struggle feel that we should have at least an equal share in its administration.

### The Schuman Plan

The Labour Government and the Labour Party are absolutely right when they refuse to be hoodwinked by the plan. The capitalists of America are out to undermine nationalisation. The Wall Street financiers are the real power behind the Schuman plan. Schuman is only a stooge.

The so-called Schuman Plan is not actually coming from France. France has neither the power nor the prestige. This is the policy of the American capitalist class to halt nationalisation. It is they who prayed for the defeat of the Labour Government in February, 1950. They do not care about the British voters' wishes. They, and the old Nazi bosses who are back in power in the Ruhr, want to be able to say to the pits of South Wales: *not half of you will be required*; or to certain steelworks: *you must go out of existence.*

### War and Peace

Lastly we cannot avoid the international situation. External affairs are more and more influencing the course of matters at home.

Many of those deploring aggression by the North Koreans are showing they are not

averse to aggression themselves. These people must be stopped. First of all this war in Korea must be limited and peace restored. The United Nations to all intents and purposes no longer exists. It must be reconstituted by recognition of China and the return of Russia to the Security Council.

Some people, however, are saying it is not enough to push the North Koreans back into their own territory. Certain gentlemen want British troops to march into North Korea and to stay there. These people will drag us all into a world war if we are not careful.

There is no doubt that in a world war the bases occupied by the Americans round Soviet territory would be used in an attempt to destroy the sources of Russian industrial production.

That would not be the Soviet strategy. They learnt from what happened in the last world war. The Germans made the mistake of concentrating on the destruction of life in London. Had they concentrated their attack on the great airfields immediately North and South of London we might not have survived.

Therefore the Soviet Union will concentrate on a great offensive on the air bases of those who attack them. Because Britain is the great floating base of the American air force the bombs will come down here—and they will in all probability come down rapidly and effectively.

We, in this country, will be in the first line of attack. We have agreed to this and therefore we cannot complain. War is not fought with kid gloves on.

## That Compensation Question Again

That all sections of the working class very much resent having to keep the stockholders in idleness and luxury while the workers have wage-freezing inflicted upon them, is shown in the following resolutions. The first was carried UNANIMOUSLY at the recent Annual Conference of the **National Union of Railwaymen**. The second will appear on the Agenda of the Labour Party National Conference in October in the name of the **Edgbaston (Birmingham) Labour Party**.

**"That this Conference cannot agree to wage-freezing, more production, higher prices and worsened conditions in order to pay well over £30 million per annum to railway stockholders, for 90 years, and a further £3 million into a redemption fund for 90 years, to buy out the late owners, making a total of £3,200 million to be paid for a transport system ruined and neglected for years in the interests of dividend and profit. We demand that all national legislation dealing with national transport be revised with a view to curtailing the 90 years' guarantee of interest."**

*"That Conference believes that the colossal sum of £84 million, which is paid annually to the ex-owners of nationalised industries is a severe drain on the country's resources, especially in view of the present economic crises.*

*"Conference declares that this money would be better used in modernising these industries and in raising the standard of living for the many underpaid workers in them.*

*"Conference therefore demands the immediate suspension of all compensation interest payments to ex-owners of nationalised industries, except in cases where hardship can be proved."*

# Asia Fights Imperialism

## Korea is part of the Colonial Revolution

By M. BANDA—A Ceylon Socialist

**T**HE war in Korea has been raging for three weeks. The blood of Korean, American and British soldiers is being spilled in a war that would never have broken out if the "Allies" of 1945 had kept faith with the Korean people and granted the right of self-determination. The dead and horribly mutilated bodies of the inhabitants of Yongdok, "totally destroyed" by the guns of British and American battleships, are a grim testimony to the utter failure of Big Power diplomacy.

In 1945, Korea was arbitrarily divided at the 38th parallel into two hermetically-sealed spheres of influence. The industrial North, with its resources of coal, iron, and electricity, was cut off from the agricultural South, the granary of Korea. This disorganisation of Korean economy was a brazen violation of the Cairo Conference decisions of 1943 which stated that after Japan had been defeated "Korea shall become free and independent."

But the dismemberment of Korea was no exceptional case. It conformed to the general pattern of military occupation and division into spheres of influence which followed the termination of the second world war.

Let us remember that Indo-China too was occupied and underwent a similar division (at the 16th parallel) which was only cancelled out through the forcible intervention of the Viet Nameese people under the leadership of the Viet Minh.

Faced with the combined weight of the armies of their "liberators," the Korean people were powerless to defend themselves and the country was divided.

In the South, the democratically elected People's Committees which represented the people's power, were dispersed and suppressed by General MacArthur. In the North, these committees were bureaucratically transformed into props of a regime upon the people by the sheer weight of Russian military and diplomatic pressure.

Nevertheless, there still exists a qualitative difference between the administrations in North and South. Whereas MacArthur, because of his policy of propping up reaction in the South, did not, and still does not have a vestige of support amongst the South Koreans, the regime of Kim Ir Sen, on the other hand, was able to win the support of the peasantry and a considerable section of the working class because of its policy of monetary stabilisation, agrarian reform, abolition of illiteracy, and nationalisation of industries belonging to collaborators of the Japanese. The morale and heroism of the North Korean troops is testimony to this fact.

### The Cold War in Korea

One United Nations Commission followed another into Korea to see whether a provisional government could be established for the whole country but, as the "trustees" had already fallen out with each other, no agreement was reached. The frontier at the 38th parallel remained—and so did the occupation troops.

In May, 1948, separate elections were held in South Korea under the supervision of a U.N. commission. These elections, boycotted

by the entire Left and Centre, resulted in a victory for the extreme Right. In this way the puppet regime of Syngman Rhee came to power. The economic division of Korea was now supplemented by a political division. The results are well-known.

Opposition leaders like Kim Su, who opposed the Four Power trusteeship agreement and advocated peaceful unification of Korea, were assassinated.

Meanwhile, American dollars and military equipment poured into the South. In 1949, Syngman Rhee's administration received 150,000,000 dollars and a further 33,000,000 were granted in January, 1950 as the first instalment of a long-term loan of 300,000,000 dollars.

Commenting on these loans, Acheson made the significant, even apocalyptic remark, that without this U.S. assistance the South Korean Government would perish within two to three months.

### A Regime of Terror

The demand for unification grew. Clan-destine elections organised in the South by the Northern Government showed that 77 per cent. of the Southern electorate was

in favour of national unification. To this Syngman Rhee replied with violence, terror, and provocation. Mass arrests were the order of the day in South Korea. At one time, 14,000 political prisoners filled the jails. Border provocations increased. Even press correspondents attached to U.N. Commissions were imprisoned for "unpatriotic activity."

After all this, was it not abundantly clear to the people of Korea that unification would never be achieved through the good offices of the United Nations Organisation. The intervention of the Korean people themselves was seen as the only way out.

The UNO Commission admitted its own bankruptcy in stating in its Report that "the country faced the serious danger of a most barbarous civil war," and admitted that there was a general belief among the Korean people that America and Russia "are responsible for the present plight of the country and have left it in the lurch."

It was undoubtedly the fact of this impending CIVIL WAR that motivated UNO and the United States in their recognition of South Korea and granting it a seat on the General Assembly in February of this year. The application of the North for similar treatment was, of course, refused.

Furthermore, the loss of China and the exodus of Chiang and his parasitic clique from the Chinese mainland enhanced the already vital importance of Korea as a strategic base for operations against the new China and Russia in a coming world war.

No wonder then that MacArthur was determined to defend Congressional "democracy" and free enterprise in Korea at all costs—and what a cost!

### Asia Marches

The statement of Mr. Attlee in the House of Commons supporting the American invasion

*continued column 1, page 5*



Stand firm against the warmakers

## Editorial

# WHAT IS AT STAKE IN KOREA

**P**RESIDENT TRUMAN'S reply to Nehru's proposals for "mediation" in the Korean conflict has been—to order the spending of £3,750,000,000 on war preparations! What further proof is needed to demonstrate that America is bent on war—war against the colonial peoples, war against the Soviet Union, war on all nations and all social movements that stand in the way of her drive for absolute world domination.

This is the reactionary purpose which the troops of General MacArthur serve in Korea—and it is not one bit less reactionary for having received the support of our own Labour Government and the approval of some British "socialists" who pride themselves on being very "left," very "progressive," and very anxious to preserve world peace.

It is a sorry spectacle, nevertheless, to see the entire parliamentary Labour Party—with the honourable exception of **Stephen Davies** and **Emrys Hughes**—entering thus into open alliance with Winston Churchill and General MacArthur. Yet there is little real cause for surprise. The possession of colonies has corrupted and demoralised the British labour movement more than is generally realised. So much so that our "socialist" War Minister can personally take part in the hunting of Malayan "rebels" and declare it to be "a fascinating experience." While even Fenner Brockway, who is the Chairman of the Congress of Peoples AGAINST Imperialism, can now find reasons for supporting imperialist America's present attempt to crush the Korean people.

As for the *Tribune*—erstwhile journal of "left" socialism—it has now become so blatantly imperialist that it sternly rebukes even those few M.P.s who, having supported the Government's actions in Korea, now plead pathetically for a "localisation" of the conflict. Even this kind of shame-faced support for imperialism is not good enough for *Tribune* whose Editors now demand nothing less than a loud "hurrah" for General MacArthur, and a pat on the back for the admiral who ordered the "total destruction" of Yongdok.

## ASIA FIGHTS (continued)

sion is something the colonial peoples will neither forget or forgive. Not even the overtly reactionary Senanayake regime in Ceylon, not even the covertly reactionary government of Nehru in India have as yet dared to identify themselves completely with this American aggression. And why not? *Because they fear the consequences which such an action would provoke throughout India and Ceylon.*

400,000,000 million people in China have already freed themselves from the yoke of imperialism. In Korea, another 30,000,000 are in the process of smashing the same fetters which bound them in feudal slavery and imperialist oppression for the last half-century.

This is no "police action against a bunch of bandits" as the President has called it. It is one more link in the chain of colonial revolutions running throughout the whole of Asia. It is, above all, a struggle which neither the frail hand of Nehru nor the leaden fist of MacArthur can stop. The

## The Position of the "Socialist Outlook"

Our stand on Korea was clearly defined in a special supplement issued a few days after the fighting began. We are *against* all imperialist intervention in Korea. We are *for* the unification of that country and its freedom from imperialist domination. While the armies of the North fight for these aims we consider they deserve the support of the world working class. We believe that UNO has been exposed as the tool of world imperialism, and we urge the workers and the colonial peoples to place no further trust in it. We are convinced that the victory of all colonial peoples against imperialism is one of the surest ways to secure a lasting world peace.

## We Are Criticised

We did not expect our stand to find much favour with those who grant a civilising mission to Wall Street's armies. However, we have also been severely criticised by comrades who, whilst they agree that America's role is reactionary and have the courage to demand the withdrawal of all British troops from Korea, nevertheless consider that Russia too is imperialist and equally bent on world domination. These comrades look upon both North and South Korea as simply the helpless puppets of Russian and American imperialism, and consequently, they refuse to support either side. A plague on both your houses, they say, but keep Britain out of it.

This point of view, do doubt, finds considerable support in the movement, but is there any truth in it? In our opinion, very little.

Japanese workers have already demonstrated in strikes their solidarity with the Korean workers. In China, Mao Tse Tung and Chou En Lai have accepted America's challenge on Formosa and are preparing to invade this 49th State of U.S. imperialism. And it is only a matter of time before the other Asian peoples show their hostility towards the American invaders and their determination to end imperialism once and for all.

The peoples of Asia desire peace no less than the workers in Europe, but "peace" to them is a mockery if it is to be maintained by imperialist batons and bayonets. We cherish our independence and freedom and are prepared to lay down our lives for these rights even at the cost of imperilling a peace which is imposed upon the colonial peoples by arms. Peace will be secured in Asia, as in the rest of the world, only on the basis of Socialism—but Socialism and Peace can never be reconciled with Imperialism and War. One of the other must perish. Let the British workers add their strength to the side of the colonial peoples and thus ensure the complete victory of Socialism.

## The Colonial Revolution

In the first place, these comrades are so obsessed with the antagonism between Russia and America (which is, of course, reflected in Korea) that they have quite overlooked the fact that there is also in Korea a CIVIL WAR. A civil war which is part of the world-wide movement of the colonial peoples for national liberation.

We do not accept for one moment the idea that this mighty colonial revolution, which now fires the imagination of millions of workers and poor farmers in China, Indo-China, Malaya, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Korea, is—or ever can be—the mere plaything of Moscow. It is, on the contrary, a social revolution as great in its implications for the future of all mankind as was the Russian Revolution of 1917. It is a move-

## The Parliamentary "Opposition"

**Sydney Silverman**, writing in *Tribune* on his Motion which is supported by, among others, **Fenner Brockway**, **Ellis Smith**, and **Mrs. Braddock**, says "*The North Koreans are the aggressors . . . If the United Nations decide, as an essential pre-condition, that (they) should retire behind the 38th parallel, there is nothing in the motion to withhold support from that decision.*" "*None of our proposals is in serious conflict with the Government's declared policy.*"

Are we wrong to call this motion "shame-faced support for imperialism?"

ment aimed at the very heart of imperialism because, without colonies into which it can pour its "surplus" commodities and its "surplus" capital, world imperialism will choke to death with its own "surpluses."

## Can We Be Neutral?

Of course Russia has a very great interest in the Korean fighting. She may even be actively aiding the North. But this does not alter the fact that some 30 million Koreans are engaged in civil war involving such great social questions as the ownership of the land and the rights of the nations to self-determination. This is an anti-imperialist struggle, a progressive struggle and, in its implications, a socialist struggle. If we claim to be anti-imperialist ourselves we must give it our full support. How can we be neutral towards those who are fighting the very same people—the British imperialists—against whom the Labour movement has itself been struggling for over 100 years!

Anyone who has an ounce of feeling for the spirit of revolt which now animates the colonial peoples must rejoice at the victories of the North Korean armies over the forces of world imperialism. They are victories of the poor over the rich, of the oppressed over their oppressors. And this fact alone—not any legal quibbles about who first crossed the "frontier," or whether Russia provides arms for the North—should determine for socialists which side to support and which side to resolutely oppose.

But, someone will object, the leadership of the North—even if it is the progressive side in the struggle—is in the hands of men who owe allegiance to Moscow. That may be true, but, if it is, then it is primarily due to the utter failure of our social democracy to offer any kind of an alternative leadership. Support for General MacArthur is not an alternative—it is an insult. And neutrality is very little better.

continued page 6, column 1.

## Editorial (continued)

### Russia's Role

We have no wish to deny that Russia supports the North. But we *do* deny that their support is given to **Kim Ir Sen** for the same reasons which motivate Wall Street's support for **Syngam Rhee**. In other words, it is wrong to label the foreign policy of Russia as *imperialist*.

Imperialism is the policy of monopoly capitalism, but the economy of Russia is *not* capitalist. On the contrary, it is the product of a workers' revolution which, in 1917, changed the old capitalist order of things and introduced, for the first time in history, conscious human planning into economic affairs.

If Russia can to-day lend aid and support to the progressive side in Korea, it is precisely because the victory of the colonial peoples does not endanger Russia's *planned* economy. In fact, the very existence of the non-capitalist Soviet Union is an encouragement to the struggles of the oppressed peoples for national liberation. What is more, world imperialism knows this and, consequently, is determined on a show-down with the Soviet Union.

We are far from suggesting that the Russian Government, at all times and under all conditions, supports progressive movements. Unfortunately, it doesn't. We have only to cast our minds back to India in 1942 to find Moscow *actively* opposing the struggle then being waged against British imperialism by the Indian people and the Indian Congress Party.

Russian foreign policy is determined by what the government of that country considers is in the best interest of the Soviet Union, but that, as India proved, *does not, by any means, always coincide with what is in the best interests of the international working class*. Or even, in the long run, the best interest of the Soviet Union itself.

Nevertheless—and this is the point under discussion—if it suits her purpose the Russian Government CAN for the reasons given above, support progressive movements of national and social liberation. Imperialism NEVER CAN.

### Who May Criticise Russia?

It is often argued, and in our opinion correctly, that the leadership provided by Moscow to these progressive movements is neither as *consistent* nor as *socialist* as we would like it to be. Unfortunately, however, most of Moscow's critics are *themselves in the camp of imperialism*. Is it any wonder then that the colonial peoples treat criticism from such people with complete contempt. What would a striker think of a *blackleg*, an employer's man, who dared to criticise the leadership of a strike! Yet that is the position of critics like the *Tribune*. They are blacklegs.

**Only those who stand shoulder to shoulder with the workers and the colonial peoples in every manifestation of revolt against imperialism have the right to criticise Moscow's leadership.**

We ourselves have criticisms of Russia's role. But we do not say to the North Koreans—"first you must accept our criticisms, and then perhaps we will support you." They would rightly tell us to—*go to hell!* We support them *first*, and that—and that only—gives us the right to criticise.

# SOCIALIST FELLOWSHIP NEWS

## National Council adopts resolutions on Peace—Ireland—Wages

FRED EMMETT, the National Secretary, was able to report steady progress when he opened the first meeting of the *Socialist Fellowship National Council* held in London on June 25th. Besides members of the National Committee delegates were present from Manchester, Liverpool, East Midlands, West Midlands, Yorkshire, South Wales and London.

34 local Fellowships were now in existence, and others in the process of formation. And this despite serious lack of finance—due in the main to the postponement of the raising of a "development fund" in order not to clash with the all-out effort of the Party at the time of the General Election. All indications showed that, during the Election, Fellowship members were everywhere in the forefront of the campaign.

We must guard against two extremes, said the National Secretary. On the one hand the tendency to become a small society of knowledgeable intellectuals who meet once in a while for a drawing room discussion, and on the other hand the tendency to regard the Fellowship as some sort of separate Party, engaging in activity separate from and distinct from that of the local Labour Parties.

Our job, he continued, is to work *within* the Party, actively and conscientiously, building the Party and at the same time campaigning for the adoption of a real socialist policy. In line with this, we should do all in our power to increase the sales of the *Socialist Outlook*, bearing in mind that every new reader for the *Outlook* is a potential new member of the *Fellowship*.

### Policy Resolutions Adopted

The national council unanimously defined its attitude toward the British Peace Committee with the following resolution:

*The National Council of the Socialist Fellowship does not lend its support to the Peace Campaign of the British Peace Committee as the programme presented in this campaign completely ignores the real struggle for peace, which is inseparable from the struggle for Socialism.*

### How to Achieve Peace

On this issue we do not agree with the leadership of the Soviet Union. There is a distinct flavour of power politics about Moscow's attempt to secure peace in Korea in return for an extra seat on the Security Council.

There is, of course, no valid legal reason why the Chinese Peoples' Republic should not be represented. It is a government which has the support of about 99 per cent. of the Chinese people, and it has in fact been formally recognised by our own Labour Government.

But—and this is our criticism—how will the return of Russia and China to the Security Council ensure world peace? Is it seriously considered that the exercise of the veto will in any way stop America's carefully laid plans for world domination?

We do not think so, and therefore we shall continue to say—*whatever Moscow's policy might be*—that world peace will only be

*The National Council of the Socialist Fellowship considers that the following programme is essential in any real struggle against war, but none of these points is contained in the propaganda of the British Peace Committee.*

- (1) *The end of colonial exploitation and the granting of immediate freedom to all the colonial peoples.*
- (2) *The nationalisation of all war industries, including the production of atomic material, under the control of the working class.*
- (3) *The vote at 18.*
- (4) *The ending of conscription.*
- (5) *No participation in the war plans of Imperialism, as for example, the Atlantic Pact.*
- (6) *The Socialist United States of Europe—and an end to the present policy of occupation and reparations.*

It confirmed its complete opposition to any form of wage freezing, and referred to the National Committee a resolution calling for a revision of the cost of living index.

**In relation to Ireland the National Council of the Socialist Fellowship is of the opinion that it would be in the best interest of the British Labour Party, and indeed of International Socialism, to withdraw the British Armed Forces from Northern Ireland and allow the whole country to unite.**

On housing, it deplored the lack of direct labour schemes on some councils under Labour control, and recorded its opposition to cuts in housing standards, urging instead increased attacks on profits to bring down costs.

The Korean events had not broken out at the time of this meeting, but an attitude to them is being actively discussed at the moment and a decision will soon be taken on this important question.

It was decided to call a National Conference of Fellowships at the end of September.

secured when the colonial peoples, aided by the workers in the metropolitan centres, have overthrown imperialism which is the basic cause of war. We shall continue to urge the workers to place no reliance at all in any form of a United Nations Organisation.

China's Foreign Minister, **Chou En Lai**, perfectly expresses our point of view in these words:

*"The Chinese people firmly believe that all the oppressed nations of the world are undoubtedly capable of burying once and for all the hated American imperialist war mongers in the course of the struggle for national independence."*

There is no talk here of UNO being the way to world peace. Instead, there is a clear call to rely solely on our own strength. These are fine words and we subscribe to them wholeheartedly. It is our aim to convince a majority of the rank and file of the British Labour Movement to subscribe to them also.



### Korea and Keir Hardie

"In war truth is the first casualty," said Lord Ponsonby.

From now on the peoples of the world will be fed on atrocity stories. In both the American and Russian blocs they will be supplied through the newspapers, radios and cinemas with accounts of their enemies' devilishness. The fact is, of course, that there will be atrocities on both sides—including atomic bombing.

Despite three years' cold war, however, a large number of active Labour Party members and trade unionists are not deceived. Instead they are adopting the attitude of Keir Hardie and the international socialists of World War I: "We fight neither for German nor British imperialism, but against the war which is not in the interests of any people."

Similarly, we are not prepared to wage a war for the Wall Street millionaires or the Kremlin commissars in their bid for world domination.

When Stephen Davies and Emrys Hughes asked in Parliament for the British Navy to be brought back from Korea they were absolutely right. We should go further and ask the Americans to remove their bombers from Britain which is otherwise going to be a distinctly unhealthy place to live in.

Manchester.

L. Ball.

### Korea—Who Is Progressive?

I agree with Stephen Davies that we should bring back the navy; I am against the war; I believe that to "defend UNO" means, in present circumstances, fighting for the Yanks. Our Government should go further and ask the Americans to remove their bombers from Britain.

I strongly disagree that the armies of the North "are pursuing a progressive war." The Northerners are as much puppets of the Kremlin as the Southerners are of Wall Street. I think the Russians took a wicked step that may land us all in an atomic war when they gave the O.K. to the Northerners.

I don't like the Kremlin any more than I like American big businessmen. I think they are both out for world domination—the former because as a political dictatorship they are obsessed with power, the latter because their warehouses are bursting with goods which need a world market.

My attitude is the same as Keir Hardie's in World War I. Once you start to think, one side is better than the other; from that moment you are guilty of bringing the war a bit nearer.

Manchester.

F. Allain.

### Anti-War Group

I think perhaps some of your ex-service readers will be interested to know of the formation of the **Ex-Service Men's Anti-War Group** which at its recent inaugural meeting adopted the following four points:

★ Correspondence should be as brief as possible and addressed to The Editor, 6 Station Road, London, N.11

1. We respect the individual conscience of members in relation to their obligations to the community.

2. We aim to unite all ex-service men and women who believe that none of our present-day problems can be solved by war. We refuse to regard war as inevitable.

3. We call upon the British Government (a) to resume and persist in fresh attempts to secure international discussion of hydrogen and atomic bombs and their control; and (b) to dissociate itself from the power blocs of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., and act as mediator for a peaceful settlement.

4. We believe that the present arms expenditure at the yearly rate of £16 for every person in the country is crippling our economic recovery; we affirm that housing, health and education must be our first priority.

We shall be glad if all who are sympathetic to the view we express would write to our **Secretary, 147a High Street, Sevenoaks, Kent.**

Sevenoaks.

Lyn Mostyn.

### Greetings from Israel

It is with a feeling of great satisfaction that I received the news of the existence of your journal *Socialist Outlook*, serving, if I am not mistaken as the organ of the *Socialist Fellowship*, left-wing group, within the Labour Party.

There is many a Socialist in Israel who looks forward eagerly towards the renewal of the traditional friendship between the Israeli and the British labour movement. This time not on the political basis of the official Labour Party and its counterpart—*Mapai*, neither on the basis of Stalinism and its fellow travellers, as represented in this country by the self-Stalinised party, *Mapam*. Rather on the plane of real, genuine Socialism, in the spirit of workers' internationalism, independent both of Russian Stalinism and dollar imperialism.

It is in this spirit that I send my comradely greetings and best wishes for the success of your journal and organisation.

Affula (Israel).

N. Sreh

(Israeli Socialist).

\* \* \*

### Editor's Note:

We are grateful for the good wishes of our Israeli comrade and can assure him that we shall always endeavour to carry out a true policy of international socialism. However, our correspondent is mistaken in his belief that our paper is the organ of the *Socialist Fellowship*. We give that organisation every support, but the policy of the *Socialist Outlook*, while it very often coincides with the *Socialist Fellowship*, is not determined or controlled by it.

## German Workers appreciate 'Outlook' Stand against Dismantling

Dear Friends,

We have received issues 5 and 6 (May and June) of *Socialist Outlook* and are delighted to see that, in the true spirit of socialist international solidarity, you are attacking the decision to dismantle the factory at Watenstedt-Salzgitter, because of the fate of the workers there.

Ever since the publication of the list of factories scheduled for dismantling, we have fought alone, and without help or support from outside, against this destruction of the means of livelihood of thousands of workers and the misery which would result from it.

For a long time we had no success in our efforts to get understanding and sympathy. Although lip service was paid now and again to solidarity, there were never any practical manifestations of it.

We have brought the article in your paper to the notice of the union and have also published the two declarations of sympathy and support agreeing with it. As a result of this we were able to experience the value of such demonstrations of practical solidarity and have seen the eagerness of the workers here to fight shoulder to shoulder with friends all over the world who are in the same position. Your concern with our fate made a great impression on our colleagues and the wish was expressed on all sides that the bonds of comradeship should be strengthened and that a truly international socialist community should arise.

We thank you for the support you have given us and are thereby strengthened for a continuance of the fight against dismantling and for the interests of the workers

With socialist greetings

Best

Socialist Outlook

(London Office of the Publishers of the International Socialist Review)

## Security Council Decision Legally Indefensible

Says K. ZILLIACUS

THE United States has called its armed intervention in Korea "self-defence." The Labour Government's representative on the Security Council endorsed this monstrous claim and helped our American masters to railroad a decision through that body condemning North Korea, *unheard*, as an aggressor, without the vote of the Soviet Union and *with the vote of a Chinese gentleman whom neither our Government nor the U.S.S.R. recognises as representing China.* That was a legally indefensible and politically disastrous and dangerous decision.

Either the conflict in Korea is a civil war. If so, Article 2, par. 7 of the Charter of the United Nations is clear and to the point: "*Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorise the United Nations to interfere in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State.*"

Or the conflict is a clash between U.S. and Soviet power politics over Korea (which is not a member of the United Nations). If so, Art. 27 of the Charter lays it down that the Security Council cannot take a decision on matters of substance (as distinguished from

### LABOUR LEAGUE OF YOUTH

Labour LEAGUE of Youth

Pressure on our limited space has forced us to hold over the Youth material until our next issue. Another reason why you must help us to get that

### WEEKLY PAPER

WEEKLY PAPER

procedure) *unless it secures the concurring votes of 7 of its 11 members, including all five of the permanent members (the U.S.A., U.S.S.R., Britain, France and China).* In case of disputes the votes of the parties are not counted.

When it comes to the dread issue of peace or war, the Charter, as the Foreign Office Commentary points out (Cmd. 6666, 1945), is based on the necessity for unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council: "*When enforcement action is necessary, the complete unanimity of the Great Powers is always required.*" The F.O. Commentary explains that "*It is imperative that the consent of the Great Powers should be necessary to action,*" because "*no enforcement action by the N.U. Organisation can be taken against a great power itself without a major war. If such a situation arises the United Nations will have failed in its purpose.*"

We are being dragged step by step into a world war as the helpless stooges of American power politics and imperialism, and the U.N. Charter has been most shamelessly twisted to serve this purpose. Socialists should dig in their toes and cry "halt!" We should vigorously oppose sending any British conscript lads to be slaughtered in Korea under the command of the reactionary, bellicose, brash and incompetent politician-General MacArthur.

## THE CAMPAIGN FOR THE WEEKLY

TO produce the *Socialist Outlook* as a weekly paper we shall need **£5,000 in ready cash**, plus—a guarantee of **£50 per week** coming into the "Fighting Fund" for the first three months.

A weekly paper is much more costly than a monthly. A monthly can be (as the *Outlook* has been) produced by the voluntary labour of a band of enthusiastic comrades giving up their evenings and week-ends. But a weekly needs a **full-time staff.**

A monthly can, for two or three evenings a month, take over someone's front room for packing, despatching, etc. But a weekly will have to have an office of its own.

To cover these expenses we must at least **DOUBLE THE CIRCULATION.** Until we do, we shall be running at a loss. This will take time (we estimate three months) and **heavy expenses**, in circularising, advertising, etc.

### How you can help

1. Become a shareholder yourself, and get your T.U. or L.P. to take out shares.
2. Become a regular collector for our "Fighting Fund" among your friends and workmates.
3. Double your sales—particularly among the lads and lasses at work.

For more detailed information please fill in the form below.

### FIGHTING FUND

#### GRATEFULLY ACKNOWLEDGED

	£	s.	d.
Manchester Readers per H.			
Ratner .. .. .	9	0	
J. D. W. Nottingham .. .. .	2	0	
K. Lamptey .. .. .	2	0	
S. Ojiako .. .. .	2	0	
N. Dinning .. .. .	1	0	0
J. Duffy .. .. .		6	0
Manchester Readers per H.			
Ratner .. .. .	9	0	
F. Blackman .. .. .	2	0	
Birkenhead Readers per A. Rose	10	0	
H. Hopkins .. .. .	2	12	0
Eve Brown .. .. .		9	6
G. Duffy .. .. .		4	5
Eltham E.T.U. .. .. .	1	0	0
American Seaman .. .. .	1	0	0
G. Norris (Fighting Fund Card)	16	6	
H. Brown .. .. .		7	0
G. Duffy .. .. .		2	6
D. Barns .. .. .		7	0
H. Hopkins .. .. .		4	0
J. Lightfoot .. .. .		2	0
<b>Total .. .. .</b>	<b>£10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>

To the **BUSINESS MANAGER, LABOUR PUBLISHING SOCIETY LTD.**  
6 Station Road, London, N.11

Please send me details of how I can help to make the *SOCIALIST OUTLOOK* a Weekly Paper.

Name.....

Address.....

### Subscription to "Socialist Outlook"

Enclosed please find P.O. for 3s. for

12 issues starting with.....

Name .....

Address .....

Date.....

**Socialist Outlook, 6 Station Road,  
New Southgate, London, N.11**

Labour Parties and Trade Unions please note: Special rates for bundle orders. All orders of 12 or more for *Socialist Outlook* will be supplied at 25% discount. Take advantage of this offer and order your copies to-day. Please cross: /& Co./ all cheques and postal orders.

### Labour Publishing Society Limited. APPLICATION for MEMBERSHIP

I hereby apply for membership of Labour Publishing Society Ltd., and enclose £ s. d. for £1 shares, together with 1s. for a copy of the rules.

SIGNED .....

NAME .....

(Mr., Mrs. or Miss) (Block Capitals)

ADDRESS.....

Occupation .....

Date.....

Are you over 16 years of age?.....  
Send to: Labour Publishing Society Ltd.,  
6 Station Road, New Southgate, London,  
N.11. Please cross /& Co./ all cheques  
and postal orders.