

Join the
**LABOUR
PARTY**
TODAY

Socialist Outlook

WEEKLY

No. 129

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

FRIDAY, MAY 14th, 1954.

3d.

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

GERMAN RE-ARMAMENT

★ Is There An Alternative? ★
Asks John Diamond

THE Debate in the House of Commons after the Berlin Conference coincided with the Annual General Meeting of my Labour Party. The decision of the Parliamentary Labour Party, by a bare majority, to support the Re-armament of Germany brought forth a spate of emergency motions opposing this decision and calling for an emergency national conference. My Party, which has a strong Left Wing and a strong Right Wing, were united in their reaction, and, the A.G.M. became a demonstration against the decision to re-arm Germany.

are unconditionally opposed to German re-armament. They reject out of hand the concept of the European Defence Community."

WHO WILL LEAD?

The writing on the wall is now quite clear for all to see, and there is little doubt that the Whitsun week-end will give us another spate of annual conferences on the same lines. The unhappy declaration in favour of German Re-armament is already raising the whole question of the leadership of the Labour Party, and this question of leadership will not be an easy one for the Labour Party to resolve, but it is one that all of us in the Movement must face during the months to come.

Which are the "suicide clubs"—the Constituency Labour Parties which have taken the lead in opposing German Re-armament or those Labour Leaders who are trying to commit the Labour Party to the Re-armament of Germany? We may soon know.

It is not clear why the Parliamentary Labour Party and the National Executive Committee of the Labour Party rushed suddenly into this new declaration in spite of the fact that they had great difficulty in obtaining a majority for such a declaration. They must have known that by avoiding the conditions laid down by the Morecambe and Margate Conferences they were inviting immediate opposition and sharply dividing the whole Labour Movement.

In fact it is very doubtful whether, if a decision were taken now, they could obtain a majority for German Re-armament within the Parliamentary Labour Party.

OPPOSITION GROWS

Since February 24th there has been a mounting wave of opposition. First from the Constituency Parties, and now from sections of the Movement at their annual conferences.

We had the Co-operative Party and the Union of Distributive Workers both coming out strongly against German Re-armament, followed by the annual conference of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, where the opposition to German Re-armament was complete and absolute. To quote the "Manchester Guardian" of last Friday:—

"The engineers' decision was quite uncompromising. They

DISCUSSION NEEDED

Mr. Herbert Morrison told the House of Commons on February 24th during the debate on the Berlin Conference that the differences of opinion in the Labour Party on German Re-armament "are sincerely held and are convictions which are fairly held and which we must mutually discuss." We agree with Mr. Morrison and we are doing everything possible to get the subject fairly and fully discussed.

The reason given for the decision was that the Berlin Conference constituted the "further efforts" called for by the Margate Conference resolution. We deny this, and we have prepared a 4,000 word Statement on German Re-armament which deals with the subject fully, and which we claim is official Labour Party Policy. This official Labour policy is sound and socialist, and is a basis on which a constructive and

Support Viet-minh Terms for Cease-Fire

Here Is A Chance For Peace In Asia

THE might of Imperial France, well-equipped by their "friends" in the United States and possessing absolute air supremacy, forced to surrender to the armed forces of the Indo-Chinese people! That was Dien Bien Phu. The biggest blow to an out-dated and vicious colonialism yet to take place.

It was not superior arms that furthered this amazing defeat of the French. It was the overwhelming moral superiority of the Indo-Chinese who fought with the knowledge that they were freeing their land of an age-old oppressor.

The French on the contrary, fought a purely military action, surrounded entirely by a bitterly hostile population and conscious of the fact that at home in metropolitan France the prevailing mood was to end the war on almost any terms.

THE FUTURE FIGHTS THE PAST

Viet-minh in fact represented the Asian Revolution against oppression, misery, squalor and exploitation. The French represented all that must pass, and is passing away—foreign domination of the Asian peoples.

Absolutely understandable therefore, is the note of jubilation which permeates the official communist settlement could be achieved in Europe. There was no justification for abandoning this policy and for handing the Labour Party on a plate to Churchill.

As the demands for emergency conferences were not responded to, we decided to call a Delegate Conference for our area, which covers the counties of London and Middlesex. We were told by Transport House that we could not do this, and although we could not see what objection could possibly be taken to our proposal, we did not proceed with the conference.

A CHANCE TO SPEAK

Instead we are now holding a

unique of the Viet-minh High Command which announced the fall of Dien Bien Phu.

"The Vietnam people's forces have completely defeated the enemy on the Dien Bien Phu battlefield and scored the greatest victory ever recorded in the history of the Vietnam People's Army.

"Over 21 enemy battalions and 10 companies, numbering over 16,000 crack troops and all the French Command including one brigadier-general, 16 colonels, 1,749 officers and non-

The number of parachutes captured amounts to 30,000."

PEACE DESIRED

Yet, despite their resounding victory, there is no desire by the peoples of Indo-China to continue the war a day longer than is necessary. They are absolutely willing to end the fighting—providing justice is done to the legitimate aspirations of the Indo-Chinese people.

This is showed beyond all doubt in the peace terms announced by the Viet-minh delegate to the Geneva Conference.

1. Recognition by France of the sovereignty and independence of Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia.

2. An agreement to withdraw ALL foreign troops from these territories within a time limit to be agreed upon by the belligerents.

3. Free Elections in Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia.

These are the main proposals. They are just, democratic and must surely be supported by every socialist in this country.

The people of Viet Nam are not seeking aggrandisement, they are not seeking to hold anyone in subjection—they merely insist on the right to manage their own affairs without the interference of foreign powers.

LABOUR'S RESPONSIBILITY

Whether these simple demands will lead to peace depends primarily on the Labour Movements in the Western World. If we use all our great strength to compel our governments to accede to the just demands of Viet-minh then peace can be established in South East Asia. The shadow of World War III which hangs over us all will be lifted.

The Asian Revolution has shown its tremendous strength. Dien Bien Phu has thrown confusion and demoralisation into the men of the old order. Dulles has temporarily retired from the scene in high dudgeon. But he will come again if he can. Plans for the fashioning of an instrument of aggression in Asia—the

Editorial

commissioned officers were killed injured or made prisoners in this offensive.

"The Vietnam People's Army brought down or destroyed 62 enemy planes of various types and captured all enemy arms and depots of ammunition and military equipment."

The offensive lasted 55 days and nights from March 13 to May 7, 1954.

"The Vietnam People's Army captured all enemy arms, ammunition, vehicles—including artillery pieces, tanks, trucks, etc. and all enemy depots of ammunition and military equipment.

Private Meeting restricted to Labour Party Members who are members of their Constituency Management Committees. No objection has been taken to this meeting, and we are most anxious that it should be as representative as possible, and we would ask readers of this paper to tell members of their Management Committee about it. By doing this they will be helping to make this meeting on this most important subject a success.

For further particulars, and copies of our Statement of the Case Against German Re-armament, please write to **Holborn and St. Pancras South C.L.P. 169 Hampstead Road, N.W.1.**

South East Asia Treaty Organisation—are going ahead, with the obvious connivance of the British Tory Government.

There is real need for vigilance on the part of the Labour Movements of the world. The victors of Dien Bien Phu have offered a chance of peace that must be grasped without hesitation by our Labour Movement here in Britain... yet so far there is an inexcusable silence from the leadership of the Labour Party. Here is a chance to lead—by declaring, without reservations, support for the main proposals of the peoples of Viet Nam.

The National Executive Committee meets next week. Labour Party members will insist that it places our movement on the side of the Asian Revolution and for world peace. Let the Tories and their American friends know that British Labour will not tolerate a world war to place the French back in power in Indo-China.

Unions To Meet On War Danger?

IN contrast to the hysterical 'toe-the-line' brigade who are doing their best to expel Aneurin Bevan from the Labour Party, the General Secretary of the Amalgamated Engineering Union has suggested that trade unionists should meet together to discuss seriously a policy for Labour on foreign affairs.

Mr. Ben Gardner, according to a "Times" report, has written an article in the current issue of the A.E.U. journal in which he says that issues like German Re-armament and the war in Indo-China "are not purely political." Trade unions are affected to such an extent that they should have an opportunity of ascertaining how far they are in agreement.

He therefore proposes a conference of Trade Union Executives. If, says Mr. Gardner, union executives met during a time of economic crisis, they should surely meet now to discuss, in their members' interests, the "existing precarious counterpoise of the world between war and peace."

This is an excellent idea. Trade unionists cannot stand aloof on political questions. The A.E.U. at its recent Conference decided not to support German Re-armament. The vote was unanimous in a union which is, with 900,000 members, the second largest in the country.

It is high time that great weight of opinion was brought to bear in the present discussion on foreign policy within the Labour Movement.

Bevan and Morrison

What is it all about?

(See article on p. 2)

Tory Trick To Catch The Homeless

DOES the new scheme for larger advances for house purchase mean that Mr. MacMillan, Tory Housing Minister, has developed a heart of gold? Is he moved to pity by the thought of countless young couples living in furnished rooms or with in-laws?

A glance at his official circular disproves that suggestion. It says: "The time has come when every reasonable step should be taken to minimise the heavy and increasing burden housing subsidies put upon rates and taxes." This scheme is intended as a partial substitution for municipal housing. The motive is financial—not humanitarian. The theme song is "Don't spend so much money on providing houses to let—sell them instead."

Countless thousands of families are living in heart-breaking conditions. All the efforts of the Government should be turned to

★ Light on the 'Buy-Your-Own-House' Scheme ★

giving new houses to those most in need, and in using to the full all the available accommodation.

The people are led to believe that rapid re-housing is prevented by shortages of materials and other such factors. Yet the Ministry's circular says: "During the last two years, however, the production of building materials has steadily increased and enabled licences for the building of unsubsidised houses—for sale or for letting—to be granted with progressively increasing freedom, with the result that 60,528 private enterprise houses were completed in England and Wales in 1953 as against 32,078 in 1952, and 21,406 in 1951."

We know that the vast majority of these unsubsidised houses are for sale, thus showing that something in the region of 60,000 houses have gone—not to those most in need—but to those most able to pay.

The Ministry's circular con-

tinues: "It is generally recognised also that the clearance and replacement of slums sets local authorities a formidable task of the first importance and urgency." No-one will disagree with that—but here follows the catch: "They will be better able to concentrate on it if other agencies can be persuaded to make a growing contri-

By
Audrey Wise

bution to the satisfaction of other housing needs, including the needs of families who want accommodation to rent."

So let the local authorities clear the slums, there's no profit in that. But put other housing back in the hands of the jerry-builders and the profit-seekers. Thus runs the hope of "private enterprise". The Labour Party, on the contrary, regards housing as a public service,

and will fight to extend municipal ownership.

It is, of course, no accident that this scheme is announced on the eve of the municipal elections. It is an endeavour to catch the "middle class" vote, with the twin slogans of "a property-owning democracy" and "reduce the rates."

It is also aimed at the young voters, in their twenties, engaged or married in the last two or three years, who can't have children till they get a house and can't get a house till they have children.

In many cases it will raise false hopes. Some couples, however, paying £3 or so for a couple of furnished rooms from which they can be evicted at any time and where they can have no family life, might even find it more economical to buy a house and might be glad to make use of the scheme. They are, in any case, frequently striving desperately to raise the deposit, and no doubt

they will be relieved by this provision for larger advances. But all that this "concession" amounts to is in utilising the housing shortage to help property speculators to keep up the price of houses by ensuring a market.

It is taking advantage of the housing shortage, not solving it.

A comprehensive plan is needed to ensure full and rational use of all housing accommodation. All new houses should be built by local authorities, and let by them to those most in need. All empty houses should incur rates, and, if empty more than three months, should be immediately requisitioned and let.

The furnished room racket should be stopped by rent control and security of tenure. There may well be a place for assisted house purchase within the general scheme, but it must not be regarded as a substitute for municipal housing.

Mr. MacMillan's scheme—like all Tory schemes—is a trick designed to catch those in desperate need of homes.

Bevan and Morrison

★ It is a Difference of Principle ★

LAST week in the "Socialist Commentary" Morrison fired the first shot in a campaign by right wing leaders of the Labour Movement to silence Aneurin Bevan or remove him from the Labour Party. The rank and file must, and will, rally to Bevan's defence. What is at stake is not primarily the fate of one individual leader but whether the party is to move forward to take its own independent socialist position on home and foreign policy or whether it is to be tied to the policies of Toryism, particularly in relation to the Anglo-American Alliance.

It is not simply the resignation of Bevan from the Shadow Cabinet which has engendered the present state of affairs within the party. The drive of the right wing against Bevan is the result of a much more fundamental process—the steady growth within the party and among the working people in general of anti-war sentiment, of uneasiness at the plans of American Big Business and of opposition to imperialist adventures against the deep going revolutionary movement in the colonial and semi-colonial world. The resignation of Bevan was itself a reflection of that.

RIGHT-WING AIMS

The right wing are faced with a mounting demand for the Labour Movement to cut itself free from, and stand in opposition to, the Dulles-Eden foreign policy. They are faced with the possibility of a defeat at the Labour Party Conference or, at the best—from their point of view—with a very small majority in their favour. In such circumstances they attempt desperately either to imprison Bevan in anti-democratic rules or to expel him from the party and thus remove a figure around which the opposition could coalesce.

That is like trying to hold back Niagara with a fork. The suppression of Bevan will not suppress "Bevanism"—the general left wing sentiment among the rank and file of the Labour Party, the growing opposition to the drive to war. Proscriptions, victimisations of leaders, removal of democratic rights will not stop that movement, which is rooted deep in the experiences and socialist traditions of the rank and file. Only the defeat of right wing policies and concealed coalitions with Toryism, will end that movement.

Mr. Herbert Morrison, in his article in "Socialist Commentary" attempts to minimise the conflict on principles in the Labour Party. For him the differences in the Labour Party revolve around the question of expediency. There is no "fundamental cleavage of principles." By this method he can create the impression that the conflict is due simply to the foolishness, the awkwardness, the ambition of a certain group of people, and their inability to work loyally with their colleagues in the Parliamentary Labour Party or in the leadership of the Movement.

In fact there is a difference of principle. Mr. Morrison evidently cannot recognise principles in any case so we would not expect him to recognise this difference. But it is a difference that is vital to the Labour Movement, and the future of the working people of Britain. In practice there has already been evidence of this in regard to one of humanity's greatest problems—the drive towards war.

One of the most important factors which prevented the British Government from agreeing to intervene in Indo-China together with American imperialism was the widespread opposition which it knew such intervention would

says

G. Healy

engender among the working people at home.

By his resignation Bevan highlighted the prevailing sentiment among the rank and file of the Labour Movement and the working-class in general. It brought sharply home to American Big Business and the Tory Government that full intervention for the defence of colonialism in the East would be met with opposition by a large section of the Labour Movement.

For that reason alone—the fact that his action helped to check American plans in the Far East—the Labour rank and file must rally resolutely to his defence.

He is accused of splitting the party. Why? Because he resigns from a committee which adopted a course he, in all principle, disagreed with? And when that course is tearing the party away from its independent and socialist principles, lining it up with the Dulles-Eden combination in foreign policy? In such circumstances blame for splitting the party rests with those who seek to separate it from all its independent, socialist and anti-colonial traditions; and not with those who fight such a course.

WHO AIDS TORIES?

Mr. Morrison declares that Aneurin Bevan has embarrassed the Labour Party and aided the Tories. "The so-called left" which is guilty of "foolishness" can be sure of "first-class publicity in the anti-Labour press" he declares. Bevan certainly is given much publicity in the anti-Labour press. But, unlike Morrison, he receives no praise from that quarter. All are united in attacking him.

In the last few weeks, almost every editor in the anti-Labour press has been ready with advice on how Morrison and the other right wing leaders could deal with Bevan. The anti-Labour forces mortally fear Bevan's victory. The "Daily Telegraph" made this plain when it declared on May

6th: "A victory for Bevanite socialism in the next election would be a disaster beyond computation."

There speaks the voice of Toryism. It is certain that the prospect of a victory for Morrisonism strikes no such alarm among them. On the contrary; they can hope only for victory for the forces in the Labour Party who are united with them on foreign policy.

Thus in rallying to defend Bevan the rank and file of the Labour Party rallies not only against the right wing but also against the Tories. The first step in fighting Toryism is to establish the independence of the Labour Movement.

In the same issue of "Socialist Commentary" where Herbert Morrison gives the signal for the offensive on Bevan there is the following statement by "Commentator". He declares that Bevan's actions would be justified if they led to "the adoption of a positive, trenchant policy which could sweep Labour back into power and advance the socialist cause everywhere. But the fact is that he has no such policy to offer."

Presumably the author is implying that the right wing leadership of the Labour Party are offering such a policy. In this way he only shows his inability to understand the reasons why the working people sacrificed and struggled to establish their own party independent of capitalist politics.

It is precisely out of the desire of the rank and file of the party for a "positive trenchant policy" as against the policies of Morrison and his colleagues, their "new thinking", their compromise with capitalists at home, their failure to fight against the war policies of American Big Business and Toryism, that Bevanism has gained support. And it is as part of the fight for a "positive, trenchant" and socialist policy that the rank and file must rout the present right wing offensive against Bevan.

East versus West: Clear Thinking or . . .

'Through A Glass Darkly'

IN each Western country authority must talk more plainly and more squarely to its lunatic fringe.

"At a time like this the China lobby in America, which howls so loudly for military adventure against the Chinese, and the Bevanite faction in England, which is so bland and so blind about the consequences of a Communist victory, must not be allowed to weaken, divide and disrupt the Western Alliance.

"In wrong-headedness and doubt the greatest danger lies. To see clearly, and to act resolutely—that has been, is, and always will be the way to safety."

Thus the 'News-Chronicle' editorial of 26th April. I quote the 'Chronicle' not because I have any personal animus, but because that newspaper may be taken as a reliable guide, not exactly to WHAT people think, but to the WAY they are thinking.

Let me draw your attention to that sentence which begins "To see clearly," etc., and let us see just how clearly the 'Chronicle' sees things. Speaking of Indo-China and the Chinese, it says: "...they may feel the need for peace—if they are ready to leave the non-Communist Indo-Chinese their independence and integrity on terms the West can accept."

Let us by all means see this clearly. The 'West' is, of course, Britain and America, mainly. America is a country, notorious throughout the world for leaving Communists their independence and integrity, and Britain is the country which has just suspended the Constitution of one of its Colonies, and imprisoned the former Prime Minister—constitutionally

elected, mark you. The Constitution was suspended on the sole grounds that the Government of that Colony, freely elected, was suspected, only suspected, of being Communist. The name of the one police witness mentioned in the early stages has never, so far as I can see, been published, nor was the Prime Minister's Defence heard in the Parliamentary debate. Dr. Jagan himself was imprisoned for going outside arbitrary boundaries in the course of his professional duties.

Look at it squarely—see it clearly. These two countries propose to send delegates to Geneva, and preach to the Communists the doctrine of independence and integrity. Haven't we a strong case! Are we not standing on nice, firm ground?

Most people in this country, apparently, see things in terms of black and white. We are white, and therefore right, Communism is black and, ipso facto, wrong. And because a few, a very few, people see things in terms of a little white and a little black, with innumerable shades of intervening grey, we are called a "lunatic fringe".

The 'Bevanites' are described as 'bland and blind'. Is 'Bland' the adjective you would use in connection with Nye Bevan? As to his blindness, why not read, or re-read Wells' 'Country of the Blind', and then think it over? We look at things so squarely in Britain, we see things so clearly, that we can howl at Bevan one minute, do exactly what he told us we should have to do the next, and still call him a turbulent trouble-maker, still swear that he is wrong. Need I mention the word 'Armaments'?

The 'Black and White' outlook is a comfortable one, it is also very easy. It is also impossible to justify. Very few things in this world

America Still Drives

to War

THE "Economist", immediately after Bevan's resignation, put very plainly what is at the root of the present division in the Labour Party. "...the differences on principle" it declared "between Mr. Attlee, who knows that with all its annoyances the Anglo-American Alliance is the chief hope of peace for the world and of security for Britain, and Mr. Bevan, who wants to smash it, are the most important differences of principle in the modern world."

Shall the Labour Party go along with American Big Business in the vanguard of the forces striving to preserve the old rotten system of imperialism which it is pledged to destroy? That is the question posed.

There is a fundamental conflict in the world today. On the one hand—the old imperialist order. On the other—the colonial revolution, erupting in Asia, Africa and South America, and the Soviet Union which—however much its present leaders have departed from the principles that governed the leaders of the Russian Revolution—represents an area torn out of capitalist exploitation, thus heightening the crisis of the old system.

In that conflict American Big Business takes the lead on behalf of the old ruling classes. It does so because it is the most confident, the strongest, and the most powerful.

Its allies in Europe, their Empires crumbling, weakened in two world wars are dragged willy nilly along after it. Desperately anxious for a breathing space they might even be prepared to re-adjust themselves to the post-war realities, accept the existence of the Soviet Union, the Chinese Peoples Republic and the Eastern European States and the loss of some of their former "glories". However, there can be no adjustment of the old system with the constant eruption of the desire of the colonial peoples for freedom.

The rise of colonial revolt spells death to the status quo. Only the eradication of the old imperialism can end the colonial revolution.

So, in attempting to defend and maintain what they have left, the older capitalist powers are forced to go along with American Imperialism in its aggressive policies, as it rings the earth with military bases and attempts the diplomatic and military encirclement of China and the Soviet Union—policies that can only lead to war. They have no alternative, only American power can guarantee the continuance of their economic system.

Thus, the enormity of the crime of Bevan in the eyes of Tory poli-

By
Bill Hunter

tics and the press. That is why the "Economist" describes as "most vital" that he is opposing "the basic principle of foreign policy that Ernest Bevan laid down—the principle of according paramount importance to the Anglo-American Alliance."

That Alliance is driving to war. The basic aim of the U.S. Government—with or without any success for its pressures at Geneva—remains. That is to weld together, in a concerted strategy, a united capitalist front, a front tied even more firmly to the leadership of American Big Business and directed at the colonial movements, China and the Soviet Union. That is the meaning of Dulles' "united will".

Let no-one believe that when Dulles refused the request for American troops to land in Indo-China, or when Eisenhower talks of the possibility of achieving a "modus vivendi" in the Far East—as he did recently—that the American Government is dropping this strategy. Speaking of

the "practical basis" on which the East and West can get along, Eisenhower declared the "common solution" must "strengthen the defences of the free world against Communist expansion." Translated into the language of reality, this means the strengthening of Boa Dai, Syngman Rhee and colonial imperialism in Asia.

The aim remains, but in working out its strategy. American Big Business can only work with the means at its disposal. Its Allies are bound to it fundamentally, but occasionally drag their feet at the consequences. Full intervention in Indo-China meant going it alone or, at least, with very unwilling European Allies and amidst the hostilities of Asian states such as India and Burma. And in America, there is rampant the fear of another Korea. American newspaper editors recently were bombarded with letters attacking Nixon's speech indicating that American troops might be sent to Indo-China.

U.S. Big Business hopes that full-scale military intervention in Asia will be more saleable to the American public if America's Allies are fully involved.

Hence, the holding back of a smaller intervention now and the probing for a "common solution" so as to prepare a unity and an alliance for "massive retaliation" in the future against what it views as the source of the canker—China and the Soviet Union.

That means World War Three. That is where the Anglo-American Alliance leads. As that has become clearer there has grown an uneasiness in Labour's ranks. The rank and file of the Labour Movement rally to Bevan because of this.

The stopping of this drive can only be the task of the Labour Movement. World War Three can only be prevented by developing further the anti-war sentiments among the working people which have already helped to hold back the war drive. These anti-war sentiments can be developed positively in a fight against the war alliances and in a programme joining the Labour Movement here with the colonial people in struggle against the old system.

would you do if you were an East African?

Remember, you are less than the dust. You have no vote, but you are taxed. You have purely nominal representation on the Legislative Council, but your representatives are not of your choosing, neither have they any influence on your behalf. You are subjected daily to insult and degradation, you are part of a vast pool of cheap labour, you have no security of any sort, you are uneducated, you may not do this or that, but you had better do the other, or else.

Isn't it obvious what you would do? You would form resistance bands, and because of your ignorance they would be terrible, beastly, merciless. In your ignorance you would believe that only terrorism could gain you your ends. And only those with a 'Black and White' mentality could condemn you out of hand. Only the majority of British and American public opinion.

We have much to offer Africa—let it be offered at a fair price.

Let us see clearly the price we are asking now. Because it is not so high as that asked by the South African Government does not mean that it is not exorbitant. We were once instructed, by a wise man, to 'cast our bread upon the waters'—in other words to give, and not to sell, our most precious commodities.

Oh, yes, there will be a harvest, a harvest of friendship, and East Africa will emerge politically neither 'Black nor White', but grey, not necessarily a drab colour. It is, at any rate, the colour of clear thinking.

This is not a pro-Communist article, far from it. It is a plea to 'See clearly, and to act resolutely.' Only, for heaven's sake be sure you do see clearly before you act, and be sure you know the meaning of the term 'resolute action.' Apparently the 'Chronicle' doesn't.

By G. C. Siddle

are just plain black or pure white. Many religious sects adopt it, which explains why so many people are irreligious today—in fact I can only think of two Christian sects which do not adopt it, and even they are not wholly free. However, this is not an article on religion.

Black or White, Communism is a fact which has to be accepted. Neither our Tory press, nor the 'News-Chronicle', nor indeed the majority of people in the Western world have sufficient clarity of vision to see this. They persist in thinking that world Communism can be handled as it is being handled in British Guiana (if it really exists there to the extent alleged).

They think we have only to shout long enough at the Communists, telling them that our point of view is white, and theirs is black, to effect a change of heart. They presumably read, or have at some time read, history, but they see nothing clearly there, either. Just as Trade-Unionism was a fact which had to be accepted black as some people thought it, just as Non-Conformity in religion had to be accepted, so we shall, sooner or later, have to accept Communism.

This is not propaganda, it is sober fact. We shall show our wisdom, or the lack of it, in the way we accept it. We have a choice in the matter. We can accept it with, or without, bloodshed, and that is our only choice. Unpalatable, perhaps, but inevitable.

One thing is certain—just as the transportation of certain Tolpuddians failed to kill Trade-Unionism, and the burning alive and torture of its devotees failed to kill non-conformity to the Church

Socialist
Outlook

59 FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

Editor: John Lawrence

May Day in B. Guiana

★ Police Ban The Socialist Outlook ★

Georgetown, British Guiana,
May 5th, 1954

By
Janet Jagan

SIX THOUSAND workers marched in traditional May Day Celebrations, after police permission was granted to the Trade Unions on the morning of May Day. The Police gave permission on condition that no political placards be used, no political speeches be made and an alteration of the traditional route through the working-class districts. Mounted police, police lorries and jeeps, police inspectors and plain clothes security police were seen in large numbers. They carried the procession through the least populated areas of the city.

The procession was led by the leaders of the country's most powerful Trade Unions—Trans-

port Workers' Union, Post Office Workers' Union, B.G. Labour Union, Clerical Workers' Union, Guiana Industrial Workers' Union. Mr. Jackson, President of the Post Office Workers' Union moved the following resolution:—

"Be It Resolved that this May Day gathering of workers pledge itself to fight for (1) the establishment of democratic rights, civil liberties and a representative government; (2) the recognition of trade unions fully representative of the workers; (3) increased wages and salaries to meet the high cost of living and improvement in the standard of living of the workers; (4) continued support for colonial and other workers fighting capitalist oppression and exploitation in their lands; (5) the formation of one strong, central trade union organisation fully representative of the trade union movement."

While the 6,000 marched, a handful of trade unionists belonging to the recently established break-away T.U.C. met in a hall.

Seventeen persons were arrested at Plantation Skeldon following a May Day demonstration.

On April 27th, the P.P.P. marked the anniversary of its victory at the polls in the 1953 elections by the wearing of the Party's red, gold and black colours.

When the cases against the sixty-five persons charged with illegal procession and other charges came before the Whim Court on April 27th, over 800 persons assembled in the court yard to hear the proceedings. Ten persons were arrested and tear gas was used by police to disperse the non-violent crowd. Several persons were beaten by police in a baton charge. The crowd, consisting mostly of East Indian women, refused to move during the tear gas attack.

Bertrand Yhap, P.P.P. member charged with disorderly conduct for shouting "God Bless Cheddi Jagan. Down with Savage" on the occasion of Dr. Jagan's second arrest was found guilty and fined \$50 or two months imprisonment. He chose imprisonment.

Barrister Rudy Luck was taken to prison on May 3rd to serve two months for refusing to sign a bond of \$100. He was charged by police for disorderly conduct and assaulting a police officer when, on April 7th, after a tear gas attack on the Party Headquarters, he came to assist in locking up the office. The Police later withdrew the assault charge and the Magistrate ordered that he be placed on a \$100 bond. Announcing his refusal to sign the bond, Mr. Luck was given ten days by the Court to do so.

Following an accusation by the

press and pulpit that the People's Progressive Party was guilty of painting slogans on city churches and desecrating a bible in Smith's Memorial Church, the Party issued a denial statement noting that it has every reason to believe the acts to be committed by enemies of the Party in efforts to discredit the organisation. This denial has been attacked by all three newspapers.

The Customs Department are still holding up non-banned publications sent to Mrs. Jagan. They include publications issued by the Union of Democratic Control, Labour Research and Socialist Outlook.

Following the press attack on the Party referred to in the previous paragraph, the Police have carried out over thirty raids on private homes and two raids on the Party's new headquarters. The Party's weekly paper "Thunder" came out for the first time on April 26th after a two week delay caused by police scrutiny of articles.

Viet Minh Internationalism

THE Central Executive Committee of the Vietminh General Confederation of Workers has sent a message of congratulations to the dockers in Sydney Harbour who refused to load U.S. made arms bound for Indo-China.

The message voiced the Vietnamese workers' admiration for the Sydney dockers and concluded by wishing the Australian workers and dockers success in their struggle for vital rights and world peace.

THE Vietminh General Confederation of Workers has sent a message of greetings to the French General Confedera-

Joe Must Go! Say These American Workers

THE main reason why the shadow of the Third World War hangs over all humanity is the relative passivity of the American working-class. While throughout the rest of the world, ordinary people are on the march against the old order the American workers—for all sorts of reasons which cannot be gone into here—are making no serious resistance to the fiendish plans of their own rulers.

It is this above all which lends confidence to people like Dulles. They—unlike Bidault and Eden—have as yet no "home problem" to consider.

But that situation is bound to change and, indeed, it is already beginning to change. The small but valiant band of socialists, communists and militant trade unionists who have risked life and freedom to oppose American Imperialism in America itself, who have courageously spoken out against McCarthyism and the

witch-hunt, are at last beginning to be joined by bigger sections of the American working-class. Here are a few examples taken from the American press of the past few weeks.

JOE MUST GO!

A spontaneous movement to force the recall of Senator McCarthy is spreading like wildfire through the state of Wisconsin which he "represents" in the American Senate.

It began with an offhand suggestion by the Republican editor of

American Report

a small-town weekly paper. The idea was caught up by others throughout the state and soon the "Joe Must Go" movement was a force to be reckoned with.

Despite lack of formal organisation and fund shortage, about 200,000 signatures, almost half the total required, have been collected at this time (April 11th). The local labour movement is now giving its support to the campaign.

In the same state, all the McCarthyite judges who recently had to run for election were defeated by decisive margins.

LET HER SPEAK

Free speech has won a big victory at the University of Minnesota when it succeeded in bringing to the university a speaker from an organisation which is on the attorney-general's "subversive" list.

Mrs. Elizabeth Moore of the National Council for Soviet-American Friendship was granted permission to speak and show a film on the Soviet Union. The meeting was attended by 150 students.

A small but significant breach in the prevailing thought control atmosphere of most American universities.

The Lord's Prayer

Typical of the anti-Republican poetry now circulating in American factories is this one from Detroit, the centre of U.S. car manufacture now suffering serious unemployment.

Our father who art in Washington
Ike is thy name
When your term begun
Our jobs were done
At Hudson Motor and Wil-
low Run.
Give us this day our star-
vation pay
And forgive us for taking it
As we forgive those who
take it from us
And lead us not into demo-
cratic prosperity.
For thine is the country
and General Motors'
The power and the profits
for ever,
Amen.

As the anti-war aspirations of the American workers grow—and this is inevitable—they will find no lack of courageous spokesmen. Here is an extract from an article which recently appeared in "Ford Facts" the paper of Ford Local 600, the world's largest local union.

"We entered the war in Korea and under a war-time economy we had three years of artificial prosperity. The parallel is that today the Republican administration is beating the drums in an effort to condition the American people to our entrance into a shooting war in Indo-China. We have not heard from any of our Labour statesmen. We in Local 600 would rather stand in the bread lines than have one American youth die in an abortive attempt to hold together the last remnants of French colonialism in Asia."

The author of the article was the President of the Local union.

A GREEK TRAGEDY

In October it will be ten years since the Nazi Occupation of Greece ended. Today, many of the Nazis who committed crimes against the Greek people are free, but many thousands of Greek patriots who resisted their tyranny and helped the Allies are enduring their eighth or ninth year of imprisonment.

For several years, relief supplies, including blankets and medicines, have been sent from Britain to the political prisoners and exiles in Greece, through the International Red Cross. As the years pass by, the health of the prisoners and exiles deteriorates and the humanitarian task of saving them becomes more urgent. At the moment, although second-hand clothes and foodstuffs are in stock, a mere trickle is flowing through to the Greek prisons because of lack of finance. An urgent appeal has been received from the International Red Cross for 12,000 Rimifon tablets so that treatment begun on tubercular prisoners can be continued, but only 4,000 tablets have been sent because of lack of finance.

May I therefore appeal to all those who are able to make a financial donation to enable existing supplies to be sent off and 8,000 Rimifon tablets to be bought, to do so now and to make their donations as generous as possible. Donations should be sent to: Relief Committee, (L.D.G.), 19, Beak Street, London, W.1.

Yours faithfully,
Compton Mackenzie
President, League for Democracy in Greece.

Real Reasons For Nationalisation

★ No Need For Apologies ★

THERE is to be a distinct change from the autonomous boards set up by the Labour Government to run nationalised industries.

Morgan Philips has stated that Labour should become more flexible in its approach to methods of exercising public control over industry.

One method may be demonstrated (when Labour returns to power) by the acquisition of a controlling number of shares in firms manufacturing mining-machinery. Directors nominated by the Government will adopt measures to increase supplies of existing machines but more particularly to stimulate research into the manufacture of coal-cutters and conveyors.

The N.C.B. has already approached this problem of research but Labour feels that more can be done in this direction.

Method apart, the idea is commonsense. But why has Labour chosen this way of showing flexibility?

Even the most ardent advocates

By
J. F. Marston

of nationalisation admit to faults in the publicly-controlled bodies and would gladly consider ways and means of modifying the existing structures to eliminate friction between management and men, which undoubtedly exists.

But few socialists can believe that a partially-owned industry will solve labour problems. And it is in the manpower situation that drastic changes are needed. Production and general efficiency have surprised even the Tories; discontented miners and railwaymen after years of nationalisation surprise all but the discerning socialist.

Flexibility is needed, but it must spring more in the direction of industrial democracy. If Labour feels that more consolidation is necessary before attempting further extensive nationalisation measures, not including those industries destined for public ownership—chemicals, water, machine-tools—then it should experiment in really effective democratic control by the workers, starting from shop-level.

Labour will also set up a Development Council for the Shipbuilding industry with plans involving the granting of subsidies to shipyards used almost exclusively for defence purposes. Efforts will be made to ensure a steady supply of orders, even to the extent of building a reserve mercantile fleet.

The aircraft industry, in addition to almost complete financial support for research, carried out largely at the Royal Aircraft Establishment, the National Physical Laboratory and the National

Gas Turbine Establishment, is to receive bulk orders for civil aircraft.

Further help is already provided through the leasing of special equipment to the industry.

As there has been a satisfactory expansion of trade, particularly in exports, which rose from £34.2 millions in 1949 to an estimate of £64.6 millions in 1953 (with a comfortable increase in profits, De Havilland up by £961,000 to £2,639,193 at September, 1953) the aircraft industry need have no fear of nationalisation. Labour is not convinced of the need for public-ownership, (only for a great deal of public assistance).

Engineering firms, whose exports amount to more than 40 per cent. of the whole export trade, are assisted by an Export Credit Guarantee Department which protects the exporting firms from bad debts and delayed payments. This scheme is to be extended.

Market study to promote sales abroad will be the responsibility of the Labour Government through an Export Promotion Organisation. (It seems that all that is required of engineering employers is to reject workers' pay-claims and, perhaps, vote Labour.)

Action will be taken to ensure that the policies of the Heavy Electrical Engineering sector are in accordance with Labour's future economic planning, though no specific mention is made of nationalisation.

Only in the machine-tool sector of the engineering industry will Labour take positive action in the sphere of public ownership.

A reduction in the number of independent companies is considered necessary for greater standardisation, and key machine-tool firms will be taken over. These will act as centres for technical nationalisation and development.

Taking things all round, a great deal is to be done for the engineering industries, there is to be a little coercion and unlimited advice, subsidies for some and public ownership for a very few. And the industry as a whole will

still remain a bastion of "free" enterprise, bolstered up where necessary by Government support.

There appears to be a mounting antipathy among the Labour leaders towards public ownership. The stress on the need to "make a case" for nationalisation of a particular industry is rapidly approaching the phobia stage. And if the leaders believe that only by making the case for nationalisation so overwhelming will they convince the electorate of the justice of their claims they must beware of apparent contradictory statements which are only too easily exploited by the Tory press.

For instance, in the 1954 "Speaker's Handbook" it states that "A major obstacle to efficiency in this industry (machine-tools) is the existence of far too many small firms. From this flows the familiar defects of inadequate research, insufficient application of research and lack of standardisation."

These defects, according to the Handbook, can be remedied by public ownership. There is little to criticise in that.

But it goes on to say this of the Chemical Industry, which is destined for public ownership. "There is plenty of evidence to show that the degree of concentration has increased, ... 48 per cent. of those employed in chemicals were employed by the three largest firms... No democratic Government can afford to leave so much power in so few hands."

How easy it is for the Tories to make a mockery of Labour's well reasoned arguments.

One industry, they could sneer, is to be nationalised because there are too many firms—and the other because there are too few.

Quinton Hogg, (now Viscount Hailsham) in his book "The Case for Conservatism" used exactly

Continued on page 4

Is the "SOCIALIST OUTLOOK" in your Local Library?
If not—ASK FOR IT!

Stop This Cruel Persecution

The London District Committee of the Association of Supervisory Staffs, Executives and Technicians has sent the following letter of protest to the Spanish Ambassador.

ALTHOUGH we are aware that in the early days of Trade Unionism in Great Britain severe punishment was often meted out to leaders, we now appreciate that this was a barbarous and uncivilised thing to do, and had supposed that there was now no country in the world which was not of this mind. Yet we learn that throughout your land there are men and women imprisoned without trial for no other "offence" than active membership of a Trade Union.

We call your attention to the

fact that in Britain and throughout the whole civilised world such association and activity is honoured and respected. It is brought to our notice that in the Modelo prison alone there are five groups awaiting trial and we are sure that what information we have, a monstrous indictment of events in Spain although it is, can only be a fraction of what is hidden.

Secondly, the trials themselves when they do occur, reveal, not only a contempt for the accused, unthinkable in a Christian country, but an indifference to Rule of Law, which we in this country regard as fundamental.

Apart from the fact that every effort seems to be made to secure both the most terrible punishment, and the absence of witnesses to the proceedings, especially from foreign lands, the rules of evidence seem to be completely in abeyance. In no case which has been reported to us by British observers of unimpeachable integrity, does there appear to have been any evidence on which a charge could

properly lie, and yet not only have people been prosecuted, but have actually been condemned to a lifetime's imprisonment, in the absence of any real evidence whatsoever and for an act which would only be considered meritorious here in Britain.

These men and women who are undergoing, what Captain Mark Hewitson, M.P., recently described as "such cruel persecution" are our brothers, and we identify ourselves wholly with them in their righteous stand for their elementary rights. We utterly deny that any Power has any right to withdraw from any man or group of men their fundamental freedoms.

We therefore look to you Sir, having put this matter clearly before you, to make representations to your Government as will shortly result in the release of all these people wrongly imprisoned, and where in the opinion of your Government a case for prosecution can be made out, that they will allow full facilities for observers from foreign lands to be present to assure themselves that justice once more resides in Spain.

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.

They Work in Secret

Last week a group of Labour M.P.s in the House of Commons, sought to determine that, before the Hydrogen Bomb was manufactured in this country, Parliamentary approval must be granted. Their proposition was defeated, only 63 Labour M.P.s voting for it.

So much for the limits of Parliamentary democracy, when on an issue of major importance to the people of this country, Parliament is to have no say. The decision whether or not to manufacture the hydrogen bomb now rests with a small group of people, and their conclusions will remain secret.

This is quite in line with the history of mankind's greatest horror weapon. Its very inception was decided by a small group of 35 men in the United States.

The Washington Correspondent of "Truth", a Tory weekly, recently gave a few details of how the weapon which is 750,000 times more powerful than the heaviest missiles dropped on Germany during the war, came to be manufactured in America.

When four years ago, these 35 men decided that the hydrogen bomb was to be produced, the American public was not even remotely informed. "Only as a result of widespread fear throughout the world has information begun to seep through from various quarters on how the momentous decision was made in America."

Of this group of 35 men, only eighteen were Senators and Congressmen. These 18 therefore were the only ones who could remotely claim to represent the wishes of the people, in taking a decision which effected not only 140 million in America, but many more additional millions in the rest of the world. The decision to develop the bomb was taken although a large minority in these secret conclaves were opposed. The Atomic Energy Commission was opposed, as was its ten member advisory group.

Thus the destruction of mankind is prepared behind its back.

Tottenham J. Dipple

The Chicago Martys

The May Day article by Reg Groves (S.O., 30/4/54) mentions the Chicago Anarchists who were executed or imprisoned for the bomb which they did not throw.

Many more, frame-ups were to take place against persons whose views were considered to be "subversive"—Joe Hill, Sacco and Vanzetti and, more recently, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were all done to death by one of the most notorious ruling classes in all history.

In addition, how many innocent persons have been put in prison either by fascist-like legislation or on framed-up charges?

The Labour Party Right-Wing

Real Reason (from p. 3)

that argument in his observations on reasons for nationalisation of the coal and steel industries.

The Labour arguments, however sound they might be in themselves, are bound to clash when there are so many degrees of inefficiency, monopoly and exploitation in each and every industry.

Is it not time the Labour Movement reverted to the ideological reasons for nationalisation, production for use, "that the economic destinies of the people should not be directed by a privileged minority of owners, ... that only by democracy, in industry as well as in the council chamber and Parliament, can we enhance individual freedom?"

These quotations are not old. They are from "Labour Believes in Britain." They are still the most powerful reasons for the socialisation of industry.

betrayed Socialism in 1945 by lining Britain up with U.S. Imperialism against Soviet Russia and the socialist countries of Eastern Europe. Let the Left-Wing reply with a demand that the Labour Party breaks completely with the ruling class of "God's own country", and ally itself with the American Proletariat.

Back to the Chicago Martyrs of 1887. It would be interesting to learn if the line in "The Red Flag" "Chicago swells the surging throng" makes reference either to "the Chicago Anarchists" or to the fact that a strong Labour Movement existed in that American city when Jim Connell wrote the famous socialist hymn.

Keighley M. Evans

Which Side Herbert?

When the Labour Party was formed, almost fifty years ago, it defined its political object as:

"To secure for the producers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry, and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible, upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production and the best obtainable system of popular administration and control of each industry or service."

In conformity with this general aim, the Parliamentary Labour Party, on March 20th, 1923, proposed the following motion in the House of Commons:

"That, in view of the failure of the capitalist system to adequately utilise and organise natural resources and productive power, or to provide the necessary standard of life for vast numbers of the population, and believing that the cause of this failure lies in the private ownership and control of the means of production and distribution, this House declares that legislative effort should be directed to the gradual supersession of the capitalist system by an industrial and social order based on the public ownership and democratic control of the means of production and distribution."

The Government of the day was Tory. The motion was opposed by their spokesman, Sir Alfred Mond, and defeated by 368 votes to 121.

Contributing to a symposium "What is Socialism?" compiled by Dan Griffiths in 1924, Mr. Herbert Morrison expressed his own views as follows:

"Socialism: Ownership by public authorities of land and the essential means of industrial production and distribution, together with public direction as to, in any case, policy and economy in the use of the instruments of social labour."

Joining issue with Aneurin Bevan, and writing in "Socialist Commentary" in May, 1954, Mr. Morrison now says:

"I do not know anybody in the Party, and certainly nobody in any position of responsibility, who takes the view that a true Socialist is one who believes in the immediate or quite early nationalisation of all the means of production and distribution."

"It is impracticable unless we committed ourselves to hot revolutionary tactics. And even then it would lead to a mess and, moreover, is quite unlikely to command the support of an electoral majority, so we would have no chance to do it anyway."

So, fifty years after the formation of the Labour Party, and thirty years after the famous House of Commons debate, Mr. Morrison publicly disavows the political object of the Party he represents, claiming indeed, that nobody in the Party believes in it either, and that, even if they did, the people wouldn't have it anyway.

What sort of "Socialism" is this—and whose side is Herbert on, anyway?

New Wanstead George Moore

Our Readers Write . . .

Our Duty Towards The Colonial Peoples . . .

THE acid test for any socialist paper in Britain is its attitude towards the struggles of the colonial peoples against British Imperialism. For this reason I think the points raised in the letter published last week by J. Fairhead deserve a somewhat detailed reply.

The proud record of the "Outlook" on colonial affairs is well established in the Labour Movement. Leaders of the colonial struggle—like Cheddi Jagan—have written in the columns of the paper. But now, it seems that some of our readers want to believe that the paper is departing from its old line on the colonies. Why? Because, in reporting the recent U.S.D.A.W. Conference, I suggested that the demand for the immediate withdrawal of all troops from all colonies was not

always an appropriate slogan for British socialists. Let us see.

Where the demand for independence and self-government is advanced by the colonial people themselves or where a bitter struggle is taking place and there are in effect two governments, then it is the duty of all socialists to give unconditional support to such movements.

Of course we are all for the withdrawal of troops from Kenya. Indeed, the very first article to appear in the paper on Kenya was written by myself and was headlined... **Withdraw All British Troops!**

The position is not always as obvious as that. Many articles have been written in the "Outlook" against Central African Federation. In this case the struggle was against federating

two Crown colonies with a White Dominion, Southern Rhodesia which practised Malanite racial policies. The Africans of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland organised in African National Congresses and Trade Unions opposed this scheme and demanded the right to remain as **Crown Colonies** with a future of constitutional advance leading to eventual self-government as predominantly African states.

Once again, as in Kenya but in a different form, the "Outlook" backed the demands of the African peoples. How ridiculous it would have been whilst there was a mass movement against a repulsive feature of colonialism, the attempt to rivet legal racist policies, a legal industrial colour bar, etc. on 4 million Africans who had never known it, for us in Britain to say, "Your struggle is futile and we shall have nothing to do with it or you unless you are for immediate self-government for all the colonies, withdrawal of all troops at once."

Is it necessary to remind our emphatic friend from Woking that in the Rhodesias this programme for the immediate withdrawal of all British troops was the programme of Huggins, Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia and apostle of White Supremacy, in order that he could extend his state northwards for the benefit of the copper barons and their associates.

Many more people here and in Africa were prepared to join in a struggle to prevent the riveting on the backs of 6 million Africans a strong centralised state controlled by the Southern Rhodesian white settlers. Very few would support a purely abstract demand for the withdrawal of troops. We joined in such a struggle, and left the crackpots with their religious attitude to the withdrawal slogan on one side and I hope we shall continue to do so in Uganda, Nigeria and other African states not to mention the Gold Coast, where the success of Nkrumah's government has led to great advance with the recognition that complete independence cannot be long delayed.

To refuse help and co-operation to this government on the grounds that it does not demand "immediate" self-government is like refusing to be a member of a Trade Union because it does not demand Socialism immediately.

The "Outlook" supported the demand for the return of Seretse, a semi-feudal chief (member of a class who are 75 per cent. in the pockets of British Commissioners) because the action of the British

Government represented an attack on the human rights of the Africans and the struggle against this injustice represented an attack on colonialism as a whole. No-one demanded that the "Outlook" should call for "the withdrawal of all troops at once."

Today in Bechuanaland and the other South West African protectorates the call is "Hands off the Protectorates." "Keep Malan out."

In all these cases the link between the immediate struggle and the ultimate aim of independence for the Africans is the setting of a timetable for achieving self-government within the framework of steady constitutional advance in agreement with the colonial peoples.

Mr. Fairhead refers to "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."

Complete ignorance of the facts in Northern Rhodesia is not excusable. No-one will ever gain the confidence of the colonial workers by such ignorance nor is it a fit qualification for even local leadership in the British Labour Movement. It is not good enough to repeat a statement that is true of Malaya and generalise it as holding good for all colonies. In N. Rhodesia, as a result of advice and help from British trade unionists, the African Mineworkers' Union was established on a stable basis for the first time, has conducted two strikes and won, since the end of the war, wage increases which in the aggregate represent about 500 per cent. on the 1945 rates.

Mr. Fairhead seems to be very upset about "reporting" and considers that "the task of a socialist reporter... is not merely to relate, but to comment on what took place." The whole article was a comment and intended as such. In the "Outlook" what one reports is held up to give guidance to the readers. It seems such a straightforward matter that I am at a loss to understand what all the fuss is about but then I must be rather a simple chap as I cannot understand what all the other stuff I have mentioned above has to do with the real struggles of the colonial peoples to destroy Imperialism, either.

Peckham John Goffe

French Dockers Demand Indo-China Cease-Fire

Geneva, May 9th

A DELEGATION of 5 representatives of Marseilles dockers, came here and presented an appeal for the restoration of peace in Indo-China and further easing of international tension to the delegation of the Chinese People's Republic to the Geneva Conference yesterday evening.

A similar appeal was also sent to the delegations of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France and the United States, and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Text of the appeal reads as follows:—

"The workers of the Port of Marseilles, like all the workers of France are following the Geneva Conference with attention. With the holding of this conference, great hope is born out of the action of the peace-loving peoples.

"In particular, the workers of the Port of Marseilles—dockers and transport workers and others—have since 1949, engaged in concrete action to bring an end to the war in Indo-China.

"In 1950, the 6,000 workers of the port, in the most complete unity, in a magnificent and powerful action, acted concretely by going on strike for peace in

Indo-China for 40 days. They waged a patriotic fight against the forces of reaction and war.

"The workers of the port have their own particular reasons for wanting peace, because they knew that it is in a climate of international relaxation and normal trading exchange between all countries, that they will avoid knowing unemployment and misery on their homes.

"Today, along with the immense majority of the French people who ask for peace in Indo-China, the workers of the port of Marseilles, on the basis of their struggles and their particular interests consider that the Geneva Conference must lead to an immediate cease-fire, which is the expressed desire of the French people, and that M. Bidault representing the French Government resists this strongly expressed desire. The workers of the port of Marseilles have sent an elected delegation to the representatives of the powers participating in the Geneva Conference in order to demonstrate their firm determination to see the negotiations result in a cease-fire in Indo-China, as a prelude to peace and a relaxation of international tension.

(Reported by New China News Agency).

General From The Jungle

General From The Jungle by B. Traven. Published by Robert Hale 10/6d.

THIS is a book about a revolution—a colonial, agrarian revolution against a decadent and oppressive social order, a revolution led and conducted by Mexico's landless and dispossessed peasantry.

The setting is somewhere in the deep south of Mexico, near Guatemala and the Honduras. It is the year 1910, the first year of Mexico's Great Revolution which lasted until 1919, cost 3,000,000 lives, but successfully eradicated the semi-feudal land order and thereby laid the foundations of present-day Mexico.

With the heroism born of desperation, with the cry of "Land

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

.....

.....

and Liberty", the Indian peons and workers of Mexico storm the gates of a hellish tyranny to equip their own armies from the armouries of their oppressors. Within a short period hundreds of roving guerilla bands operate in every state.

The title of this book can be somewhat misleading. The story revolves not just around a single central figure, the "General from the Jungle". It turns around the desires, needs and actions of a segment of the oppressed classes of a doomed Mexican society, around their collective leadership—the General (one-time soldier-deserter), a teacher (victim of political persecution), press ganged lumber-jacks and peasants who had sold themselves to Lumber tycoons in order to redeem themselves from debt. It is a continuation of the story which Traven began in the "Rebellion of the Hanged."

In the General himself we are given an excellent portrayal of a revolutionary soldier. He takes nothing for granted, always credits his enemy with every advantage, weighs up every situation with cold blooded objectivity, and acts decisively and ruthlessly. He neither expects nor gives quarter.

There is no attempt to stuff sophistication into the characters of this book. They speak their

own tongue, the simple, direct and violent language of men engaged in a ruthless, life and death struggle against tyrannical and corrupt rulers. It is a struggle like those which today are being waged throughout the colonial and semi-colonial lands of the world and B. Traven has rendered a great service in portraying it.

A. Banda

A PRIVATE MEETING on German Re-armament

Restricted to G.M.C. members of Labour Parties in London and Middlesex.

(admission free)

Holborn Hall (Grays Inn Rd.) Saturday, 29th May at 2.15 p.m.

Further particulars and copies of the Statement of the Case Against German Re-armament from Holborn and St. Pancras South C.L.P., 169 Hampstead Road, London, N.W.1.

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

BAN THE H. BOMB! March in Holborn on Wednesday, May 19th with the Holborn and District Peace Council. Leaving Portpool Lane (behind Holborn Hall) at 6.45 p.m. and proceeding via Tybalds Close and Herbrand Street to Cromer Street, W.C.1. Your support is requested.

CHINESE SPOKESMAN REFUTES "MANCHESTER GUARDIAN" REPORT

The "Manchester Guardian", carried in its May 5th issue a dispatch from its special correspondent in Geneva stating that during a private discussion with Mr. Myrdal, the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Europe, the Chinese Deputy Minister for Foreign Trade dropped hints to the effect that the Chinese delegation was prepared to consider an armistice in Vietnam along the 20th parallel provided that it could make a pact for a wider settlement including a substantial expansion of trade between China and the West.

Regarding this, the spokesman of the delegation of the People's Republic of China states that Mr. Lei Jen-min, Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade of China, never met Mr. Myrdal, and consequently the above mentioned report is a pure fabrication.

(New China News Agency)