

Join the  
**LABOUR PARTY**  
TODAY

# Socialist Outlook

WEEKLY

No. 128

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

FRIDAY, MAY 7th, 1954

3d.

Help the Fight  
**AGAINST**  
**TORYISM**  
and **WAR!**

## London's May Day Sparks

**M**ORE than 7,000 workers marched to Hyde Park in Labour's May Day demonstration on Sunday. This was the loyal and enthusiastic core of the movement, marching cheerfully through heavy rain. Eleven bands provided nondescript marches, but in the band's intervals the marchers seized every opportunity to sing the "Red Flag."

The march culminated in a rally at Hyde Park, where Herbert Morrison was the main speaker. On such a cold and miserable day the rank and file made it clear that they wanted something much hotter and stronger than Mr. Morrison. The most popular slogan chanted by a majority of the crowd was "We want Bevan."

It is difficult to give an account of Mr. Morrison's speech, as it was largely drowned by the indignant crowd, but he plodded doggedly on, accusing his critics in the audience of being Tories, Fascists and Communists. In fact, however, they were, in the main Labour Party members who wanted a platform more representative of rank and file opinion. Many of them waved their membership cards to prove it, but inevitably Mr. Morrison could make no other reply than to raise the red bogey.

Labour crowds are normally good-natured and very keen to give fair play to speakers, and it is all the more significant that Mr. Morrison's reception was so hostile.

The speaker preceding Mr. Morrison was a member of the League of Youth. The crowd were sympathetic and he started well by saying "Comrades", which received rousing applause, but he soon threw away this goodwill and made a pathetic exhibition. Unable to find a fluent right-winger in the League, apparently, the London Labour Party made the League of Youth a laughing stock.

The speaker referred frequently to the fact that youth has problems, but he was far too scared to mention the problems (conscription, the probable third world war, living with 'in-laws', etc.), let alone suggest any remedies.

There is no doubt that both the youth and the Party generally are getting tired of their official spokesmen, and May Day next year might be a much brighter affair.

A. Wise

# GOOD-BYE MR. DULLES!

## And Don't Come Back

**A** MERICAN plans to intervene in France's war against the people of Indo-China have had to be abandoned—at least temporarily—in face of the firmness of the revolutionary peoples of Asia and the widespread opposition which the "massive retaliation" talk of Mr. Dulles has aroused in France and Britain—America's closest allies.

### Editorial

That is the meaning of Mr. Dulles' withdrawal from the Geneva Conference. It is an American diplomatic Dunkirk.

The American threat of armed intervention in Indo-China tied to the full support of the Syngman Rhee regime in Korea received unqualified backing from... South Korea, Colombia, Turkey and Thailand! Even the Australian delegate felt obliged to ask the Geneva Conference to give "serious consideration" to General Nam Il's proposals for a solution to the Korean problem.

As for Eden and Bidault—representatives of America's leading allies in any war in South East Asia—they didn't speak at all! Unable to support the American plan for armed intervention, and lacking either the military or social strength to make independent proposals of their own, these two spokesmen for a doomed system of nineteenth century imperialism were obliged to hand over the leadership of the Geneva meeting to... North Korea, China and the U.S.S.R.

Thus is reflected in the diplomatic field the real relationship of forces in the world today.

It is not difficult to understand the present diplomatic paralysis of the French and British Tories. Both lack any semblance of popular support for a war against Indo-China inevitably involving total war against both China and Russia. Last Tuesday's "Times" summed it up in these words: Churchill's decision not to intervene in Indo-China was made because "public opinion in the United Kingdom would not countenance a military intervention in south-east Asia (and) the countries of the Commonwealth—particularly India—would be seriously disturbed by intervention in a war which retains for

them some aspects of a 'colonial struggle.'

That the peoples of India would be "seriously disturbed" by a further imperialist adventure in south-east Asia is a typical "Times" understatement. For "disturbed" one should read "angered to the point of alliance with China to resist American aggression!"

At all events, it is clear that Churchill has been forced to recognise what must be, for him, most uncomfortable facts.

After popular approval of Aneurin Bevan's resignation from Labour's Front Bench had indicated clearly enough that Labour would not go along with the Tories in support of Dulles, and after Prime Minister Nehru's forthright statements, Churchill had little choice but to dissociate himself from any possible armed intervention.

Under these conditions, for America to have proceeded with

her much-trumpeted plan for aiding the French would have meant... going it alone! And such a prospect no American Government is—for the time being at any rate—prepared to face up to.

Dulles was therefore confronted with the choice of either staying at Geneva and participating in an attempt to reach a solution to the Korean and Indo-Chinese problems or... withdrawing altogether. (The possibility of extracting significant concessions from the Chinese was out of the question for the same reasons that made armed intervention unrealistic).

That Dulles chose to withdraw is proof that the United States is not willing to achieve any real solution, is not prepared to recognise the right of the Asian peoples to independence and is not prepared to stop interfering in the affairs of other countries.

With such an attitude—and lacking the will to "go it alone"—American diplomacy found itself

in a dilemma which has been neatly described by Walter Lippman. Writing in the "New York Herald Tribune," he said, "The American position at Geneva is impossible, so long as leading Republican senators have no terms for peace except an unconditional surrender of the enemy, and no terms for entering the war except as collective action in which nobody is now willing to engage."

Lippman therefore advised Dulles to withdraw "for the time being" to the sidelines and, albeit with a considerable display of bad temper, Dulles has accepted this advice.

True enough, this sideline position carries with it a threat of sabotage of any agreement which may eventually be arrived at in Geneva—but this should not detract from the obvious fact that a sideline position represents a definite diplomatic defeat for the Almighty Dollar.

The tremendous movement for national and social liberation which is sweeping across all Asia will not be stopped by threats of "massive retaliation." Indeed, the mere making of such threats while it does not deter in the least the armies of Ho Chi Minh, arouses widespread anti-war sentiments among the British and French peoples thus further disrupting the Holy Alliance of World Reaction.

Should the rulers of the United States ignore the writing on the wall and still plunge into the Asian Revolution—without allies, without reliable bases and surrounded by a bitterly hostile Asiatic population—they will, it is true, bring misery and terrible bloodshed to all mankind.

But they will not, in our opinion, stop the forward march of the oppressed peoples.

The quicker the peoples of Europe and America create Governments which recognise that fact—and act accordingly—the quicker will the peace of the world be assured. For Britain that means the election of a Labour Government which will end the old colonialism and thus place itself, in the words of Harold Wilson, "on the side of the revolution in Asia and not on the side of the oppressors."

## The Reason For Mr. Dulles' Failure

Chinese peasants burning the landlord's title deeds. This is the Asian Revolution which Mr. Dulles can't stop.



# A Rallying Call From Holborn

## ★ A Local Party Takes Action ★

**O**N February 24th, during the Debate on the Berlin Conference, Mr. Herbert Morrison told the House of Commons that the differences of opinion in the Labour Party on German Re-armament "are sincerely held and are convictions that we must fairly discuss and mutually respect."

The Holborn and St. Pancras South Constituency Labour Party has taken these words seriously and issued at its own expense a carefully reasoned document stating "The Case AGAINST German Re-armament." The document has been sent to all Labour Parties, Co-op Parties, Trade Unions, Labour M.P.s and to Transport House and the London Labour Party.

Summarising their statement, the officers of Holborn and St. Pancras South C.L.P. declare:—

**1 GERMAN RE-ARMAMENT IS INCONSISTENT WITH LABOUR POLICY.**

The decision of the National Executive Committee to support the re-armament and inclusion in the European Defence

Community of Western Germany was contrary to the resolutions on Germany of the Margate Conference and inconsistent with the declared principles and aims of Labour's foreign policy.

**2 E.D.C. USELESS FOR DEFENCE.**

In case of war E.D.C. would be powerless to avert the destruction in a few days of our cities and industrial centres and the wiping out of most of our population by atomic and hydrogen bombs.

**3 GERMAN RE-ARMAMENT MEANS WAR.**

The re-armament of Western Germany will probably provoke a world war because a divided, re-armed Germany will be reactionary, aggressive and bent on recovering its lost Eastern territories by threatening and ultimately resorting to force.

**4 THE ALTERNATIVE.**

The Labour Party is pledged, since the Margate Conference, to make "further efforts" to

come to terms with the Soviet Union on the establishment of a "united, democratic Germany" through free elections. It proposes, in return for Russian agreement to a settlement on these lines, to drop E.D.C. and keep united Germany disarmed and occupied until the conclusion of a Peace Treaty with guarantees against German aggression. The Labour Party is further committed to an all-Europe collective security treaty, including the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, which the U.S.A. would be

asked to join, followed by an agreement to reduce and limit armaments.

A Meeting has also been organised in London to which are invited members of the Management Committees of London and Middlesex Labour Parties. At this meeting the Holborn statement will be fully discussed. It is to be sincerely hoped that the meeting gets the widest possible support, for Holborn and St. Pancras deserve the congratulations of the Labour Movement in thus taking the lead in organising responsible opinion in the Movement against the N.E.C.'s disastrous policy of supporting West German re-armament.

## A Chance To Speak Out!

A Private Meeting on the question of German Re-armament will be held at the Holborn Hall (Grays Inn Road, London) on Saturday, May 29th at 2.15 p.m.

The meeting is being organised by the Holborn and St. Pancras South Constituency Labour Party and is restricted to Labour Party members of

London and Middlesex C.L.P.'s who are members of their General Management Committees.

Details can be obtained from the Secretary, 169, Hampstead Road, London, N.W.1.

The meeting will discuss the Statement on German Re-armament which is reviewed on this page.

## THIS IS TORYISM

### They Let Old People Starve!

**N**EIGHBOURS in a Glasgow tenement were alarmed, when the second day passed without seeing or hearing the kindly old couple who lived in a single-end three-up.

They sent for the police, who forced their way into the house and found the old man and his wife collapsed on the floor.

They were rushed to a city hospital, where they were

stated to be suffering from malnutrition.

A simple story. It didn't get the headlines. But what a heart-rending commentary on those who are left to spend the twilight of their lives in loneliness—and in a constant struggle to make ends meet.

What a sordid sidelight on the Tories' "dear money" policy, which gives old age pensioners less than 2s. a day to spend on food.

In All Local Elections  
**VOTE LABOUR**

# Korean People Can Unify Their Own Country Peacefully

Says General Nam Il (Korea's Foreign Minister)

Extracts from his speech to the Geneva Conference.

THE main task in the solution of the Korean question is the national unity of Korea, the formation in a peaceful way of a unified, independent, democratic state of Korea. Therefore, it is the expectation of the Korean people that the Geneva Conference will work out and adopt resolutions which will contribute to the conversion of the armistice into a lasting peace and a peaceful unification of Korea in democratic principles.

For over forty years the Korean people incessantly waged valiant fights against the Japanese occupants, for their national liberation and for the restoration of the sovereign rights of their state.

It is also a well known fact that the victory over Japan in 1945, thanks to the decisive role of the Soviet Army, brought to the Korean people liberation from the colonial yoke of Japanese imperialism. Following the liberation, the Korean people began to establish a national, independent, democratic state. Throughout Korea, people's committees as the local democratic regimes were formed by the inhabitants themselves.

However, the people's committees could function normally and carry out democratic reforms only in North Korea where the Soviet troops were stationed. On the other hand, in South Korea under the occupation of the American troops, these people's committees were dissolved by force and the inhabitants of South Korea were deprived of their elementary democratic rights and freedom. Thus, from the earliest days of her liberation Korea began to go two different ways.

## 1945 AGREEMENT

An important stage in the settlement of the Korean problem was the conference of foreign ministers of the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom, convened in Moscow in December 1945. In the resolution concerning the Korean question, adopted at the Moscow Conference, it is stated that: "With the view to the re-establishment of Korea as an independent state, the creation of conditions for developing the country on democratic principles and the earliest liquidation of the disastrous results of the protracted Japanese domination in Korea, there shall be set up a provisional Korean Democratic Government which shall take all the necessary steps for developing the industry, transport and agriculture of Korea and the national culture of the Korean people."

However, the agreement of the Moscow Conference concerning Korea, which was in full accord with the basic interests of the Korean people, was not carried out owing to the refusal of the United States Government to fulfil its duties provided in the agreement.

Instead of co-operating in the formation of a democratic, interim government of Korea, the United States side took the course of dividing Korea and for that purpose on May 10, 1948 enforced, in violation of the Moscow agreement, a separate election in South Korea under the circumstances of police pressure.

Even the United Nations temporary commission on Korea had to admit the anti-popular nature of the so-called elections in South Korea. In the official reports (Number 59) of the same commission on the results of the elections it is stated: "Inasmuch as the election this time did not comprise both North and South Korea, and did not comprise all or most of the existing political par-

ties and social organisations, it was not a nation-wide election—that is a fact which we fully understand." The report further says: "In some places the police were within the polling booth."

The democratic forces of Korea waged everywhere fights against the separate election, since it would lead to the division of Korea. In April, 1948, representatives of political parties and social organisations of North and South Korea, with various political views and convictions, held a joint conference in Pyongyang.

At the conference a resolution was adopted to boycott the May 10 separate election in South Korea, and specific measures were worked out for the attainment of a peaceful unification of Korea on democratic principles.

Replying on the agreement of the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers concerning Korea, the masses of people of North Korea carried out basic democratic reforms in a short length of time.

As a result of the agrarian reform, 722,522 families of landless and land hungry peasants received without compensation over one million hectares of land confiscated from Japanese landowners, pro-Japanese elements and national traitors.

Following the agrarian reform, large enterprises, transport, banking and communications were nationalised. The democratic reforms accelerated a rapid progress of the people's economy in North Korea.

## RESULTS OF REFORMS

In consequence of a successful execution of the people's economic plan, already during the period 1947 to 1948 the industrial output exceeded that of 1944, and in 1950 industry increased 51.4 per cent as compared with that of 1944. Also in farming a great success was scored. In 1950 the annual crop of rice as the main agricultural produce of the land showed an increase of 148 per cent as compared with 1944.

In South Korea no democratic reforms have been carried out and the peoples have been denied elementary human rights and democratic freedom. The so-called agrarian reform effected in South

Korea has not improved the conditions of the peasants.

Land remains in the hands of the landowners even after the so-called agrarian reform, and the peasants are in sore need of land as before. The conditions of the workers and office employees in South Korea who suffer from unemployment and subject to the cruel exploitation of the factory owners have not been improved.

The South Korean authorities gave no answer to all the proposals by North Korea on a peaceful unification of the country, but instead made an attempt to enforce their own regime upon North Korea as well as the instigation of the United States.

A severe sanguinary war, which lasted for over three years and imposed hard trial and privation upon the Korean people, broke

out in consequence of intervention from outside.

The assistance rendered by the Chinese People's Volunteers to the Korean people was a most important factor for securing the victory over the foreign armed interventionists in Korea. The conclusion of an armistice on July 27, 1953, and the halting of war in Korea opened up a road to a peaceful unification of Korea on democratic principles.

It is a self-evident fact that it is possible to achieve this objective only if both sides will strictly observe the provisions of the armistice agreement and strive to ensure a stable and peaceful situation in Korea. In South Korea, however, the cry for restarting military actions is being continually raised and the South Korean authorities are increasing their troops and the United States is bringing large quantities of armaments into Korea in violation of the armistice agreement.

In addition to this, the United States of America concluded with the Government of South Korea the so-called "Mutual Defence"

pact, which envisages the maintenance of the United States forces in the territory of South Korea and the enforcement of other measures of a military nature.

The most important factor for the achievement of a peaceful unification of Korea on democratic principles is the withdrawal of foreign forces from Korea, inasmuch as the existence in the country of foreign forces will lead to foreign intervention in the internal affairs of Korea.

## WITHDRAW TROOPS

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea holds that all foreign forces be pulled out of Korea in 6 months time.

We hold that the problem of unifying Korea by peaceful means can be solved by the Korean people themselves without any interference from outside. In this connection, we take into account the fact that between South Korea and North Korea an agreement must be reached concerning general elections with the free participation of the entire Korean people. The unification of Korea by peaceful means must be achieved through the formation of an All-Korean, single, democratic Government representing all the Korean people. Such a Government can be formed only by means of holding general elections throughout Korea through a free expression of the will of the Korean people.

We consider that for the discussion and working out of the concrete measures for the preparation and holding of democratic elections, it is necessary to organise a joint conference of representatives of South and North Korea, which, in our view, should form an all-Korea committee. This committee should also take urgent measures designed to promote the economic and cultural intercourse between South and North Korea.

## Would You Like a Flat?

ACCORDING to a gossip writer, Sir Winston Churchill's flat at Hyde Park Gate, London, which he rented, when he went to Downing Street in 1951, is again vacant.

It is being redecorated with a view to being re-let. The rent? Around 50 guineas a week.

## Labour Fights The H. Bomb

WEST LEWISHAM CONSTITUENCY LABOUR PARTY is so concerned about the menace of the Hydrogen Bomb that it is proposing to suspend its normal activities for two months in order to put its entire efforts behind the National Campaign to get fifteen million signatures to a petition against the use of this horrible weapon of war.

The Campaign was inaugurated last Friday at London's huge Albert Hall. About 800 to a thousand people were present. Speakers included Anthony Wedgwood Benn, M.P.; George Doughty, General Secretary of the Draughtsmen's Union; and Ian Mikardo, M.P.

Among Labour organisations which contributed to the collection of £354 were: Shirley (Croydon) L.P., Basingstoke L.P., Reigate L.P., Richmond and Barnes L.P., The Fire Brigades Union (£75), N.A.T.S.O.P.A., and a number of Shop Stewards' Committees from the London area.

The Campaign Committee—whose Treasurer is Sidney Silverman, M.P.—urgently need money to carry out their plan to get fifteen million signatures. Everyone

who wants to see the country roused against the threat of the Hell Bomb will therefore get in touch with Mr. Silverman or with the Secretary (Arthur Carr) at 141, Victoria Street, London, S.W.1. where copies of the Petition forms can be obtained.

The Petition itself reads as follows:—

That the hydrogen bomb with its immense range and power as disclosed by recent experiments constitutes a grave threat to civilisation and that any recourse to war may lead to its use.

## Wherefore

Your Petitioners pray that Her Majesty's Government should take immediate initiative to bring about a meeting between the Prime Minister and the heads of the Administrations of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the purpose of considering anew the problem of the reduction and control of armaments and of devising positive policies and means for removing from all the peoples of the world the fear which now oppresses them and for the strengthening of collective peace through the United Nations Organisation.

# Hands Off The Air Lines

By Frank Beswick, M.P.

[Reproduced by kind permission of the "Railway Review"]

RECENT action by the Minister of Transport and Civil Aviation against the Air Corporations for which he is responsible, is part of Government policy to take back profitable enterprise from the public to the private sector.

In the case of steel and road transport the action was taken by straightforward parliamentary means. Against the Air Corporations the Minister has used cuts and restrictions.

## THE BEST MEANS

It must not be forgotten that B.O.A.C. was originally set up, in 1939, by a Conservative Government. The late Sir Kingsley Wood stated in Parliament then that experience had convinced him that a public corporation was the best means of building up British civil air transport.

"Private companies," said the late Sir Kingsley in 1939, "must quite properly have regard to the primary interests of their shareholders... Under the new Corporation national interests and national advance will come first."

And so it has been, though the war delayed the development of B.O.A.C.

New routes have been pioneered and new aircraft developed in team work with the manufacturers.

Now that so much public money

has been spent and so much achieved, the present Tory Minister is trying to hand back large profitable parts of this industry to private capital.

The Air Corporations are not allowed to keep aircraft for charter work. They are refused permission to tender for regular air-touring contracts. They are warned that freighting must now belong primarily to the private operator.

All this in the name of free enterprise and competition.

Passenger services are reserved by law for the Corporations, but the Minister has found a way round that.

The 1946 Civil Aviation Act contained a Clause permitting the Corporations to sign agreements with private companies to do certain work if—"the agreement is calculated to further the efficient discharge of the function of the Corporations."

The Minister has compelled the Corporations to sign agreements under this Clause which allow the private companies to operate parallel services at cut-rates.

The Corporations have asked if they can at least compete fairly

and cut their own fares. The Minister has refused them permission. This quite intolerable State protection to private companies is given by a Minister who has called for more healthy competition!

In any case, the fact is that these scheduled passenger services are held by some authorities to be illegal. The Minister was faced with this charge in the Commons, but he evaded it.

Plans are already made for these cut-rate and allegedly illegal services to be extended. One route mentioned is to Hong Kong. Another down to Johannesburg. Three big shipping companies have brought big sums of new capital to three selected private air transport firms. Their spokesman has said that they have the encouragement of the Minister.

If these cut-rate services are extended the whole network of B.O.A.C. and B.E.A.C. may be threatened.

Moreover, there are many international agreements designed to relate total aircraft capacity on any route to potential passenger traffic, and to prevent dangerous cutting of fares which might also cut into safety standards. It can be expected that at the next meet-

ing of the International Air Transport Association, Britain will be accused of breaking some of these agreements.

Let no one think that either B.O.A.C. or B.E.A.C. are against cheap air travel. They have both brought in big reductions with their new tourist services. Much new traffic can be generated with cheaper fares.

But the British Corporations have reduced fares within international agreements, and whilst maintaining certain minimum standards.

## BAD FOR BRITAIN

The entry of these private companies will not in the long run mean cheaper air travel. It will mean duplication of services and ground bases. It will mean big and costly aircraft flying with a 50 per cent. load instead of a 60 per cent. load which is necessary for economic operation.

In the long run it will be the passenger who will pay for this overlapping.

Indeed, the passenger and the country as a whole will pay because this new policy is bad for British civil aviation. The tragedy of it is that we were getting on so well, and in many ways leading the world.

In order to make profitable room for private capital the Minister is sacrificing Britain's best interests.

# APPEAL FROM AFRICA

By Solly Sachs

A NEW wave of oppression is sweeping South Africa.

1. B. J. Schoeman, Malan's Minister of Labour, is preparing a Bill designed to divide, disrupt and destroy the free trade unions.

2. C. R. Swart, the so-called Minister of Justice, has rushed through an Amendment to the Riotous Assemblies and Suppression of Communism Act which gives him tyrannical power.

3. Another Bill will exclude Africans from Universities.

4. Seventy thousand Africans are to be uprooted from their homes in the western part of Johannesburg and transplanted ten miles away from the city.

5. The Government is making life hell for Africans by enforcing many administrative measures.

But in spite of the Nationalist Government's policy of oppression and terror, resistance is growing. The ten million non-Europeans are awakening and are slowly but surely learning to create mass political and industrial organisations with which to fight against tyranny.

## STOOGE UNIONS

The so-called South African Federation of Trade Unions is rapidly becoming a stooge organisation of the Nationalist Party. But the South African Trades and Labour Council, the real National Trade Union Centre having no colour bar, is increasing its opposition to Malan's slave laws.

The Labour Party—which has for the last six years consistently and courageously fought against Nationalist tyranny—is adopting a more progressive policy towards the non-Europeans and is showing more fighting spirit than ever.

Even the United Party, having got rid of some of its reactionary elements, is beginning to show fight, and is becoming a more effective opposition.

Those of us who are fighting against fascist tyranny in South Africa are deeply grateful for the sympathy shown to us in Britain. It is an inspiration to carry on, to know that we are not isolated, that we have millions of friends all over the world. But resolutions and sympathy are not enough.

Two weeks ago the Fund for African Democracy in London received a heart-rending appeal from the Council of Non-European Trade Unions in Johannesburg.

## SEND MONEY NOW

The African workers need funds for halls, offices, equipment, field organisers, etc. One million African workers can be organised into effective trade unions, but they require financial assistance immediately.

Moreover, £5,000 is needed now to save Saamtrek (Pull Together), a truly progressive workers' newspaper, published in Afrikaans and English in Johannesburg, with a circulation of 20,000.

Donations towards organising African workers may be sent to the Fund for African Democracy, 6 Endsleigh Street, London, W.C.1. (Euston 5501).

The Fund for African Democracy does not concern itself with policy, but confines its efforts to practical technical assistance. It is in regular contact with bodies and individuals in Southern Africa.

We earnestly appeal to all true friends of African freedom, to all people and organisations irrespective of political affiliation, who have the interests of Africans at heart, to send a generous donation to enable us to render effective help.

Is the "SOCIALIST OUTLOOK" in your Local Library?

If not—ASK FOR IT!

## 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.

## Two Views on 'Outlook' Policy

# Our Aim is Left Unity

### Don't Let us Depart From it

**By Tom Braddock  
and  
John Lawrence**

and the Editor of the "Socialist Outlook"

THROUGHOUT the five and a half years of its existence it has been the aim of "Socialist Outlook" to unify the Labour Party on a clear socialist policy directed against Toryism and against the Right Wing which is Toryism's ally within the Party. The paper's success—its development from a monthly to a weekly—despite financial and material stringency, has surprised both friend and foe alike. Sure confirmation of the generally correct editorial policy and method of presentation.

These good results have been achieved without ever departing from socialist principle. The paper has never adopted an exclusive attitude towards comrades with differing socialist viewpoints, yet it has always been very much more than a simple forum for the expression of different views. Editorially it has presented, week after week, a consistent anti-Tory and anti-Right Wing policy... even when the going was rough, as for example, when it refused to give any support to the United Nations imperialist intervention in Korea.

But now, it would seem, there are a number of people connected with the paper who would like to change this traditional policy. From the articles which have recently appeared by G. Healy (and from others who generally support his viewpoint) it is clear that they want the "Outlook" to adopt a 'holier-than-thou' attitude towards the mass socialist opposition which has developed within the Party over the past few months.

The "Outlook" is no longer alone in opposing Imperialism, is no longer alone in wanting an end of the disastrous alliance with America, is no longer alone in seeking a more socialistic foreign policy for Labour. But instead of seeing in this development a great tribute to the socialist perseverance of our paper, certain people see in this new situation only new and more dreadful pitfalls for the unwary.

Instead of using all our influence to unify this movement, they tell us our main task is to "distinguish," "differentiate" and "separate" ourselves from all the "impurities" which exist in the viewpoints of the Socialist Outlook's new-found friends and allies.

If this advice was ever followed by the Editorial Board it would have this inevitable result: **the main fire of our criticism would be then directed not at our traditional enemies—the Tories and their Right Wing allies—but, on the contrary, at those socialists whom certain people consider to be "less advanced," "less pure" than themselves.**

If proof of this is needed, just consider the remarkable diatribe by G. Healy against Jennie Lee and the Editor on the question of German Re-armament. With that kind of policy the "Socialist Outlook" would more or less rapidly degenerate into the organ of a narrow, doctrinaire sect—"separated" from everyone, including ninety per cent. of its present readers!

That this sort of thing is actually desired by a few of our readers can be demonstrated on every issue which they have called into dispute. Take first the question of **German Re-armament.**

To most socialists this is a comparatively simple question. The efforts of Dulles and Churchill to re-arm Adenauer's gang of ex-Nazis must be vigorously opposed for what it is—a dastardly war move directed against the Soviet Union and against the workers of Germany itself.

But such a simple way of posing the question does not suit some people. They write thousands of words to "warn" our readers of the dangers which beset them in opposing German Re-armament, of the dangers of being led astray by "chauvinists" and "class collaborators" like... Churchill and Morrison? No—like Jennie Lee

in the Labour Movement who are not at this stage prepared to indulge in direct action to defeat the Bill. The only result of this kind of activity would be to divide the Labour Movement—quite artificially—from the start into proponents and opponents of Rent Strikes.

But it was on the question of a Mass Petition calling for the resignation of the Tory Government that the differences first manifested themselves in the columns of the "Outlook". We can say right away that differences of a practical nature on this question were absolutely normal—was it timely, etc. But the opposition of G. Healy and others was of a different calibre: it was what is known as an "opposition on principle."

That "principle" insofar as we could discern it amid the voluminous correspondence sent it was this: There is only one way to remove the Tory Government and that is by "industrial action." Now that is patently absurd, for a Government can be removed at an Election, and an Election can be secured by many different ways. In any case, industrial action for political ends (the removal of a government) cannot be opposed by socialists—but it can only be seriously advocated at a stage in the class struggle far in advance of anything which has yet been reached in this country. It was to get a little nearer to that stage that we suggested a mass anti-Tory Petition—a mass campaign organised by the N.E.C. of the Labour Party which could result in a widespread opposition to this lousy Tory Government.

Transport House, needless to say was NOT in favour of this Petition—but again, our opponents were far too busy correcting what they dubbed the "reformist errors" of Braddock and Lawrence to have done anything about Morgan Phillips.

In conclusion we ask this question of all our readers. If, as is suggested by Healy and others, we cannot unite with anyone who does not agree with their dried up conceptions of a "pure" socialist, with whom shall we unite in the struggle against the Tories and the Right Wing? For our part we shall use all our influence to see that the "Socialist Outlook" continues the job it was started for—securing the greatest possible unity within the Labour Party against Imperialism and its Right Wing allies.

There have been many other issues on which this "holier-than-thou" attitude would have separated the "Outlook" from the mass socialist opposition within the Labour Movement. For example, coming nearer home, we have had the same attitude displayed on the Rent and Repairs Bill.

Instead of the paper using its influence to develop a lively opposition to this Bill, forging a working-class unity against it and taking the lead in all the necessary preparatory steps for a real struggle, certain readers have suggested that we should have announced our support for immediate Rent Strikes—and thus, once more, direct our main fire not at the Tories but at those comrades

## Bevan in Leeds (page one from)

it was essential we return another Labour Government. "But" said Bevan, "it MUST be a Labour Government with a Socialist Programme."

Referring to Churchill, he described him as a 19th century Imperialist. Taking the example of the Canal Zone, he pointed out that it cost Britain £85 million per year which is of no value to this country. By withdrawing these troops and thus cutting this expenditure, all the cuts in the Health Service could be restored and old age Pensions substantially increased.

Referring to the Revolutionary Government of China, he said it "was here to stay and the U.S.A. must also recognise this as a fact."

"If Leeds workers lived in China," Bevan continued, "and had to choose between the regime of Chiang-Kai-Shek backed by U.S. dollars and the Communist regime, then the Leeds workers would undoubtedly have also chosen Communism."

The loud applause greeting this remark showed how correctly Bevan expressed the feelings of the Leeds workers. "It is wrong and silly," he went on, "to describe the present upsurge taking place in the colonies as being Kremlin inspired. It was the British Labour Movement's task to support them because finally the colonial peoples will achieve their independence anyway."

# On German Rearmament

### No Yielding To Chauvinistic Sentiments

**By G. Healy**

THERE has been a good deal of sharp criticism on both sides in the discussion on German Re-armament in the Socialist Outlook. For my part I welcome the discussion. Differences such as this need clarification, if the left wing is to be equal to the great tasks it faces.

First of all, it is necessary to be clear just exactly what we have differences about. Let me put the record straight on E.D.C.

No one on the editorial board or staff of the Socialist Outlook has been for E.D.C. All of us have been against this brain child of American Imperialism and its British, French and German helpers. The real issue in question is—how shall we fight it? What shall we counterpose as the socialist policy. It is around this matter of method, of tactics in the struggle against E.D.C. (or German re-armament) that our differences revolve.

These questions of method are very simple. Shall we, in the Left:—

- (1) Unite with all and sundry, regardless of their political affiliations or social interests who oppose E.D.C.?
- (2) "Make use" of, and go along with those who espouse anti-German chauvinism as part of their opposition to E.D.C.?
- (3) Make our anti-E.D.C. struggle an anti-German or anti-American struggle, pure and simple?

Or, shall we—

- (1) Stress our opposition to E.D.C. and German re-armament as an anti-capitalist position?
- (2) Link it up with the struggle against all capitalist re-armament, including the Tory programme at home?
- (3) Tie this struggle up with the international fight of the working-class and oppressed peoples against capitalism and imperialism?

In other words, shall we treat the question of this E.D.C. as a national issue, uniting people of all classes and parties, here and in France—or as an international issue, pitting labour against capital? That is the question.

Now, I have been told that this

is all a matter of splitting hairs, of "idiotic socialist principles." I have also been told that not to treat it as a national issue—not to take advantage of "divisions in the capitalist camp"—is to abstain from this struggle.

I am all for taking advantage of divisions in the capitalist camp, and of seeing segments of the middle class join the Labour camp. But what I question is the need to yield in any way to chauvinistic sentiment for this purpose—or the need to obscure a clear internationalist policy. We have nothing to learn, in this respect from Morrison, who often tells us that we must not push our socialist programme, so as not to antagonise the middle classes.

We can win over a united people to a socialist policy, if we put it forward firmly. That holds good all the time. In taking advantage of divisions in the "enemy camp" we must, however, be very careful not to be taken in ourselves by a policy that can only aid capitalism.

This has happened only too often before, and it has happened on the very matter we are discussing. For what else gave rise to the disastrous line we took after the war in Germany—of yielding to American capitalism as against our German Socialist colleagues on nationalisation of the Ruhr (which Anuerin Bevan so correctly says, we must now repent) Was it not the wave of anti-German chauvinism, which had as its sponsors folk like Lord Vansittart at one end and Ilya Ehrenberg at the other?

The result—as Bevan aptly points out—was the bolstering of a reactionary capitalist regime in Germany that is now prepared to revive the Nazi military machine as part of the U.S.-led counter-revolutionary drive.

That is, E.D.C. itself is a product of a line of thought that has proved dangerous for Labour.

There is a lesson from history which we would do well to ponder; No compromise with chauvinism! Our opposition to E.D.C. can have no more in common with de Gaulle's or Juin's than our anti-fascist struggle could have with Vansittart. Our method must always be one based on working-class, socialist interests. It can never have anything in common

with any form of nationalistic hodge-podge. Our motivation against German re-armament must always be clearly anti-capitalist. It must never be based on the alleged "psychology" of the German "race", for that is a falsehood. Otherwise we will "repent" again and again.

As a matter of fact, some of the sponsors of a catch-all "unity" against German re-armament may have cause to repent already. Quite a number of Easter week-end resolutions against German re-armament stress opposition, not only to E.D.C. and the re-armament of Western Germany, but in Eastern Germany as well.

Of course, that is not what the Communist Party, for instance, intended. But Left Wing socialists who are opposed to stalinism must see dangers in such an interpretation of opposition to German re-armament. To show why, let us take a hypothetical case.

Assume that Eastern Germany frees itself of the Soviet embrace, and develops into a genuinely free socialist republic. After the June events of last year no-one will surely declare that impossible. Would socialists propose that, in a world armed to the teeth, an independent German socialist state should disarm, or be disarmed without their consent and approval? That could only facilitate its destruction by the capitalist powers or its renewed subjugation by the Kremlin bureaucracy.

That is what undiscriminating propaganda against German re-armament means.

Regardless of whether it would affect a truly independent and unified Socialist Germany, or the present anti-capitalist East German state, socialists must be very careful in how they present their position on this question. We must have a socialist position—against capitalist German re-armament. As such it must form part of our whole programme of struggle against all capitalist re-armament. For the whole dynamics of armament and war lies in the capitalist system.

Our opposition to E.D.C. must be linked to a positive solution. The free determination of their affairs by a united German people; the withdrawal of all occupying forces.

That is the socialist approach to the problem and I stand by it, as the only approach that provides a real, lasting, practical solution.

# What Are the 'United Nations'?

**Asks Herbert Feilden**

be re-christened the 'UNITED REACTIONARIES'. For we find already that:—

- (1) U.N.O. supports Herr Adenauer and his Nazi "fellow-travellers" in Western Germany as a Nazi army is slowly developed.
- (2) Japan (China's ruthless war enemy) is being re-armed.
- (3) After the U.S.A. having wasted over £1,000 million on its puppet—Chiang-Kai-Shek—it now wants U.N.O. to do its dirty work in East

Asia and pull American chestnuts out of the fire.

- (4) For over a year, whilst MacArthur hobnobbed with Japanese War Lords, Truman refused recognition of the duly elected Chinese People's Government. Had the U.S.A. followed Britain's lead and recognised Mao-Tse-Tung, the Korean question might have been settled peaceably years ago!
- (5) Syngman Rhee has been able to pursue his policy of ruthlessness in Southern Korea (as shown by the Commission) secure in the knowledge of MacArthur's support. America made no attempt to stop the countless executions of Northern Koreans—executions which British troops could not stand.
- (6) To-day the U.S.A. insists upon Fascist dictator Franco being accorded membership of the United Nations as an ally in a mad escapade.

How many people realise that the very structure of U.N.O. tends to make the policies of the United States and the United Nations synonymous?

The U.S.S.R., India and China, which together embrace half the world's population, cast only 10 per cent. of the total votes. On the other hand, the 20 Latin-American Republics representing a mere 7 per cent of the world's population, control no fewer than

40 per cent of the total votes. As the States of Southern America are satellites of the U.S.A., it is clear that the U.S.A. almost has a majority before any debate begins.

In the General Assembly, which chooses the all-important members of the Security Council, Luxembourg and India each have one vote. Yet Luxembourg has a population of 300,000 as compared with India's 300 millions.

Is it not obvious that there is need for a radical overhaul of the U.N.O. constitution at once? If we delay, our manhood may suffer the fate that Clarence Cannon has prescribed. This Chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Appropriations Committee explained that possession of the atom bomb meant that "Britain could send their boys into the holocaust so that America need not send her boys."

The crucifixion of the Korean people, with the destruction of their homes in the depth of winter, is not the action of a League of Peoples. Christian ethics cannot permit the slaughter of innocent women and children, in order to enable America to retain footholds against China in Korea, Formosa and Japan. It is a policy reminiscent of Mr. Churchill's Archangel Expedition to replace Czarism in Soviet Russia.

When will we learn our lesson? A quarter of a century's Tory Press cold war against the U.S.S.R. has done nothing to promote good relations.

Britain has some goodwill in the Far East. Don't let us sacrifice it at the behest of America's "United Reactionaries"!

Yorks Correspondent

# Our Readers Write . . .

## An Autumn 'Smog' Budget

A reader of Kemsley's "Empire News", writes to the Editor as follows:—"Having just recovered from a severe bout of sunstroke brought on by the blinding brilliance of 'Butler's Sunshine Budget', I am hastening to lay in a supply of smog masks and lung cancer cures just in case the Chancellor feels constrained to hit us with a Supplementary Smog Budget in the autumn, (from which heaven preserve us)."

The "Empire News" Editor's footnote:—"Butler's Sunshine Budget" was last Sunday's Empire News headline. But we weren't the only optimists!"

Under that headline the "Empire News" (4/4/54) had written: "There is now a small surplus in the Treasury kitty, which it is believed will be used mainly to raise benefits rather than relieve taxes... In the £ increase in old age pensions and insurance benefits, equal pay for some grades of women civil servants. 2d. a gallon

## FILMS WORTH SEEING

If you live in London and can afford the price of a West End cinema ticket I suggest you go to the Academy Cinema in Oxford Street whilst there is still time to see "The Wages of Fear."

This French film (which has English sub-titles) won the 1953 Cannes International Film Festival Award despite protests, at the time, from some American film bosses that it was "unfriendly" to Uncle Sam.

It has a simple story set in the back of beyond in Central America. The American Southern Oil Company is exploiting the oilfields. The poverty-stricken villagers in the locality are dependent on the Oil Company for what little employment is offered.

An isolated oilwell catches fire. Only large quantities of explosives can put the fire out. It means that two truck loads of nitro-glycerine must be taken many miles by rough and dangerous roads. There is no safety equipment at the Company's depot. The job can easily mean death for the truck drivers. "The Company can't afford trouble with the Unions," says O'Brien, the depot boss. So casual labour from the village must be hired.

A prize of \$2,000 is offered to each man who gets through alive. Driven to despair by the squalid and hopeless conditions in which they live four volunteers come forward.

The drive on the edge of death brings out the best and the worst of man's attitude to man. It also provides a drama of great suspense.

There are fine performances by Charles Vanel and Yves Montand. The direction by Henri Clouzot is first class.

G. W. Pabst's "Kameradschaft" was shown last week at the National Film Theatre Club on the South Bank, Waterloo. This is a German film made in 1931. It is based on real happenings and tells the story of a mining disaster in a French coal mine on the Franco-German border.

Working against time the German miners break through the formal barriers of the frontier to come to the rescue of their French comrades. A subject such as this puts to shame the so-called "dramas" now churned out by the brainless McCarthyised Hollywood business machine.

From time to time this Club show other classics of the past. Membership costs 5/- a year but a member may take up to 3 guests to any performance and there are many good seats at 2/- each. Membership applications should be addressed to the British Film Institute, 4 Great Russell St., W.C.1. 17,000 people have joined already.

**Mark Freeman**

off petrol, 1d. a pint off beer. Family allowance for first child or increase in income tax allowance for children."

It was suggested that Butler would recoup some of this expenditure by reductions in Government spending. But I'll warrant the "Empire News" were not optimistic enough to hope for a substantial reduction in arms expenditure which in itself would provide further benefits.

Cleotherpes S. R. Pearson

## Reporting?

John Goffe's article in the April 30th issues raises again the question of socialist reporting.

Surely the task of a socialist reporter covering an event like U.S.D.A.W.'s annual conference for a paper of the character of the "Outlook" is not merely to relate, but to comment on what took place.

Comrade Goffe tells us, without comment, that delegates resolved "to set target dates for the achievement of self-government" in the colonies. Without comment, he informs us that a resolution demanding the withdrawal of troops was "overwhelmingly defeated."

Conference, we are told, decided to support such "practical" help for the colonial peoples as the sending of Transport House stooges to "help found" (i.e., disorient and disrupt) trade union movements in the colonies

Without a word, Goffe records the views of delegates who really still believe, in this year 1954, that Africans want British troops in their countries to "protect" them.

I am sure I am the last person who should be telling you the job of a socialist newspaper, which is to lead and help educate the rank and file in the Labour movement.

Goffe's article will give leadership and education to nobody. By failing to attack the arrant social-democratic and pro-colonialist nonsense talked at the U.S.D.A.W. conference, Goffe lends tacit support to these sentiments.

Will you please make it clear at once that the "Outlook" stands, as it has always stood, for immediate self-government for all the colonies, withdrawal of all troops at once, and for recognition of those colonial trade-union movements, e.g. in Malaya, whose leaders are now behind bars or in the jungle fighting, among others, just those "practical" helpers from Transport House whose function is to destroy and vitiate genuine trade unionism.

# A.E.U. Youth Conference

**F**ORTY-NINE delegates from all over the British Isles, assembled at Eastbourne, to discuss 17 composite Resolutions, dealing with many aspects of Engineering, with a particular bias on Youth problems.

Conference opened on a militant note. An Emergency Resolution on German Re-armament was tabled, but President Tanner would not allow this to be discussed even after many protests from delegates.

**WAGES**  
The sorest point with all delegates was next for discussion. Two Resolutions, one asking for a percentage increase, the other for a £1 per week increase, were on the Agenda.

The E.C. introduced the fact that at the present time they were negotiating for a percentage increase for lads of 18, 19 and 20. This created much confusion among some of the delegates, but eventually they passed the Resolution for a percentage increase and, wrongly, in my opinion, rejected the claim for a £1 per week.

The question of Piecework was next on the Agenda. Conference overwhelmingly passed a Resolution asking for the abolition of Piecework for apprentices—the general thought being that Piece-

I hope Goffe's silence did not indicate assent, but I doubt it when I look at his last paragraph, What, pray, is "the second stage of the British revolution" and what was its first stage?

If Goffe does not understand that in 1945 the British workers sustained at once a victory and a defeat; if he doesn't know that despite certain progressive social legislation (now being rapidly dissipated in the arms race) the six years of Labour government changed nothing in the relationships of class forces in Britain (the only meaning for socialists of the word "revolution"), then he knows and understands nothing.

Woking John Fairhead

## Straightforward Answers, Please

It is imperative that the paper shall not fall under the control of the political maniacs of the "extreme" left. Let us adopt a sensible attitude to current affairs and see things as they really exist and not as we would wish them to be.

It appears that some of our colleagues as lost in a "dialectical" fog, as far from reality as possible. For instance when faced with the question of German re-armament they completely ignore the facts and begin to dabble in "pure socialist" fancies. To obtain a straightforward answer from any of them is impossible.

To German re-armament Lawrence says "NO". Adherents of Healy answer "Ah, well, you see..." and then proceed to tabulate their reasons for not opposing German re-armament.

This is but one of many current questions, towards which they devote great endeavour in creating a theoretical maze around the original material question.

Dukinfield H. Wilkinson

## NEW READERS SPECIAL TRIAL OFFER 9 issues for 2/-

Fill in and return to:  
**SOCIALIST OUTLOOK,**  
59 FLEET STREET,  
LONDON, E.C.4.

Name .....

Address .....

.....

.....

## Reported by A Delegate

work was detrimental to the efficient training of apprentices.

Should an apprentice work night shift? "NO"—said the Conference, it's dangerous to a lad's health and it interferes with his Technical Training.

## CONSCRIPTION

Perhaps the most important Resolution to be discussed was one asking for a reduction in National Service to 12 months.

Bro. Garland in seconding the Resolution, made the points that—'young men are being used as the tools of Imperialism by the British Capitalists—'We must insist', he said, 'that British Troops be stationed at home so that they can defend Britain.' This is even more important nowadays, when the threat of German re-armament is imminent.

Bros Yapp and Atkinson then moved and seconded an amendment asking for the "Total Abolition" of National Service, and in doing so, completely tore to shreds the arguments put forward by Bro. Garland. They pointed out that British Troops would be "the tools of Imperialism" whether they were in Malaya or in Britain, though obviously we would prefer them to be in Britain.

Touching on the point of Ger-

## British Guiana

# '133 Days Towards Freedom'

**I**N answer to the charge that the P.P.P. Ministers spent their time conducting an ideological campaign instead of getting on with the job, Mr. Ashton Chase, acting leader of the P.P.P. during Dr. Cheddi Jagan's absence in jail, and Minister of Labour in the Government, has written a pamphlet, "133 Days Towards Freedom in British Guiana."

He shows clearly that the Ministers, instead of doing nothing, did too much: too much, that is, for the Colonial Office and the "importees" as the European Ministry is called. He also shows, and this quite clearly, that everything that was done, and everything that was attempted in the way of legislation was the known and declared policy of the P.P.P. before they ever came to power! The Trades Disputes Bill, the Labour Relations Bill, the Removal of Restriction on trade with Europe, Reform of the distribution of Crown Lands, Reform of the schools and the amendment of the laws and regulations which restrict civil liberties.

Considering that the P.P.P. Government lasted only 133 days, the surprising thing is that it was able to do so much. Certainly the energy of the Ministers and the speed with which they proceeded

## Fighting Fund

A disastrous month for our fund. With only £27 19s. 3d. received, we are £70 in debt for the month. Rally round comrades, before its too late.

The following donations are gratefully acknowledged:

- Leeds readers 13/8d.; J. Pennington, 10/;- J. Lightfoot, Edmonton, 3/9d.; H. Blake Shrewsbury 2/6d.; F. Turner, Wallasey, 5/3d.; R. J. Johnston, Altrincham, 4/;- W. Suttie, Angus, 11/;- West London Readers, 214/3d.; Islington readers, 22/6d.; Upper Norwood reader, 7/4d.; Bermondsey readers, 20/;- Edinburgh readers, 10/;- R. J. Dutch, Chichester, 5/6d.; Collection at London shareholders' meeting, 26/6d.; St. Pancras readers, 10/3d.; Bethnal Green readers, 15/;- Birmingham readers, 24/3d.; R. T. Shelley readers, 74/;- Enfield Engineers, 79/6d.

Total £27 19s. 3d.

## A P.P.P. Pamphlet Reviewed by Tom Mercer

to force their programme through, not only surprised Governor Savage and Mr. Lyttelton, it frightened them into precipitate action for which they were ill-prepared. That is the only explanation of the blundering crudity of the gunboat diplomacy.

Dr. Jagan and his colleagues were different to the type of colonial politician that Savage and Lyttelton were used to. They could be neither bought nor intimidated. They answered all threats and opposition by pressing on with their programme: incidentally, the most effective answer.

Savage was in a quandary. The legal set-up was unreliable. He could veto a Bill, and did so. But when he did he was, in theory, bound (on demand) to call a joint meeting of both Houses, the House of Assembly and the State Council. And, due to their overwhelming victory at the Polls, the P.P.P. was assured of a majority at any such joint meeting. Once that procedure was carried out, any Bill which passed through it was legally the law of the land.

So Savage, recognising defeat, sent for a gunboat. But once gunboat diplomacy was embarked upon it had to be justified: hence the "Red Plot" accusation and

the White Paper with its mixture of lies and half truths. Jagan and his party had to be discredited in the eyes of the British people, not the Guianese—it is impossible for Lyttelton to do that. That was the purpose of the White Paper to confuse.

The Comic Opera flavour of Savage and Lyttelton's pronouncements reach their height in the absurd "threat of violence" tale. There was neither the need for violence nor the power to practice it—on the side of the P.P.P. Government. There was both the need and the power on Lyttelton's side, and he used it.

Smashing a Constitution and dismissing a Government by force is violence. The fact that no blood was shed was due to the fact that armed resistance on the part of a small people—about one-and-a-half millions—to the armed might of Britain is impossible, especially when they occupy an exposed territory such as British Guiana.

The "Red Plot" rubbish is exposed for what it is: an attempt, crudely and hurriedly put together, to try and cover up an act of violence perpetrated by the Tory Government at Westminster. The White Paper which tries to white-wash this violence by attributing Lyttelton's crimes to the P.P.P. is as full of holes as a colander.

After reading it, it is refreshing to turn to the pamphlet and to read the account of how a small people, without assistance from anyone anywhere, "Red" or "White", did their best to do a job and were succeeding until overthrown by violence after only 133 days in office.

# Now Tories Try To Turn Clock Back

Georgetown, April 22nd. On April 13th, the thirteen persons charged with illegal procession following Dr. Jagan's release on bail on April 5th were sentenced to two months imprisonment or one hundred dollars (\$100) fine. Barrister Burnham gave notice of appeal for all except Dr. Jagan. His two months will run concurrently with his previous six months sentence.

On April 16th, the Governor withdrew the section of the Restriction Orders requiring persons to report to the Police twice weekly. This followed Mr. Burnham's refusal to report and the refusal of most of the ten restricted persons to report on April 10th to the Police.

The Customs Department has held up the entry of the booklet "British Guiana—The Facts" printed in the United Kingdom

and issued by the Labour Research Bureau.

The Bureau of Public Information announced on April 20th that Dr. Jagan's imprisonment of six months with hard labour was incorrect. It stated that the sentence did not include "hard labour."

On the Queen's birthday (April 21st) the P.P.P. called for a day of mourning to show disapproval of the Emergency Laws and police action. Black armbands, ribbons and dark clothing were worn by many.

The P.P.P. Headquarters is still closed and guarded by police twenty-four hours daily. Police still guard the Arcade Printery—printers of the Party's organ "Thunder", although the premises are opened.

The Party has called for an intensification of its boycotts during the defiance of the Emergency Laws campaign.

**Janet Jagan**

## Who is Changing the Paper?

**T**HE article by John Lawrence on page 3 was not presented to the Editorial Board for its consideration, although it concerns editorial policy.\* Space does not permit a detailed reply but I am confident that the socialist intelligence of those who have followed our paper's history will rebel at his allegations.

Let me say, first of all, everybody on the Editorial Board whole-heartedly desires the maximum unity of the Left wing, and indeed of the whole Labour Movement, but on what policy must this united movement fight?

Take the question of the petition. "The Tories must resign—Let's have a petition to get 'em out" said John Lawrence in "Socialist Outlook" (7/11/1953). Did any of our readers seriously believe that Churchill's Government could be removed by a petition? Contrast this with his declaration on behalf of the Editorial Board made on February the 24th, 1952: "Labour must use its entire political and industrial might" to "Force the Tories out."

It is changes which have already been taking place that have aroused protests from the majority of the management committee and a great number of self sacrificing supporters of the "Socialist Outlook." Is it not clear that it is John Lawrence who is changing

policy behind a smokescreen of accusing others of doing precisely what he is doing himself?

There are many misstatements in the article which I cannot deal with here. One point I must, however, make. No-one has attacked Jennie Lee when she attended a meeting of the Seine Federation of the Socialist Party. That will be clear to readers who go over the past issues of the paper. What was criticised was Lawrence misinforming our readers that a conference against German Re-armament called by De Gaulists, was "dominated" by Socialists and Communists.

The article implies that criticism of John Lawrence is support for Morrison. That is descending to the lowest level of argument.

By all means let us get unity on the widest possible basis for a struggle against the Tories. That is not the issue. The issue is How?

Our paper gained support because it had its own distinctive contribution to make to the Labour Movement. Lawrence and Braddock are changing this. A study of the back issues of the paper is sufficient to clear up the question of who is changing what.

**G. Healy**