

***A COLLECTION OF ARTICLES AND
EXTRACTS
FROM
“THE LABOUR MONTHLY”
(1925-1975)
On
CYPRUS, GREECE, TURKEY AND
MIDDLE EAST***

Scanned/Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus-London Bureaux
<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk>



&
Direct Democracy (Communist Party)
www.directdemocracy4u.uk
<http://www.directdemocracy4u.uk/cominform>



E-Book: June-October 2019

In this E-Book, articles and extracts on Cyprus, Turkey, Greece and Middle-East are compiled from “The Labour Monthly” issues which were published between May 1923 to September 1976 are available at

<http://www.unz.com/print/LabourMonthly/>.

“The Labour Monthly”, the Marxist journal was edited by Rajani Palme Dutt (R.P.D.).

“Labour Monthly was a magazine associated with the Communist Party of Great Britain. It was not technically published by the Party, and, particularly in its later period, it carried articles by left-wing trade unionists from outside the Party. It was published from June 1921 to March 1981, and from its inception until his death in 1974 it was edited by leading Party member and theoretician Rajani Palme Dutt, with only a few months absence in 1922 where he was deputised by another leading party figure, Tom Wintringham. The several-page editorial, entitled Notes of the Month, represented official CPGB policy. The intention was to try to keep open a potential channel of communication to Party members in the event of the CPGB being banned at any point.”

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Labour_Monthly

An index of the issues between 1921-1947 is available at <https://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/sections/britain/subject/index.htm>

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. The Labour Monthly, July 1925.....	10
GETTING MOSUL INTO PERSPECTIVE By W. N. EWER. The Labour Monthly, November 1925	11
The Mosul "Victory" by W.N. Ewer, <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , August 1926	27
IMPERIAL DEFENCE By W. N. EWER. The Labour Monthly, January 1927	38
THE GERMAN SITUATION By R. F. ANDREWS, The Labour Monthly, April 1933	45
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. The Labour Monthly, March 1934	52
TERROR IN CYPRUS By EVDOROS JOANNIDES. The Labour Monthly, May 1934.....	53
CONFERENCE ON TRADE UNION PROBLEMS AND POLICY. The Labour Monthly, October 1935.....	60
BOOK REVIEW. THE VOLCANO OF BALKANS by Doros Alastos, The Labour Monthly, October 1935.....	62
Book Reviews, In Europe, <i>The Balkans and Europe</i> , by Doros Alastos, by Reginald Bridgeman, <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , December 1937.....	67
Greece Under the Nazi Shadow by Odysseus Androutsos, <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , March 1939.....	72
The U.S.S.R., Turkey and the Allies by "Quaestor" <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , April 1940.....	78
AFTER SIX MONTHS—WHAT NOW? BY HARRY POLLITT. The Labour Monthly, April 1941.....	92
CIVIL LIBERTY IN THE EMPIRE By DESMOND BUCKLE—The Labour Monthly, February 1941.....	110
The Soviet Beacon by E.M. Winterton, <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , May 1941.....	117
Turkey and the U.S.S.R. by "Quaestor", <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , May 1942.....	123
STRATEGY AND THE SECOND FRONT By WILLIAM RUST—The Labour Monthly, September 1942	132

BOOK REVIEWS. Patrick Geddes: Maker of the Future, by Philip L. Boardman, <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , October 1945	145
BRITAIN'S ECONOMIC BALANCE SHEET, Margot Heinemann, <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , September 1946	147
EGYPT AND THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS by George Audit. <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , September 1946	148
MR. BEVIN AND BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY By K. ZILLIACUS, M.P., <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , March 1946.....	155
NOTES OF THE MONTH. New Stirrings by R.P.D., <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , October 1946	163
WHAT IS RUSSIA AFTER? By QUAESTOR. <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , April 1946	167
NOTES OF THE MONTH. Britain and Empire. R.P.D., <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , February 1947	169
THE GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM (Features of the Home and Foreign Policy of the Capitalist Countries during the Epoch of the General Crisis of Capitalism) by E. Varga, <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , January & February 1947	173
Notes of the Month, <i>America and Britain</i> by R.P.D., <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , April 1947	191
Notes of the Month, <i>Six Months of Decision</i> by R.P.D., <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , June 1947	209
THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT AND LABOUR'S FUTURE BY QUAESTOR, <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , March 1951	228
Notes of the Month, <i>The Great Contrast</i> by R.P.D. <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , November 1951	240
MEDITERRANEAN RIVALS. MALCOLM CARR, <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , November 1951	252
War Moves Over the Middle East by Clemens Dutt, <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , January 1952	258
OLD FALLACIES FOR NEW By ANDREW ROTHSTEIN, <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , August 1953	266
PATIENT TEACHER. <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , August 1954.....	269
LABOUR PARTY BOOMERANG. By E. M. Winterton, <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , September 1954	271

NOTES OF THE MONTH: New Horizons, by R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, September 1954	272
ENOSIS—CYPRUS' ROAD TO FREEDOM. GEORGE PEFKOS. The Labour Monthly, November 1954	273
TERROR IN THE MIDDLE EAST. C. ALLEN, The Labour Monthly, December 1954	281
TURNING POINT FOR PEACE By GORDON SCHAFFER. The Labour Monthly, October 1955	284
THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE. 1917-1955, By QUAESTOR, The Labour Monthly, November 1955	287
NOTES OF THE MONTH: After Geneva, by R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, December 1955.....	288
Watch This Washington Visit, Quaestor, The Labour Monthly, January 1956.....	289
The William Morris Society, The Labour Monthly, January 1956 ..	298
NOTES OF THE MONTH: Leadership and Policy in Britain, by R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, February 1956.....	299
CYPRUS, GREECE AND N.A.T.O. BY THEODORE DOGANIS, The Labour Monthly, February 1956.....	301
HOW TO FIGHT THE TORY OFFENSIVE By JOHN GOLLAN. The Labour Monthly, March 1956.....	306
Notes of the Month, Crisis and Contrast, R. Page Arnot, The Labour Monthly, March 1956.....	312
Notes of the Month, The Vision Splendid, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, April 1956.....	315
N.A.T.O.—Fact and Fiction by Sancho Panza, <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , April 1956.....	316
Notes of the Month, The Great Debate, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, May 1956.....	330
Socialism and Civil Liberty, D.N. Pritt, Q.C., The Labour Monthly, July 1956.....	331
BRITAIN'S SHAME IN CYPRUS. R. PAGE ARNOT, The Labour Monthly, July 1956.....	333
Notes of the Month: <i>Breakers Ahead</i> By R. PAGE ARNOT, The Labour Monthly, August 1956	339

FAR-SIGHTED MILITANTS By John Baird, M.P., The Labour Monthly, September 1956	341
Notes of the Month: <i>Labour Into Battle</i> By R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, October 1956	342
Why This Suez Madness, Ivor Montagu, The Labour Monthly, October 1956.....	345
Sanity in Storm, R.P.D. The Labour Monthly, December 1956	355
The Invasion of Egypt, Quaestor, The Labour Monthly, December 1956	356
Labour Discussion Forum, A.R. Bennett, J. Delahay and others, The Labour Monthly, January 1957.....	359
Notes of the Month, True Blue Democracy, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, February 1957	360
Notes of the Month, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, March 1957 ...	361
Outer Mongolia (Review) Andrew Rothstein, The Labour Monthly, March 1957.....	362
Labour Discussion Forum, M. Carter, R. Dixon, A.M. Richard, A. Saunders, The Labour Monthly, July 1957	363
Notes on Inflation, A Student of Affairs, The Labour Monthly, September 1957	364
No to the No-men, Ivor Montagu, The Labour Monthly, October 1957	365
Rising Tide at Blackpool, E. M. Winterton, The Labour Monthly, October 1957.....	367
Where is that Defence White Paper Now, Cdr. E. Young, R.N. (Retired), <i>The Labour Monthly</i> , December 1957.....	368
The Labour Party and the Colonies, H.B. Lim, The Labour Monthly, January 1958.....	369
This Picture-and That, Quaestor, The Labour Monthly, February 1958	375
Notes of the Month, 1. Strike Strategy, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, June 1958.....	384
Cyprus: Tory Colonialism Exposed, Clive Evatt, Q.C., <i>President Australian Committee for Cyprian Self-determination</i> , The Labour Monthly, August 1958	385

GREEK TEACHERS EXCLUDED.....	389
Gunboats off the Lebanon, A. Masri, The Labour Monthly, August 1958	391
Notes of the Month, Hands off the Middle East, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, August 1958	395
Notes of the Month, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, February 1959	406
Notes of the Month, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, March 1959	408
Mcmillan’s Visit by Quaestor, The Labour Monthly, April 1959.....	409
Drawing & Message for May Day, The Labour Monthly, May 1959	411
1959 Trade Unions Under Fire, O.H. Parsons, The Labour Monthly, May 1959	412
1959 The Intelligent Voter’s Guide, County Councillor Renee Short, The Labour Monthly, September 1959	413
Document of the Month, The Labour Monthly, June 1960.....	415
The Market Alternative, Quasestor, The Labour Monthly, October 1962	416
The Notes of the Month, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, November 1964	422
The Peace Movement Today, Andrew Walker, The Labour Monthly, April 1965	424
The Notes of the Month, After Washington, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, January 1965	425
Crisis in Greece, A Struggle for Democracy, Betty Ambatielos, The Labour Monthly, October 1965	426
Cyprus in the Grip of Crisis, Minos Perdios, The Labour Monthly, September 1971	432
Cyprus, Dina Machallepies, United Popular Support for Makarios Government, The Labour Monthly, April 1972	436
Honour to D.N. Pritt by Jacques Duclos, The Labour Monthly, August 1972	441
Bereaved-Rejected-Deprived Emotional and educational experience of West Indian adolescent immigrants by Jane King, The Labour Monthly, October 1972	442

Sad Cyprus, British Government Responsibility One Year After the Turkish Invasion by Lena Jeger MP, The Labour Monthly, July 1975	443
Partition of Cyprus! George Pefkos, The Labour Monthly, November 1975	447

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. The Labour Monthly,
July 1925**

DEBT FUND.

....

£ s. d.

Cypriot Readers Group 0 3 0

....

[pp. 395-396]

GETTING MOSUL INTO PERSPECTIVE By W. N. EWER. *The Labour Monthly*, November 1925

There are among us certain superficial Marxists who, having learned that there is oil in Mosul, say contentedly:

“Here is the economic interpretation of the question” and proceed to murmur the euphonious names of Deterding, Zaharoff and Gulbenkian, for all the world after the manner of Mr. William Bailey talking of the Jews or Mr. Walton Newbold of munition makers.

Now the fact is that, though there is plenty of oil in Mosul politics—perhaps more than in Mosul itself—the roots of the whole business run far deeper and further back. The Mosul question is a part of that “Eastern question” which has been for a century the focal point of British foreign policy. And unless we get it into its proper setting and perspective we are likely to make a very bungling job of understanding it.

That Eastern question—made vitally important to British Imperialism by the possession of India and the conspicuous feebleness of Turkey—is the leitmotif of nineteenth-century British diplomacy. For, even before the cutting of the Suez Canal, both Downing Street and Calcutta realised instinctively the strategic importance of the Middle East. Already in 1845 it was obvious to Kinglake that “the Englishman, leaning far over to guard his loved India, will plant his feet firmly in the Valley of the Nile and sit in the seats of the Faithful.” And throughout the century we were ready again and again to go to war rather than allow France or Russia to gain a foothold in Syria or Egypt or the Persian Gulf.

The British Government jealously watched the Levant. The Indian Government edged its way tentatively up the Persian Gulf, where British warships patrolled the waters and British “politicals” intrigued with vaguely independent local rulers like the Sheikhs of Koweit and Bahrein and Mohammarah. Southern

Persia and Mesopotamia were marked out as Great Britain's share of the heritage when the sick men of Teheran and Constantinople should finally collapse.

Right back in 1833, Palmerston declared that it was impossible to allow Mehemet Ali, the protégé of the French, to control Syria, for Syria was “ the avenue to Mesopotamia ;” while half a century later Beaconsfield was anxious, under pretext of supporting Turkey, to send an Indian force to occupy Basra and Bagdad. He failed to persuade his colleagues. The Indians went spectacularly but rather pointlessly to Malta. But out of the turmoil he did snatch Cyprus. It was a significant and not usually understood choice. For Cyprus has no harbour to compare with Suda Bay; nor has it any relevance to the defence of the Canal or the blockade of the Straits. But it lies—and this was undoubtedly in Beaconsfield's mind—athwart the Gulf of Alexandretta and the historic route through Aleppo to the Euphrates valley.

For three-quarters of the nineteenth century, then, Mesopotamia had been marked down as a sometime British possession. The Valley of the Euphrates, like the Valley of the Nile, was both strategically important and economically desirable. England had pegged out her claim before, at the beginning of the twentieth century, the discovery of the South Persian oilfields and the rapidly developing importance of oil came to emphasise its importance. It was in 1901 that Mr. D'Arcy was granted a concession of all South-West Persian oil-rights; in 1909 that the Anglo-Persian Oil Company was formed.

Meanwhile, rather overlooked by British diplomacy, which was for the time being intent on other troubles, the German economic penetration of Asia Minor had begun. The Deutsche Bank and its associates had their first railway concession in 1888. By 1896 they had reached Konia. In 1903 the concession was signed which empowered the German company to continue its line through Bagdad to the Gulf.

It was a direct challenge to British domination of the Gulf, to British control of the new Persian oilfield and to the British reversion to Mesopotamia. Imperialism, already bitterly jealous of German expansion, was up in arms. An offer to let British capital participate in the concession was contemptuously rejected. Britain wanted control, not a junior partnership. And the Foreign Office was set the task of blocking at all costs the German scheme.

Ten years of tortuous diplomacy followed. The newly formed Anglo-French Entente, soon reinforced by Russia, fought the diplomatic battles of France in Morocco and of Russia in the Balkans. On the Persian Gulf, France and Russia repaid Britain for her support by their aid in opposing the completion of the Bagdadbahn. Their chief weapons were two. Great Britain since 1899 claimed to be protector of the Sheikh of Koweit. And Koweit was the destined terminal of the line. More important still, the consent of the powers was necessary for the increase of the customs dues by which Turkey was to provide the money for the kilometric guarantee required by the Deutsche Bank. To this the triple veto of the Entente was opposed.

Germany, baffled, tried to buy off British opposition. A tentative offer was made that the German line should run to Bagdad, and that the sector thence to the Gulf should be British built and British controlled. It was in effect an offer to partition Mesopotamia into a German and a British sphere of influence. A tempting proposition. But Russia had no wish to see such a solution. France feared that it might be the first step to an Anglo-German *rapprochement*. The German Government wanted "compensation" elsewhere. And Sir Edward Grey, under pressure from his allies, refused to deal on these terms. His refusal may have been influenced by the fact that the oil of Mosul had now become a factor in the calculations, and that the partition would have left it in the German zone.

The first survey had been made in 1901 by a German expert who reported that the region was “among the richest in the world.”

It was an enthusiastic judgment which has yet to be confirmed ; for even now this coveted area has not been properly drilled. Oil companies know to their cost how often the hopes of the surveyor and the geologist are disappointed when put to the test. And there are not wanting experts who declare roundly that the fabulous oil wealth of Mosul is a myth.

The prospects, however, were sufficiently alluring to attract the big and little oil men. Anglo-Persian were showing interest. Germans were following up the original survey. Concession hunting was opening at Constantinople. The Chester group had already secured provisional rights, though on a title which was later to be fiercely debated. Mosul was becoming as desirable as the lower Euphrates valley and the Gulf ports. The securing of it must lie in the future. For the moment the urgent task was to keep the Germans out.

Suddenly in 1912 the barrier which Sir Edward Grey had laboured to build collapsed. It was largely in deference to Russian opposition that he had refused the tempting offer of 1910. And now Russia let him down. The Potsdam conversations between the Tsar and the Kaiser had alarmed London. (For throughout the pre-war decade any contact between one Entente partner and the Germans was watched with suspicious fear by the other two.) And when it was learnt that the Russians had withdrawn opposition to the customs increase and had reached an agreement with the Germans for the linking of the Anatolian railways, via Mosul and Bagdad, with a North Persian system, the British were terrified and furious. Sir Edward hinted that he might reverse his whole foreign policy. King George expressed his august displeasure. Simla was haunted by visions of Turko-German armies at Herat. All for a while was consternation and confusion.

When it died down, Sir Edward informed Sazonoff that he had no alternative now but to come to the best agreement he could with Turkey and with Germany, since the compact of opposition had been broken, and since it was reported that even without the customs increase funds for the building might be obtained by the Deutsche Bank.

It was indeed imperative to sacrifice something in order to retain the essential grasp upon the Gulf terminal of the railway and in order to obtain some share in the prospective oil supplies of Mosul.

Compensation was looked for in Southern Persia. The Anglo-Russian agreement had left this in the "neutral zone." But now operations there began in earnest. The Persian Government was asked for the concession for a railway system running eastward from Mohammarah to Baluchistan. The activities of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company were intensified, and the negotiations opened which were to result in the investment in 1914 of £2,000,000 of British Government money in the Persian oil fields. The policing of Southern Persia began to be a subject of discussion. The military were asked to consider what force must be sent to protect the oil fields if need be. Sir Percy Cox, the Indian Political Department's "Resident" in the Persian Gulf, became exceedingly active.

Negotiations were opened with Turkey and with Germany. They were, after the Grey habit, kept profoundly secret; and when rumours gave rise to questions in the House of Commons, they were met by evasive or misleading answers. The bargaining, one gathers, was hard: but the bargain was struck, and on June 29, 1914, Sir Edward, rather casually, and in the middle of a long speech, informed the House that he had reached an agreement with the German ambassador. Characteristically he even then concealed from the Commons some of the most important clauses of the agreement.

The date is possibly of tragic significance (it was two days after the Archduke's murder). For the fear was always present in the minds of the diplomats of Paris and Petersburg that an Anglo-German agreement over the Bagdad railway might be the first step towards an understanding which would draw England away from her partners, make her a dubious ally, perhaps even break up the Entente and produce a new—and for them unfavourable—European grouping.

How far Sazonoff's knowledge of the Anglo-German negotiation and his fear of its possible consequence determined his policy in the summer of 1914—how far they account for his insistent effort to draw England into accepting more definite obligations, for his demand—furtively conceded by Grey—for an Anglo-Russian naval convention, for his grim determination in the last ten days to face the risk of war and to drag England into it if it came—these are matters on which one can only speculate. But there is at least the possibility of truth in the tragic paradox that the movement towards an Anglo-German understanding was a powerful factor in precipitating the Anglo-German war.

The Grey—Lichnowsky agreement, initialled in June, 1914, but never signed, became of course a scrap of paper two months later. But it is none the less a significant document, and some of its clauses became important in the later diplomacy.

Its main provisions were these. The railway was to be built by the German group as far as Basra. From Basra to the Gulf the line was to be British. Two British directors were to go on to the German board. The ports of Basra and Bagdad were to be equipped and exploited by mixed companies (Anglo-German-Turkish). The river navigation was to be Anglo-Turkish. The Willcocks irrigation scheme was not to be opposed by the Germans. Finally—and in this clause the oil of Mosul definitely enters diplomatic society—a concession of all Mesopotamian and Mosul oil rights for a long terms of years was to be granted

to a new concern called the Turkish Petroleum Company, in which the Anglo-Persian Oil Company was to hold 50 per cent, of the shares, the Anglo-Saxon Company (a Shell-Royal Dutch subsidiary) 25 per cent, and the Deutsche Bank 25 per cent.

Certainly it was a good bargain from the British Imperialist point of view. It entrenched Great Britain firmly in Lower Mesopotamia, it gave her the lion's share of the hypothetical oil and the less hypothetical irrigation profits, it gave her a voice in the management of the Bagdad Railway. Germany had conceded very much, willing no doubt to pay heavily for the political implications of an Anglo-German agreement which ignored France and Russia.

But two months later the whole arrangement went sky high, and British policy had to be swiftly re-orientated to meet the possibilities of a war in which Turkey was sure sooner or later to be implicated. Diplomacy—as Sir Edward Grey boasts—worked hard and effectively to delay that entry until we were ready. Troops were hurried from Bombay to the Gulf. Turkey did not declare war until October 29. On November 7 the expeditionary force landed at the mouth of the Shatt-el-Arab. The campaign which was to lead to Kut and Mosul, to Baku and the Caspian, had opened.

Officially the purpose of the landing was to guard the Anglo-Persian pipe line, which runs only a few miles from the old Turco-Persian frontier. But in August Sir Edward Grey had already begun to talk of the partition of Asia Minor. And there is little question that from the beginning it was in many minds that at last the opportunity had come for acquiring the whole of Mesopotamia.

In the spring of 1915 came Russia's demand for the annexation of Constantinople, the shores of the Straits and a large slice of Asia Minor; and at once we replied that in the event of any division of the Turkish dominions Mesopotamia and the

“neutral” zone of Persia must be regarded as in the British sphere. France was putting in her “historical” claim to a Syria with ambitiously elastic borders. And the Secret Treaty with Russia left England and France to settle among themselves the partition of the spoils that would remain when the Tsar’s appetite had been sated. Later Italy had to be promised Adalia, Smyrna and the Aidin Vilayet. But these did not affect the areas coveted by the Imperialists of London and Paris.

Their conflicting claims were temporarily adjusted by the secret Sykes-Picot agreement of 1916. Britain was to get Lower Mesopotamia including Bagdad. France was to take Syria, the Adana Vilayet and a wedge of territory running up to the source of the Tigris. Between them was to be (in fulfilment of pledges given to the Arabs) an Arab state or states divided into French and British spheres of influence.

This partition left Mosul in the French sphere. But in a separate (and of course also secret) agreement between Grey and Cambon France agreed to sanction in her sphere of influence all pre-war concessions. This was intended to secure the oil rights of the Turkish Petroleum Company, the German shares in which had been contingently appropriated by the British Government. Yielding the territory, Britain was determined to keep hold of the oil.

But when the final crash of the Central Empires came, there was a significant change: Britain now showed much reluctance to give up the territory, for events had opened up new prospects, which made territorial possession more tempting than oil concessions.

Russia was in the throes of civil war and believed to be on the point of collapse. The British army was master of Mesopotamia and, after the armistice, occupied Mosul. Southern Persia was firmly held, and Dunsterville’s force had pushed north to the shores of the Caspian. Batoum and Baku were in British occupation. Other columns had moved through Eastern

Persia to Merv and Meshed. There were plans for seizing Khiva and Bokhara. The whole of South-Western Asia seemed to lie as a prize in the hands of British Imperialism.

If Persia were to become, in fact if not yet in name, a British dominion; if the Trans-Caucasian and possibly the Trans-Caspian states were to be under British protection, it would be absurd to give up Mosul to the French. The partition arranged in 1915 and 1916 had been rendered obsolete by the withdrawal of Russia from the plunder-game. New arrangements were necessary. Mr. Lloyd George promptly demanded that Great Britain should retain Mosul (under the newly devised system of “mandates”) and that Palestine (which by the Sykes-Picot agreement was to be internationalised) should come under British administration—or mandate.

Let me emphasise again that this was a demand for territory, not a demand for oil fields. The oil concessions were safeguarded. Mr. Lloyd George was even willing to concede some of them to France. But he wanted the Mosul territory to round off the great area of Irak and Persia, and complete the new westward extension of India to the Mediterranean. The Syrian coast line had perforce to be yielded to the French. But save for Syria—and Afghanistan—the whole vast territory from Egypt to the Indian frontier, from the Arabian Sea to the Caucasus, was in the hands of Great Britain, or of client chieftains. “And Afghanistan” I have written. But even Afghanistan was invaded by British columns and its capital bombed by British aeroplanes.

The definite acquisition of this new Empire was a vision to dazzle Imperialist minds. It opened up vistas of innumerable lucrative posts for the British upper and middle classes, of inimitable opportunities for profit for British capital. That it was seriously contemplated is scarcely open to question. The demand for Mosul is one item of evidence. The many millions of pounds expended in Persia (over £6,000,000 in bribes alone) under Sir Percy Cox’s supervision are another. The insistence in

the Mudros Armistice on the right to occupy Transcaucasia; the attack on Afghanistan; the Maxwell mission in Transcaspiia; the building of strategic roads across Persia ; all the signs are there. It was this gigantic plan, and not considerations of oil, which motivated Mr. George's claim to Mosul.

He succeeded: for he was in a strong bargaining position. France needed his support in Europe against President Wilson. She could but pay the price. The details of the negotiation are obscure. Clemenceau said afterwards that he had been tricked: he thought he was ceding a city and found he had ceded a province. But in any case he yielded, and the bargain was struck. The oil part of it was finally embodied in the San Remo agreement of 1920, by which a French group, headed by the ubiquitous and international Sir Basil Zaharoff, was given the Deutsche Bank's 25 per cent, of the Turkish Petroleum Company's shares.

Between the Allies it seemed that the whole business had now been disposed of. Turkey was settled with at Sevres. A secret agreement with the Persian Government—which in effect made Persia a British protectorate—had been signed, after the necessary financial preparation. The Middle Eastern Empire was well on the way to be made.

Within a year the whole scheme, or at any rate great and integral parts of it, collapsed.

The Afghan expedition was a muddled and disreputable failure. Russia, instead of collapsing, showed an alarming vitality. The Red Fleet controlled the Caspian. The Red Armies pushed the slender British forces out of Northern Persia. The Persians angrily repudiated the secret agreement and the minister who had signed it. The Turks equally repudiated the Treaty of Sevres. The Kurds of Mosul rose in revolt.

It was clear that the fruit was by no means as ripe as had been supposed. The effective conquest of the new Empire would demand a tremendous and costly military effort of which Britain

was now both economically and psychologically incapable. The internal situation in India was doubtful. The more level-headed soldiers—Sir Henry Wilson and Sir William Robertson, for example—were strongly opposed to the assumption of such enormous new military responsibilities. The pressure of organised Labour had compelled the cessation of the Russian campaigns.

Very reluctantly, in the face of facts, the Indian Political Department and the financial powers behind Anglo-Persian and the Lynch companies had to give way, and to admit that at least the time was not ripe for establishing King George V as the heir of Xerxes. Peace was made with the Amir. The British columns fell back from Teheran and Merv. Persia was evacuated, the great and costly military roads remaining as a reminder of the past and a warning of the future, if and when British Imperialism was again prepared for effort.

But to Irak and to Mosul we held on, stamping out the insurrections in a bloody little campaign which cost us 2,000 casualties before the tribesmen of Southern Kurdistan would realise that the “liberation” which they had been promised was merely a euphemism for British domination. The swallowing of Persia had been an afterthought, an irresistible temptation of what seemed for a moment wholly favourable circumstances. But Irak was a prize on which, as I have pointed out, we had had our eyes for upwards of half a century. Moreover, the development of our transport gave it new importance as a “stage” on the route to India. And Irak, the “politicals” and the “forward” type of soldier insisted, must imply Mosul. The old conditions of the Punjab repeated themselves. We held the river plains. To the north lay high mountainous country, inhabited by restless tribesmen, dubiously controlled by a government of uncertain strength. And a hundred miles or so across the hills, the Russian frontier.

The old fears which have haunted generations of Anglo-Indians awoke again. "The ghost of the Russian bear," Mr. Churchill cried in alarm, "comes padding across the immense fields of snow." The same deduction was drawn. Irak, like India, must have a "scientific frontier" in the mountains—a frontier which would facilitate defence and, possibly, offence. It must include not only the Mosul vilayet, but the Hakkari district beyond. That was the first point. The second was that the Kurdish districts of Mosul flanked the Persian-Kurdish provinces between Kermanshah and Lake Urmia, and gave control of a second line of advance on Teheran and the Caspian—a notable consideration for future eventualities. The third, certainly, was the oil of Mosul itself: for if the area reverted, not to France but to Turkey, the fate of the concessions was still uncertain.

At all costs, therefore, Irak, and with Irak, Mosul, were to be held, not only for their own sakes, but as an essential strategic point on the new airway to India, and as the nucleus of that Middle Eastern Empire of which the acquisition was postponed rather than abandoned.

There followed five years of intricate diplomacy, to trace which in detail would take vastly more space than I have left. Its main lines were two—or shall I say rather that it was a diplomatic war on two fronts? Irak and Mosul had to be held, firstly against the claims of a reviving Turkey, secondly against the growing demand at home for evacuation. The American oil offensive at Lausanne was a side-show. Using the dubious Chester concession as a weapon and the "open door" as a catchword, American diplomacy demanded for the American oil magnates a share in the possibilities of the Mosul field. Again Great Britain yielded—significantly willing again to part with the oil if she could thus ensure her grip on the territory. Half the Anglo-Persian shares in the Turkish Petroleum Company were the price paid for America's complaisance. They were duly

allotted, not to Admiral Chester, his heirs and assigns, who had been so useful in the negotiation, but to a group in which the all-powerful Standard and Sinclair companies were the dominant partners.

The policy evolved for the two-fronted diplomatic war was an ingenious one. The credit for the ingenuity must presumably go to the newly-created Middle Eastern Department of the Colonial Office—which had taken over Irak from the Indian Government. Its main idea was that our occupation of Irak, and of Mosul, must be converted into a treaty obligation from which we could not, with the best will in the world, free ourselves. The mandate was insufficient; for clearly a mandate could be relinquished: whereas a binding treaty obligation must be fulfilled, however reluctantly.

The first step clearly must be to establish a government at Bagdad with which the treaty could be signed. The puppet was ready to hand. The Emir Feisal, turned out of his ephemeral “Kingdom of Syria” by the French, was looking for a job. The Cairo Conference of 1921 decided that he should be King of Irak. He came opportunely to Bagdad. Sir Percy Cox, skilled in the management of Eastern politics, did the rest. Experienced political officers collected “petitions” inviting Feisal to mount the throne. Arab leaders who opposed him were promptly jailed: opposition parties and their newspapers were suppressed: Feisal was announced to the world as the spontaneously and unanimously chosen of the people of Irak, and was duly enthroned in the presence of an adequate guard of British infantry.

The way being clear, a liberally-minded British Government declared that it was unwilling to hold Irak longer in the leading strings of mandatism: that it purposed at once endowing it not only with its chosen King, but with a constitution: and that with the King it would conclude a Treaty by which it would undertake to help him financially, militarily and administratively for four

years, at the expiration of which Irak would become a fully independent state, duly equipped with membership in the League of Nations, and Great Britain would be free of all its obligations and responsibilities.

The treaty was signed in due course: but when the newly-elected Assembly met it showed an irritating reluctance to ratify it—reluctance overcome by the simple expedient of a hurried midnight session to which the opposition members (a majority of the whole) were by a curious accident not summoned, while popular demonstrations were dealt with in the usual manner. The obedient minority not only ratified the treaty, but added a useful rider declaring that it only did so on condition that Great Britain defended Irak's rights in Mosul in their integrity.

The British House of Commons, persuaded that it was preparing the way for rapid evacuation—though Mr. Thomas declined to give a binding pledge that we would get out at the end of the four years—added its ratification. And the Middle Eastern Department was fully armed. For in the treaty there was, as joker in the pack, that provision for the conclusion of a new treaty on its expiration, which Mr. Amery was, at the right moment, to produce as implying an obligation of honour not to desert poor King Feisal in 1928.

The evacuationists, Tory, Liberal and Labour alike, had been successfully duped by the treaty dodge. The Turks were more difficult. But they were persuaded at Lausanne to refer the question of the sovereignty of Mosul to the League Council. Whether Lord Curzon's assurance that the decision would have to be a unanimous one of a body on which Turkey would be represented was a deliberate trap, or whether it was based on genuine ignorance of the provisions of the League Covenant, must still be matter for speculation. But whatever the intention, it acted effectively as a trap. The Turks accepted, to find themselves confronted two years later with the suggestion that the fate of Mosul must be determined by the vote of a majority

of the Council—a majority already assured, for various reasons, to Great Britain. But in the meantime a brilliant piece of diplomacy, achieved by some unknown hand, had inserted into the minds, and so into the report, of the League's Commissioners, the recommendation that the treaty of 1923 should be renewed for a further period of twenty-five years. That completed the obligation of honour. The treaty bound us to assert Irak's claim to Mosul. The League said that if we did this we must stay in Irak. What could the Government do but patiently accept the decision? The evacuationists might fume. But they had been out-manoeuvred all along the line. So had the Turks. But the Turk is an unreliable fellow, with a deplorable ignorance of the rules of the game. Said Sout of Beresford after Albuera, "I had pierced his centre. I had turned his flanks. I had cut his communications. By every rule I had him beaten. But he was so bad a soldier that he didn't know it." So the Turks, beaten at all points, calmly upset the table and propose starting all over again. And there the question stands at the moment—Imperialism clutching tenaciously at its prize, but still uncertain of its ability to hold it.

In this two years of post-Lausanne diplomacy the Turks have again and again declared that if England will give up territorial claims she is welcome to the oil concessions. And each time the British Government has declined even to discuss the possibility of such a sordid deal.

And so I end where I began. The claim to Mosul is not motivated primarily by the desire to obtain for British oil interests the profits of its hypothetical wells. It is part of a far more grandiose scheme, the scheme of a great Middle Eastern Empire stretching from the Indian frontier to the Mediterranean, from the Arabian Sea to the Caspian and the Caucasus. The faint beginnings of that scheme were when the East India Company began to build its factories along the Persian Gulf. The end of it is not yet. The retreat is momentary: the ambition is lasting. One

may prophesy without hesitation that at least one more supreme effort will be made. It may be that Parthia will be fatal to Britain as to Rome, and that the downfall of the Empire will come in an attempt, beyond its strength, to add “the wealth of Ormuzd” to the “wealth of Ind.” In that case, the struggle for Irak and Mosul will have historical importance as the beginning of the end.

[pp. 679-691]

The Mosul “Victory” by W.N. Ewer, *The Labour Monthly*, August 1926

THE Angora Treaty has been duly acclaimed a triumph for a firm but pacific diplomacy. Sir Ronald Lindsay has become a G.C.M.G., and the Foreign Secretary has gratefully welcomed the addition of some fresh leaves to the rather faded and disreputable laurels of Locarno.

Yet in cold fact the Anglo-Turkish settlement is, if not a defeat, at any rate a decided repulse for British diplomacy. To have gained the Turkish Government’s recognition of the permanent annexation of the Mosul Vilayet to Iraq; to have secured at last the fixation of a dangerously disputed frontier; this is indeed something. But it is only a part of the programme. The real objectives of the negotiation lay much further than this. And there has been a complete failure to attain them.

Mosul, as I have frequently pointed out, is far more than an oil field of hypothetical value. Turkey is something far more than the neighbour state across the Hakkari mountains. Sir Ronald Lindsay and his chiefs in London were concerned not only to establish a frontier but to establish Great Britain’s position in South-Western Asia on a firm basis, to secure for British diplomacy a dominant influence from the Aegean to the Indian frontier—an influence which would at once oppose an impassable barrier to any pressure or influence from the north, and would secure for Great Britain the lion’s share of the inheritance when, in the fulness of time, the remaining independent Asiatic states should collapse.

It had become gradually clear to Downing Street that the key to this position lay in Angora. Turkey, to-day, is not indeed the Turkey whose territories only a few years ago stretched from the Adriatic to the Persian Gulf, whose armies controlled the Straits and the desert routes to the East, whose frontiers lay within

striking distance of the Suez Canal. But, in defiance of all the cheerful calculations of 1919, she has established herself as still a power to be counted with. She is still in fact—whatever the treaties may say about it—mistress of the Straits. She still controls the Bagdad Railway. She still lies perilously near the increasingly important motor road and airway routes to the Gulf. And though she is no longer the seat of the Khilafat, her prestige in the Moslem world was never higher. You have only to walk through any bazaar in South-Western Asia or North Africa and note the portraits of Kemal in the shops to understand.

Since, then, Turkey had opposed an obstinate and successful resistance to the projects of tri-partition and dismemberment; since she had asserted, both in arms and in diplomacy, her strength and status, it was clear enough that British policy must be reversed, and that the Turkish Republic must be lured away from its dangerous friendship with Russia, must be persuaded that its real advantage lay in friendship and close co-operation with Great Britain, must—in a word—be brought into the British sphere of influence, both diplomatically and economically. If that could be achieved, Persia and Afghanistan would follow almost automatically. The barrier against Bolshevism would have been strongly built; the road would be open to that peaceful economic penetration which, in Euro-Asiatic or Euro-African relations, is the normal prelude to absorption.

Downing Street saw that the very fact that Anglo-Turkish relations were bad, and that there was definite cause of quarrel in the Mosul dispute, offered an admirable opening for such a policy. Skilfully conducted the settlement of sharp differences is an admirable prelude to an entente.

There must, according to all tradition, be two steps in the game. For it is an article of faith with our diplomacy that the Turk is an “Oriental,” and that in all dealings with “Orientals” you must begin with a display of force, lest any conciliation be regarded as a sign of weakness. This Ethel M. Dellish

conception of the way to treat “ Orientals “ has, incidentally, been responsible for an amazing series of diplomatic blunderings. But our diplomats do not lightly forsake their romantic conceptions. The plain need for making friends with Turkey, added to this Dellosh illusion about “Orientals” therefore determined the course of the negotiation. First the firm hand. The Turk must be shown that if he continued to defy the British Empire he would pay very dearly for the amusement. When he had been taught this lesson he could be shown that if on the other hand He would enter the British parlour there would be very solid advantages awaiting him. To put things with an indecent bluntness, the plan was first to bully, then to bribe.

The obtaining, by some patient, not over easy, diplomacy, of judgment in Iraq’s favour from the League of Nations was a necessary preliminary. But clearly the matter would not be left in the hands of the League; for the League could only reiterate its decision, could not bargain with Angora as the Foreign Office proposed to do. Turkey’s anticipated refusal to recognise the Geneva judgment gave the necessary opportunity. Mr. Baldwin—nicely suited to the role—made the necessary “friendly gesture,” offered to negotiate. He explained to an approving House of Commons that the Government was anxious for neighbourly amity and co-operation with Turkey, and that he proposed himself to begin conversations with the Turkish Ambassador. The Tory Press loudly praised this new evidence of the upright character and lofty idealism of the Prime Minister. The Liberal Press nodded complacently. And, of course, the warning note sounded in the *Daily Herald* was discounted as due to mere prejudice and cynicism.

Mr. Baldwin for the blandishment. The policy needed also a bully. For England prefers, when possible, to do her bullying by proxy. It is less disturbing to the Baldwin pose.

Now anyone looking round Europe for a bully would not look long. The qualifications of one candidate are too patent to

be missed. And by great good fortune Turkey was the very state on which Signor Mussolini had his own eyes. Anatolia is his obvious plunder-ground. The coast which Italy had in her grip in 1919 and then (to Mussolini's intense disgust) abandoned is temptingly visible from the walls of Rhodes.

Sir Austen—by another happy chance—was in Italy, recuperating after the strenuous labours of the Locarno pact. The two statesmen met. They made, of course, no treaty, no pact, no agreement. These are crude methods of diplomacy not suitable to countries in which Parliament, whatever its faults, has an awkward knack of asking disconcerting questions. So (with a view to the possibility of having to issue categoric denials that any agreement had been made) the two statesmen—after the classic example of Sir Edward Grey—merely exchanged views as to possible action in certain eventualities.

Suppose Turkey proved recalcitrant, would make no agreement. Suppose a war—in which, of course, she would be defying not merely Great Britain but the majesty of the League of Nations itself. Suppose this happened, would it be likely that Italy and her client, Greece, would care to take a hand ?

Italy—and Greece—most certainly would be delighted. But—supposing such a thing should happen, and Turkey were well defeated. There would have to be a new peace settlement. Would the British Government have any objection then to Greece coming back to Smyrna and repossessing herself of the Aidin Vilayet? And if Italy wanted the country to the south, the Meander Valley and Adalia and away east to perhaps Selindi or Anemur—would Great Britain support the claim ?

Naturally no promise of such a kind could be given. Certainly it would be unthinkable that a British Government—above all a Baldwin Government—could strike bargains for the partition of a State with which it was about to open friendly negotiations. But, as between gentlemen—one might almost venture to say as between Fascists, for was not His Britannic

Excellency becoming an honorary member of that exalted body—as between gentlemen Sir Austen’s views would be profoundly interesting to Sir Benito.

They were. They were both interesting and satisfactory. Sir Benito’s views were equally interesting to Sir Austen. Had they been men of a lower social order they would have winked on parting. But Knights of the Garter do not wink, though they might advance their motto in extenuation.

Sir Austen came home. The necessary military preparations began. Angora guessed what had been afoot at Rapallo, and began to calculate the odds. They were clearly too great. The Soviet Union was the only reliable friend; and the Soviet Union could not help defend the Lycian coast or help repulse a Greek descent, backed, as in 1919, by the British Fleet, on the ruined water front of *Smyrna*. The Serbian Government, sounded by Rushdi Bey on his way home from Paris, showed no eagerness to create a diversion by a move on Salonica. It would be too risky an enterprise; the candle of Salonica was not worth the game of challenging Italy and defying the League.

Therefore the astute diplomats of Angora decided that, since war was impossible, negotiation was necessary. A cordial, but guarded reply, was sent to Mr. Baldwin’s kind invitation. Chuckling with glee, the Tory Press pointed out that Angora’s new attitude was occasioned by a

healthy fear that, in the event of a conflict over Mosul, Italy, Greece and even other Balkan States (the reference is to Bulgaria with whom there had also been an “exchange of views”) would not remain indifferent, but would see in it a useful and legitimate opportunity for carrying out their own aspirations and ambitions in Asia Minor.

That was the *Daily Telegraph*. The *Morning Post* began to drop hints of the next move

The Russian Treaty was “practically valueless to Turkey.” It was positively dangerous. “The association of Turkey with her dangerous and unstable neighbour can bring no good to Turkey,

and might result in her irremediable injury ; for it must eventually bring Turkey both within the power of the Soviet and to enmity with the Western European Powers.

“The policy of Great Britain has always been friendly to the Turks. The overtures made by the Prime Minister are in accordance with the traditional attitude of this country towards Turkey . .

“The British Government has condoned Turkey’s infringement of the rules of international comity and expressed its willingness to give every consideration to the requirements of the Turkish Government. That Government cannot hope to receive a similar offer from any other nation, for no other nation can command the requisite resources, with the exception of the United States, which will do nothing for Turkey.

“Great Britain, however, in her dealings with Turkey, can rely upon the support of both France and Italy ; and the worth of the friendship of the three most powerful nations in Europe is hardly to be despised.”

And so on. A little crudely put perhaps. But one must not expect subtlety from the *Morning Post*. Besides it is as well to be frank with “ Orientals “; to leave them no doubt of the bigness of your stick and the fatness of your purse, so that it is easy for them to choose which they prefer you to employ.

The objective of the negotiation was, then, plain enough. But the process of negotiating was delicate and complex. Secrecy was essential, and at once agreed to by both parties. And Sir Ronald Lindsay went to Angora towards the end of January.

First move was clearly for the Turks to ask what Great Britain would give them if they recognised Iraq’s sovereignty over Mosul. It would have been crude to reply in the words of Punch’s historic Fashoda cartoon—” You’ll see what I’ll give you if you don’t.” Something must obviously be done to save the face of the Turkish Government, and to allay its fears that Southern Kurdistan would be used as a base for fomenting insurrection in the north. A slight rectification of frontier and a

share in the oil royalties would do the first. Satisfactory assurances could be given on the second. There was, it was felt, small doubt that this would more than satisfy the Turkish Government. To Angora, hard pressed for ready money, half a million pounds in the hand would far outweigh hypothetical chances of securing Mosul by arms—even were there no Italian, Greek and Bulgarian fleets and armies threatening the Western marches of the Republic.

But, of course, if Turkey wanted more; if she would like not a slight frontier rectification but the cession of a large slice of territory; if she would like not a tiny half-million or so but a substantial loan; if she would like some arrangement that would ease her of part of her existing debt burden; then these things might be obtainable, on conditions. Rushdi Bey, following the traditional and often successful technique of Turkish diplomacy, temporised. He wanted time to consider matters; really time to look round again and see if there were possibilities of support elsewhere. There seemed to be, for already M. de Jouvenel, new High Commissioner in Syria, was suggesting negotiations for the final delimitation of the TurcoSyrian frontier. France was not pleased by the prospect of a British ascendancy at Angora—which would mean the waste of much past effort on her part. M. de Jouvenel was quite ready to jump in quickly, repeat the coup of M. Franklin Bouillon, and prove to Kemal Pasha and his colleagues that the real friend was Codlin of Paris, not Short of London. He came to Angora on February 10, a week or so after Sir Ronald had returned to Constantinople to report. Before another week was out he had provisionally signed a pact with which the Turks had good reason to be pleased. It gave them a good slice of valuable railway line. It provided for joint neutrality between Turkey and Syria. It did enough besides to arouse intense indignation in the Foreign Office. M. de Jouvenel had, indeed, done too well. He had not realised that the financial relations of Great Britain and France made it impossible for the

Quai d'Orsay to defy Downing Street and to thwart its plans in this light manner. Strong—very strong—representations were made in Paris, and M. Briand hastily promised that before the treaty was definitely signed everything objectionable to Great Britain should be taken out of it. General Sarraut was sent off to Angora to revise M. de Jouvenel's overzealous production.

Rushdi Bey's effort had failed. France could not help him. Russia, equally, could give no immediate effective aid. Things were going well with the project—due in the first place to Fevzi Pasha, the Chief of Staff, of a Turco-Persian-Afghan entente; but that could scarcely affect the situation. The reality of the Italo-Greek menace was now beyond question. Turkey was encircled. She must come to terms. Sir Ronald Lindsay came back to Angora in early March to find Rushdi ready to do business, ready to suggest terms on which Turkey would break—in fact if not, for the moment, in theory, her understanding with Russia, and would come into the League of Nations as an ally of the British Empire. If Sir Ronald would get a firm offer from his Government, they could get to business at once.

The plan, it seemed, had worked to perfection. The desired breach had been made between the Soviet Union and its only ally. And in the breach, if one may strain the metaphor, had been built a new section of the wall of encirclement round the Red Republics. There remained only the details of the bargain to be arranged—always a troublesome matter with “Orientals,” but still a matter that could certainly be fixed with a little patience.

Sir Ronald went home to London to get authority for a firm offer. Before he returned to Angora, Sir William Tyrrell decided conveniently to take a holiday in Rome—as befitted a devout Catholic. He saw Signor Mussolini. The war talk died down. The war preparations ceased. Official statements assured the world that Italy's intentions towards Turkey were as peaceful as her feelings were friendly. All was ready for the final triumph.

Sir Ronald went back to Angora. If Turkey were willing to break with Russia and to come at once into the League, England was willing that she should be given back a substantial portion of Southern Kurdistan. She should get her loan in the City—not, perhaps, the £30,000,000 Rushdi had suggested, but say £20,000,000 in three or four instalments. Arrangements could be made for a substantial reduction of the Ottoman Debt in consideration of the State properties which were passing to Iraq.

The bargaining began. The Turks asked more. “The British refused. The familiar process went on. Agreement seemed to be getting very near indeed. All danger of war had completely passed away. The world was waiting the signature of the treaty. And then, quietly but firmly, Rushdi Bey declared that the outstanding points of difference were insuperable, that the British offer was not enough, that Turkey would revert to the original bargain and recognise the annexation of Mosul to Iraq in return for the slight rectification of frontier, the assurances about Kurdistan, the £500,000 share in the Mosul royalties.

Whether this had been the Turks’ intention all the time and they had merely entered on the wider negotiation in order to gain time until the war-danger was over; or whether, at the last moment, realising, as good Anatolians must have done since the days of Priam, the dangers of Western gifts, they decided that to take the British offer would be, in effect, to sell the independence they had won so dearly; these are matters the truth of which is probably known only to Kemal and Ismet and Rushdi. But whatever that truth may be, the effect was the same.

The British were in an impossible position. They could not draw back. They could not reject an arrangement which conceded all that they could confess to have been seeking. Italy and Greece might have been let loose on a Turkey defying the League of Nations. But it was impossible to do anything against a Turkey prepared, on the most reasonable terms, to accept the judgment of the League. There was nothing for it but to put a

good face on an unpleasant situation, sign the treaty, and pretend to be highly gratified that the Mosul question had been settled.

And indeed that is something, as I said earlier. But a small thing by comparison with the bigger, which had seemed actually within grasp and then had suddenly eluded it.

For consider the position. Turkey is decidedly stronger for having abandoned a practically hopeless claim and for being no longer representable as defying its own treaty obligations and the authority of the League. Turkey is still closely linked with Russia—a fact announced dramatically to the world by the signature of a new protocol supplementing the Treaty of Paris. Turkey has signed a treaty of mutual guarantee and amity with Persia, and has strengthened her relations with Afghanistan—moves which would have been very satisfactory if British influence were dominant in Angora, but terribly dangerous under these different circumstances. The position in southern Asia, in fact, altered not for the better but very markedly for the worse—as the recent outbreak of acute nervous anxiety in Simla testifies.

And in Europe the Locarno system still further shaken. Italy and Greece angry, feeling that they have been used as catspaws, looking elsewhere for “compensation,” preparing diplomatic opposition everywhere to Great Britain and France. Signor Mussolini threatening to make a political and commercial entente with Moscow unless Italy is granted compensation elsewhere—in Abyssinia, Tangier, Tunis—for her balked ambitions in Anatolia.

Those are the net results of a prettily devised diplomatic campaign in which there was only one flaw. It was based upon a totally false conception of the character of the Turkish statesmen—on the belief that they are some curious kind of “Oriental” who can always be successfully dealt with by an admixture of bullying and bribing. That traditional and closely-

cherished fallacy has once again made a ghastly mess of this country's Eastern policy.

[pp. 475-483]

IMPERIAL DEFENCE By W. N. EWER. *The Labour Monthly*, January 1927

CLAUSEWITZ'S famous dictum that "war is a continuation of policy" is none the less true because it is trite. The problems of strategy and diplomacy are inextricably connected, for they are posed by precisely the same economic and political conditions. The work of a Foreign Office is necessarily linked with the work of the Defence Ministries. The same causes which created the Triple Entente created simultaneously the Committee of Imperial Defence and the Rosyth Dockyard.

So far as the British Empire is concerned the strategical and diplomatic problems of the moment are essentially defensive. Great Britain has in the past been a predatory and expansionist power. She will be so again if strength and opportunity serve. But for the moment she must concentrate on the retention and digestion of her existing possessions. She is unlikely in the near future to attempt aggression—which must not be confused with a tactical offensive—or annexation—unless for the purpose of consolidating defensive positions in a given area. Syria and Persia may be suggested as areas in which such a thing is possible.

The defence of the Empire falls immediately into two categories—defence against external enemies and defence against internal revolt. Of the two the former has become relatively less, the latter relatively more, important than before 1914.

Now the problems of defence against external enemies are determined by two sets of data—the things to be defended and the potential enemies against whom they are to be defended.

Of these the first may be classified as :—

- (1) Great Britain and Ireland.
- (2) The overseas territories.

(3) Essential lines of communication and trade routes.

Among potential enemies we do not need to include the whole of the sixty odd independent states of the world. There are among them many—indeed a great majority—with whom war is inconceivable (unless as a minor incident in a general conflagration). War with Czecho-slovakia or Paraguay is a physical impossibility. War with Denmark or Bulgaria is a political impossibility: for there are no discoverable causes of serious conflict.

Eliminating all these cases we find as potential enemies a baker's dozen of States of varying strength.

In Europe: France, Germany, Italy, the Soviet Union.

In Asia: Turkey, the Hedjaz, Persia, Afghanistan, Tibet, Siam, China, Japan.

In America: the United States.

Now of these, two maybe eliminated again. A German war is, for the moment, out of the question for obvious reasons. An American war is equally excluded, for equally obvious reasons. In the one case, Germany is physically incapable of waging war against Great Britain; in the other, Great Britain is economically incapable of waging war against the United States. Neither eventuality needs to be seriously considered by the military and naval experts.

Of the remaining eleven, France is in a category by itself. It is the only power which, from its geographical position, is capable of striking immediately at the centre of the Empire. A military invasion is probably as impossible as ever. But London is within easy striking distance of the French air squadrons; every port and every trade route is within easy range of the French submarines. The experience of 1914-1918 is sufficient warning of the potentialities of an Anglo-French war. The prospect involves for both parties so tremendous a risk, such certainty of mutual destruction, that unless under the greatest provocation they dare not hazard it.

Therefore — apart from any other motive — the strategic position makes a continuation of the Anglo-French entente essential. That entente has been seriously strained on occasion since the war. The very fact that it has survived those strains is eloquent of the forces compelling its continuance.

Therefore, though the Imperial General Staff and its affiliated military, naval, and air organisations are compelled—because of the supreme importance of the one in a thousand chance if it were to come off—to study the problems of a French war, to prepare London's air-defences and the like, this is not really a vital strategic problem of the moment. France may be counted—as in the years before 1914—as an ally, or at the least a benevolent neutral, in any struggle.

We are narrowing the field. We have only left Italy, the Soviet Union and a group of Asiatic countries from Turkey to Japan. The problem is becoming an Eastern one—Eastern and Mediterranean.

Italy we should also be able to exclude were it not for the curiously incalculable character of the existing Italian government. For Italy, dependent upon sea-borne traffic for her fuel and her food, has in the past made it a definite rule of her policy that she cannot afford to quarrel with the nation whose sea-power is still supreme among European states. To blockade Italy would indeed be less easy to-day than in the pre-submarine era. But it should not be impossible. And—except for making Mediterranean traffic difficult by submarine activity off Gibraltar and Port Said—Italy could not retort effectively. Still, there are possibilities in Mussolini's dramatic diplomacy. War with Italy cannot be entirely excluded. But it would only be a serious menace to the Empire if it were associated with trouble in the East ; then, indeed, Italian hostility in the Mediterranean would be a danger to be dreaded.

We are left, as the real questions of the day, with the Asiatic States. And not one of them (save Siam, powerlessly compressed

between British and French territory) can be ruled out of the class of possible enemies. The central problem of Imperial defence against external enemies becomes visible as primarily an Asiatic problem. And be it noted that it is precisely in Asia (including Egypt and the Sudan) that the twin problem—of defence against internal revolt—is a serious one. In the self-governing Dominions that problem is non-existent. In the tropical African colonies it does not yet seriously exist, though it may come into very real being within the next few decades. The other Crown Colonies are too small and scattered to be of considerable moment.

Asia—and Australia, which neighbours it very closely—are the crux of the whole question. The protection and retention of that band of Imperial territory which stretches with a few breaks from the Libyan Desert to the great Barrier Reef is the first and immediate task both of British strategy and of British diplomacy.

Of the Asiatic states which neighbour that territory, four—the Hedjaz, Persia, Afghanistan and Tibet—are important by reason of geographical situation rather than of their military strength. They may be fields of operation. They may operate as allies or instruments either for the British Empire or against it. They take their place, and a by no means insignificant place, in the strategic complex. But they are subordinate, not principal, factors. The principal factors are the four remaining states—the Soviet Union, Turkey, China and Japan. Of these, two are strong military powers, one may rapidly become so; the fourth is a first-class naval power.

Military defence must be provided against Turkey in Iraq, against the Soviet Union both in Iraq and on the Indian North-West Frontier, against China on the Burmese North-East Frontier. Naval defence against Japan must be provided for Australia, Malaya and the Dutch East Indies (for whose protection—owing to the close inter-connection of the Dutch and British capitalist interests and the naval weakness of

Holland—this country tacitly accepts responsibility). In addition there are the lines of communication to be safeguarded and preparations made for counterattacks.

Here then, stripped of all unessential and less essential things, are the central key-matters of the problem. The British Empire is organised primarily for war, not in Europe, not in America or Africa, but in Southern Asia.

The distribution of its armed forces is in close accordance with the requirements of this purpose.

Take the Army first. There are some 90,000 British troops outside the British Isles. Of these—apart from those who are temporarily and for purely historical reasons on the Rhine—all but a single battalion and a few garrison artillery units are in Southern Asia or on its lines of communication.

India with its 60,000 is of course the main centre of concentration. The rest are in the strategic points to East and West from Gibraltar to Hong Kong: Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus, Egypt, Palestine, Iraq, Aden, Ceylon, the Straits, China.

The distribution of the Air Force tells the same story. There are 27½ squadrons at home, 18½ abroad. Of those abroad, 6 are in India, 8 in Iraq, 4 in Egypt and Palestine, the half-squadron in Aden.

The Fleet: one cruiser squadron in the West Indies on the Panama Canal route to Australia ; one in S. Africa on the Cape route; one in Indian, one in Chinese waters; and in the Mediterranean a battle squadron, two cruiser squadrons and four destroyer flotillas.

The naval concentration, it will be noticed, is less definitely Eastern than the military. But even this is temporary. So soon as the new bases—Trincomali, Singapore, Port Darwin—are ready, we shall see a big shifting of naval strength to the East.

Indeed, just as Rosyth was the outward and visible sign of the politico-military situation before the war, so Singapore is the outward and visible sign of the new situation. Germany was the

certain naval enemy then. Japan (leaving aside for the moment the incalculable Mussolini) is the most probable naval enemy now. And the East—from India to Tasmania and New Zealand—is nakedly open to Japanese attack unless an adequate base exists from which the opposing fleet can work. Singapore, one may note, is the obvious site for such a base. Hong Kong is untenable against land attack unless Kowloon be guarded by elaborate fortifications and a large field army. Singapore is easily defended and supplied, and in as perfect a geographical situation as can be imagined. A battle squadron and two or three cruiser squadrons there, with Trincomali and Port Darwin as subsidiary bases, is the preparation for the possibility of a Japanese war.

We turn to the defence problems of the Asiatic continental frontiers.

The problem of India's North-Western frontier defences is one which has been worked out a hundred times. But if you need evidence that it is being again anxiously studied, note the new Khyber railway, the building of aerodromes near the frontier, the strenuous experimenting with cross-country motor transport, to which the Maharaja of Bardwan makes not over-discreet reference in the published report of the very discreet, formal discussion on Defence in the Imperial Conference. And if you need evidence that the problem of the North-Eastern or Chinese frontier is now being taken seriously, note the recent tour of the Commander-in-Chief and the sudden interest taken in the tribes of that tangled area of jungle and mountain which abuts on Szechwan and the upper waters of the Yang-tse.

But perhaps of all these troop, ship and plane distributions the most interesting is the concentration of air squadrons in Iraq. The official explanation that an air-garrison is cheaper than troops will scarcely hold good. Else why not substitute planes for troops in Egypt as well? The fact of course is that for strategic purposes the Middle East and its garrisons are one. In the event

of trouble, troops from Egypt could be in Iraq in a few days, troops from Gibraltar and Malta in Egypt, from home in Gibraltar and Malta. But it is deemed advisable that the army should be concentrated in Egypt, in the centre of the lines of communication, and the air force concentrated in Iraq. Why?

The answer is to be sought in the final problem of attack. Of the four important potential enemies three—Japan, China, Turkey—are exposed to damaging attack from the sea. The fourth—the Soviet Union—is (unless big risks be taken in sending a fleet through the Straits) immune from sea attack in any vital spot.

But—from Mosul to Batoum is only 500 miles; from Mosul to Baku little more. The Transcaucasian oil-fields—perhaps the most vital economic centre in all Russia—are as open to attack from the Mosul air-bases as was London to attack from the German air-bases during the Great War.

That is the real significance of the air-force concentration and of the preparation of air-force bases in Iraq : that, also, is the real significance of our determination to keep Mosul at any cost.

The British strategy for a Russian war is based upon the plan of holding the Indian frontier defensively, while hammering Baku and Batoum by air from Mosul.

Singapore for naval action against China or Japan; Mosul for air action against Russia. Egypt as central military station for the whole Middle East.

Everything is being got ready. The strategic indications reinforce the diplomatic. Great Britain is making all preparation for the great war in Southern Asia.

[pp. 46-51]

THE GERMAN SITUATION By R. F. ANDREWS, The Labour Monthly, April 1933

THE seizure of power by Hitler and the erection of an open Fascist dictatorship in Germany is an indication of the desperate economic and political position of the German capitalist class. The Fascist terror is a sign not of capitalist strength, but capitalist decay. The economic position of Germany is worse than ever. Industry shows a record low level of output, the balance of trade and of payments is worse than 12 months ago, and the agricultural crisis—as revealed in the fall of prices, the increasing burden of mortgages, more numerous bankruptcies—is also becoming steadily worse. The crisis itself brought to nothing the attempt of the German bourgeoisie between November and January to carry out a “democratic” manoeuvre through the government of the “super-Party” general, Von Schleicher, who was to be “fair to all classes.” The German capitalists had not the means at their disposal to buy off even a substantial section of the exploited and hungry workers, the starving unemployed, the ruined peasantry and lower middle class. The continuing swing to the left of the masses had already shown itself menacingly at the November 6 elections, when the Communists received 6,000,000 votes, and in the unofficial, but thereby all the more significant, strike of 22,000 Berlin transport workers under revolutionary leadership. Only the most savage terror unhampered by parliamentary formalities, and relying upon murder gangs untrammelled by any legal machinery, remained to the capitalist class—as always in such moments. The Hitler Government is a government of civil war against the open revolutionary temper of the workers (shown by the huge Communist vote of nearly 5 millions retained amidst the most savage repressions and provocations).

The gradual establishment of Fascist rule in Germany has come by “constitutional methods,” thereby giving an object lesson of the futility and fraud of contrasting capitalist

“democracy” with capitalist dictatorship. To the two year’s rule of the Centre Government of Dr. Brüning, ruling largely through presidential decrees under article 48 of the Constitution (the German “ Emergency Powers Act “), succeeded the seven months’ government by the Nationalists, Von Papen and Von Schleicher, through Cabinets themselves appointed by presidential decree under the same clause. The Brüning Government was itself the dictatorship of big business, in large measure not through Parliament, but directly through the State bureaucracy: the Nationalist “presidential” governments, represented a big step further in the same direction, ruling by Fascist methods in spite of a hostile parliament: and the final presidential government of Hitler has only taken the last step, by wiping out Parliament altogether. Even this was done by the strictly “constitutional” methods of a General Election—in which the real capitalist power which makes bourgeois democracy a farce was displayed as never before (through control of the press, wireless, films, police, ballot boxes, legal suppression of opponents, &c). The importance of these facts for British workers is that British capitalism has its own “article 48” in reserve for just such cases, in the shape of the King, the Privy Council and the House of Lords, which can and will take the same action in Britain (as in India through the “special powers,” Egypt through “reserved subjects,” Cyprus and Ceylon by cancelling the constitution) when capitalist rule is in danger. The Hitlerite murder gangs have their British precedent in the Black-and-Tans.

The German Social-Democratic leaders have played a decisive part in the gradual establishment of Fascist power in Germany. After the war they saved the country for capitalism by holding the workers back from a Socialist revolution in 1919, and by helping to suppress the workers’ risings. When the world crisis struck Germany and the gradual move towards Fascism began, it was the Social-Democrats who put forward the idea of

the *lesser evil*—”tolerating” Brüning for fear of Von Papen, supporting Marshal Hindenburg for fear of the Fascists, “loyally co-operating” with Von Papen and Von Schleicher as a “lesser evil” than Hitler—and thus creating the illusion among the workers that these were alternatives to Fascism instead of stepping-stones to it. The social Democrats supported these “alternatives” by more than votes in Parliament. The shooting down of May Day demonstrators in 1929 by the Social-Democratic chief of the Berlin police, Zorgiebel: the assurance of the Social-Democratic leader Severing, in the winter of 1930, that he was moving the re-adoption of the “law for defence of the Republic” (the equivalent in its scope of the British D.O.R.A.) only as a precaution against the workers, not against the Nazis: the repeated refusal of the Social-Democratic trade union leaders to organise strikes against wage-cuts, once Government arbitration had interfered—all of these followed logically from the theory of the lesser evil. And the same policy determined their refusal of the repeated united front proposals of the Communist Party—against capitalist attacks (in April, 1932), for an anti-Fascist majority bloc in the Prussian Parliament (June, 1932), for a General Strike against Von Papen (July, 1932), for strike action against Von Papen’s emergency decrees lowering wages (October, 1932), in support of the Berlin transport strikers (November, 1932), and for a General Strike against Hitler (January, 1933), to quote only a few. In particular, their definite denunciation of a General Strike against Hitler — at a time when the bulk of the organised workers still followed the Social-Democrats—set the seal on their betrayal of the working class to Fascism. The moves now opening for an “understanding” between the Social-Democrats and Hitler, over the ruins of the old trade union machinery, follow naturally.

The coming to power of Hitler has greatly accentuated the contradictions of international capitalism and increased the war peril. The ruin caused by the Versailles Treaty has played too

important a part in deepening the crisis for the German capitalists not to place its revision in the forefront of their programme. The big industrialists helped Hitler to come to power by, amongst other things, financing his huge machine for propaganda against Versailles among the ruined lower middle classes and despairing poor. In July, 1932, the Nationalist, Von Papen, already offered France the services of German cannon fodder against the U.S.S.R. in exchange for German rearmament: but the provinces taken from Germany by France and Poland stand in the way of any agreement to such a scheme by French Imperialism. On the other hand, the Hitlerite propagandist, Rosenberg, has long been advocating a German-Italian British bloc against France and the U.S.S.R. It was not accidental that British bankers renewed the German “standstill agreement” (postponement of debt payments to foreign creditors) immediately after Hitler came to power—just as they gave the Russian Tsar £90 millions credit to effect the counter-revolution in 1906. The standstill agreement was followed by the MacDonald plan for reducing armaments of all European Great Powers but Britain, and rearming Germany: and by the Mussolini plan—accepted by MacDonald—for creating a “Concert of Europe” composed of Germany, France, Italy and Great Britain, i.e., breaking up French military domination of Europe. Not only has this brought immensely increased tension between France and Germany, but it has been reflected in greatly increased tension between the lesser satellites of French Imperialism—the “Little Entente” (Roumania, Czecho-Slovakia, Yugo-Slavia)—and Austria and Hungary, who are being armed by Italy; not to speak of Germany, which has opened an economic war against Czecho-Slovakia, and menaces the Polish “corridor.” The capitalist politicians themselves are compelled (in pursuit of their several policies) to compare Europe to a huge powder-magazine, threatened by sparks at a dozen different points.

The threat of British imperialist war against the U.S.S.R. has become much more menacing. The alignment of Fascist Germany with the National Government in Britain is of considerable assistance to the war plans against the Soviet Union, particularly of British Imperialism. Although there have been many acts of hostility to, and provocation of the U.S.S.R. by British Governments, the latter had to reckon with revolutionary working-class action in Germany which would effectively stop a war. The setting-up of a Fascist dictatorship in Germany—if it is able to consolidate its power and really break the working-class movement—clears the road for action. Support for the Fascist Government by Great Britain was therefore in the natural order of things—and so was the outrageously provocative action by the British Government on the question of the Metropolitan-Vickers arrests in Moscow. The insulting references of British Cabinet Ministers to the Soviet courts: the impudent attempt to interfere in Soviet internal affairs, and override Soviet laws where British subjects are concerned : the attempts at coercion by breaking off trade negotiations, and threatening an embargo on Soviet imports and a diplomatic rupture: the unbridled slander and war campaign of the capitalist press—all point to one conclusion. British Imperialism is driving ahead for war on the Soviet Union as rapidly as the international alignment of capitalist forces will permit. Nor is it without significance that the British Government's action has been followed by a renewal of Japanese war talk and a provocative note to the U.S.S.R. alleging military support of the "anti-Manchukuo" (i.e., the Chinese national) forces.

The immediate future holds out the prospect of intense class conflict in Germany itself, and of sharper antagonisms in the ranks of the dictatorship itself. The German working-class has retained its fighting forces still intact. Betrayed by its Social-Democratic leaders at the crucial moment, still unconvinced in

its decisive sections of the need to follow the Communists (the C.P. had only 12-15 Per cent. of its members in factories, and its trade union work was not entirely satisfactory, which led to many weaknesses), the German proletariat has not been in action against the Hitler dictatorship, as a whole. But the fact that the Communist Party has been able to reorganise itself on an illegal basis in the heart of the working class, the numerous isolated political strikes which took place against the Hitler Government in Berlin, Hamburg, Lübeck, Saxony, show that the forces of the working class are gathering for resistance to the Fascist terror. At the same time, the Hitler Dictatorship has not been able in any way to alleviate the crisis or even prevent its deepening. Trade, industry, agriculture, unemployment, present ever more acute problems. The economic measures already adopted to meet the demands of the Hitlerites' Nationalist allies—the great landowners and rich fanners—consist of higher tariff barriers against foreign fats and other produce, which can only have the effect of (1) raising the cost of living for the masses (ii) reducing Germany's export markets and intensifying the general world crisis. The wage-cuts which the great industrial magnates are demanding must precipitate conflicts which cannot be simply crushed with the revolvers and crowbars of the storm-troopers. And the crisis itself is likely to widen the breach, already in existence, between the various groups of the bourgeoisie themselves, over such measures as tariff policy, inflation, &c.

The need of the moment for British workers is a united class front of struggle in defence of the German workers, against Fascism, against the rapidly increased peril of war, and against the attacks on our own conditions. The reply of the Labour Party and T.U.C. to the Communist Party's united front proposals is a characteristic piece of strike-breaking. It blames the German Communists for the success of Hitlerism, and ignores the repeated attempts of the German Communists to establish a united front against Hitlerism (with many local

successes). It describes the horrors of Fascist dictatorship, but refuses a united front to fight that dictatorship as “a trap.” It talks about majority rule and “the powers of the Democratic State,” and ignores the obvious lesson of the German events—that the Democratic State, whether administered by Social-Democrats as in 1919 or not, means capitalist dictatorship concealed or open. At the very moment when the British capitalists are whipping up jingo hatred of the U.S.S.R., the National Joint Council plays their game—as in August, 1914—by speaking of “Communist Dictatorship” in the same breath as Fascism, and ignoring the fact—recorded by their own Delegation in 1924—that the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R. means immeasurably more real democracy—for the people and not for the rich—than prevails anywhere else in the world. A similar piece of strike-breaking is the article by Trotsky in the Manchester Guardian, which admits that the Social-Democrats “summoned the Fascists to power through Hindenburg,” and then attacks the Communist Party for refusing to make a united front with them. Trotsky not only ignores the numerous united front proposals and achievements initiated by the Communists, but incidentally whitewashes the Social-Democratic leaders who murdered Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, suppressed the workers’ risings of 1919, 1921 and 1923, shot down the Berlin workers in 1929, &c, by such remarks as “social democracy is unthinkable without parliamentary government.” In the drive for a real class united front against capitalism which is now developing (through the demonstrations organised by the C.P. and I.L.P., the mass opposition movements in the unions, the success of the Anti-War Movement and the London May Day Committee, the growth of the F.S.U.) the exposure of such strike-breakers as the Labour Party Executive, General Council and Trotsky is an essential part of the political armament of the workers.

[pp. 252-256]

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. The Labour Monthly,
March 1934**

DEBT FUND.

	£	s.	d.
.....			
A Group of Cypriot Readers, London	0	10	0

[pp. 133-136]

TERROR IN CYPRUS By EVDOROS JOANNIDES. The Labour Monthly, May 1934

THE developments of events in the Near East during the last few years have accentuated the imperialist rivalries, and compelled a corresponding change in the attitude of British Imperialism, whose interests, economic and strategic in this part of the earth, are paramount.

The rapid change of the Island of Cyprus into a naval, military and air base, determined by the increasing uncertainty of the imperialist position in Iraq, Persia, Arabia and even Palestine and Egypt, is the expression of the concentrated efforts of British Finance Capital to maintain its rule and supremacy.

The decisive factors of the change are two:

1. The internal situation of the colonial countries taken separately and collectively.
2. The external position.

The colonial workers and peasants under the double yoke of foreign and local exploitation and oppression are reduced to extreme impoverishment. This, dialectically opposes the imperialist aim of the striving for the consolidation of its hegemony. The rapid awakening of the colonial masses proved in many cases to have upset the imperialist plans and rendered difficult the building of the Anti-Soviet bloc. British policy is especially governed by the paramount consideration of maintaining a firm hold over the Colonies of the Near East, which along with India represent the main bulwark of the Empire. It cannot tolerate any opposition which would weaken its grip. Revolts in Egypt, Palestine and Cyprus have been brutally suppressed, but in spite of that, the Imperialist position is becoming increasingly difficult. Attempts to gain liberation from the clutches of Finance Capital have been made in Persia. Iraq was granted a shadowy freedom and given chained independence. On the other hand Britain views with alarm the

steady penetration of another imperialist cancer in the markets of the Near East—Italian Fascism which cherishes hopes of economic renaissance in the Near East. Fear of the spread of revolutionary “contagion” amongst the colonial masses and fear of the barking Italian Fascist dog, have decided for the transformation of Cyprus into another Malta. From there British Imperialism will face a very complicated situation.

The Strategic Importance of the Island.

At the time of the occupation, in 1878, Cyprus as a strategic point was of prime importance for Britain. The Suez Canal, the key to India and the Far East, was in the hands of a semi-hostile capitalist group—the French. Egypt belonged to the Ottoman Empire, Thus England’s naval supremacy was challenged in the very dawn of the imperialist era. By threats and intrigues the Whitehall occupants succeeded in persuading the Sultan, who was at the time menaced by Tsarist Russia, to cede Cyprus to England. In exchange, England was to undertake the guarantee of the Turkish frontiers and to prevent the expansion of the nascent Bulgarian Kingdom at the expense of the Ottoman Empire. British diplomacy succeeded with one stroke in securing the alliance of an Empire, and the possession of an Island, the military development of which would frustrate the French plans. In the following year, the Beaconsfield Government bought a decisive share of the Suez Canal, and thus the focus of conflicting imperialist interests was transferred to another place. Cyprus’ strategic role began to diminish. The importance of Egypt and the canal were increasing.

The changing of the rulers was followed by heavier taxation. The Cypriots were forced to pay an extra sum of £90,000 annually as levy to the Sultan. The sum was reduced to £50,000 in 1906 and continued to be raised after 1914 v/hen Cyprus was annexed by Britain, until 1928. This money never found its way to the treasury of the Sultan. It was kept in the British Treasury ;

this amount of £3,080,000 was disposed of in 1931 by the Socialist (!) Chancellor of the Exchequer, Snowden, for the payment of the shareholders of the Crimean loan. Cyprus was twice offered to Greece. Once in 1915 with the provision that Greece, who was neutral, would come out in the war on the side of the Allies, and again in 1919, in exchange for the loot which the Allied Imperialists thought they would obtain from Soviet Russia if Greece would serve by participating in the war of intervention.

Now, after the signing of the Balkan Pact under the aegis of French Imperialism, and the rising fury of Italian Fascism, whose interests in the Near East are threatened and whose bellicose utterings quickly found a sharp answer in the military and naval manoeuvres of Turkey, the situation in South Eastern Europe is tense. The pretences of imperialism and the illusions of pacifism and social democracy can no longer be maintained. It can no longer be hidden from the toiling masses that the increasing decay and crisis of the capitalist system and the sharpening imperialist antagonisms will eventually find an outlet in war. It is for this predatory war that the Imperialists of all lands are feverishly preparing. A war for colonial possession, for the re-distribution of the world, for an increased share of colonial plunder, for the suppression of the proletarian movement.

British Imperialism slaughters, tortures and imprisons hundreds of thousands of proletarian revolutionaries in the Colonies, in order to crush any potential opposition or resistance from the rear in the next war. It is precisely from fear of this resistance of the colonial slaves, and to assure their destruction, that Cyprus is rapidly being turned into a military camp. The harbour of Famagusta is being opened and extended to become a naval base. A port for sea-planes is being built near Limassol. A few miles out of Nicosia an airport is being prepared.

Military barracks have been built in Nicosia and Limassol.

The Internal Situation.

Fifty-six years of Imperialist domination have reduced the workers and peasants of Cyprus to abject poverty and slavery. More than two-sevenths of the entire cultivated land belongs to the Church and the Monasteries. More than three-fourteenths are expropriated or mortgaged and only seven-fourteenths are owned by the peasants.

Cyprus is predominantly a peasant land. 75 per cent, of the entire population are peasants—small owners or renters (i.e., peasants who rent land from the big kulak farmers or from the Church and cultivate it). The Church, the biggest feudal landlord, along with a dark phalanx of usurers and money-lenders, have crushed and ruined the peasants.

Usury is rampant. The Government is delighted to keep it in protective obscurity. Not a single villager in need can borrow money without mortgaging his property. Interest is very high. The Government has fixed it as high as 12 per cent., but instances of 16 per cent, and 20 per cent, are not rare. As a result of this legalised bloodsucking a gradual process of expropriation has been going on for years. Whole territories in the district of Paphos, entire villages in the districts of Larnaca and Famagusta, belong to a relatively insignificant number of wealthy individuals. Cyprus is reverting, from the point of view of land-ownership, to Feudalism!

Taxation is hitting hard the lower-classes, while the upper-classes are left almost immune. The sufferings of the people are terrible. Wages are very low—1/- to 1/6 for men daily and 6d. to 10d. for women. Poverty is extreme. Two years of continuous drought, in a place where agriculture relies on rain, has markedly accentuated the gloomy picture of Cyprus' economic ruin. The scanty reports published every now and then in the British bourgeois press, though brief and incomplete, are sufficient to paint faintly the appalling sufferings of the workers and peasants.

It will be of use to give an analysis of the Governmental budget In order to show the way in which Cyprus is governed and how taxation operates: —

In the year 1932, the Budget was £743,076, out of this the following expenditure were made: —

85 Officials (87 of them British)	£68,000
Pension (for retired officials and government employees)	£45,000
Police	£93,000
Imperial Defence... ..	£10,000
Education (teachers' salaries)	£121,000

Over £400,000 are used annually for the administrative apparatus. Only £11,743 is expended on public works, mainly road repairs, and £738 on “trade development.”

Nothing for relief, unemployment benefit, productive work, help for the peasants, etc.

The money is raised: —

Land Tax	£77,000
Tax on sheep, goats, pigs	£23,050

Direct taxes on land, sheep, goats, pigs, salt, tobacco, licences, stamps, yield about £300,000 annually.

Import duties on flour, clothes, beans, oil, wood, fish, leather, bricks, tiles, shoes, cereals, petrol, yield £305,000 annually.

This analysis demonstrates glaringly how ruthlessly the toiling masses are ground down by taxation. There is no income tax. Capital is immune. The workers and peasants are forced to pay for the maintenance of a veritable army of well-paid governmental parasites.

The 1933 trade returns show a decrease in exports of £350,000 from the average of the previous ten years. Imports show a slight decrease in merchandise of primary importance such as flour, beans, coffee, clothing and textiles.

Terror is Raging.

The unbearable conditions, heavy taxation and brutal repression led to a violent outburst of popular indignation against the regime of foreign and local exploiters in October, 1931. The insurrection was brutally suppressed. The military and the police proved worthy of the traditions of bloody Imperialist repression.

A reign of terror followed which is still raging. The Legislative Council was abolished. The Constitution was suspended. The Governor rules by the “extraordinary powers” bestowed upon him. For three years the people have been in darkness, without any official declaration as to the constitution, the budget, the council, or the taxation.

The Communist Party was declared illegal. Many of its members were flung into prison or interned in small villages. Over 200 Cypriot revolutionaries (a relatively greater number than the imprisoned anti-fascists of Germany) are rotting in medieval jails for their revolutionary activities. A few weeks ago, ten Communist leaders were sentenced to an aggregate of 20 years and five months hard labour in Nicosia, and another 16 sentenced in Limassol. But in spite of this, the Communist Party of Cyprus is rapidly winning over the workers and peasants for the proletarian revolution.

The ignominious collapse of the Nationalist Party (Union with Greece) after the insurrection of 1931, freed the masses from the influence of poisonous ideology, and there is now a manifest leftward movement amongst them, expressed in the willingness to fight against Imperialist terror. The Communist Party has sustained heavy blows and is torn by the iron claws of

monstrous ordinances. Nevertheless, it carries on its work undaunted! The more Cyprus comes to the foreground as a strategic point of great importance to Britain, the more the terror becomes intensified. But in this terror the Communist fighters are steeled and are organising and fighting for the overthrow, along with the other colonial peoples, of the Imperialist rule of capital and the establishment of free Socialist States.

[pp 303-307]

CONFERENCE ON TRADE UNION PROBLEMS AND POLICY. *The Labour Monthly*, October 1935

I. INTRODUCTORY ANALYSIS

.....

ON August 24 and 25, at the Bermondsey Town Hall, the Conference on Trade Union Problems and Policy was held under the Chairmanship of Councillor Bowyer of the Romford Urban District Council. This Conference proved even more successful than any of the previous conferences held by the *LABOUR MONTHLY*, no less than a total of 365 delegates being appointed from all sections of the trade union movement.

Some 39 speakers took part in the discussions at the first conference, and 22 in the Recall Conference discussions. In order to give an adequate report of these discussions it has been decided, owing to very great pressure of space to divide the discussions at both Conferences, and, in view of the importance of the subject, to give this month the discussion on War and Fascism, holding over the discussion on the Economic Problems of Trade Unionism till the next issue, together with the letter from Comrade R. P. Dutt to the original Conference.

.....

The next delegate was **Bro. Pappianou (1/622 branch Catering Section, Transport and General Workers)**. Speaking as a Cypriot he pointed out how in Cyprus British imperialism had made it so safe for democracy that if you were caught reading Anatole France you got several years in gaol. The workers in the anthracite and copper mines are receiving from 1s. to 1s. 4d. per day; it was a fact that employers here had been

able to give concessions to British workers out of the enormous profits.

.....

[pp. 637-646]

**BOOK REVIEW. THE VOLCANO OF BALKANS by
Doros Alastos, The Labour Monthly, October
1935**

Terror in the Balkans. Albert Londres. (Constable.) pp. 244. 7s. 6d.

Heroes and Assassins. Stoyan Christowe. (Gollancz.) pp. 287. 12s. 6d.

THESE books purport to be an account of the influence and sinister workings of *Imro* (Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation—Komitadzis). They were intended to supply the demand for information on the subject aroused by the assassination of King Alexander and M. Barthou by a member of *Imro* last year in Marseilles. The first is the personal account of a French journalist in Bulgaria, who treats his subject in a sensational way, with a lengthy epilogue of nearly a 100 pages, written by a white Russian former secretary to the Russian Legation in Serbia, Leonide Zarine. The book is an excellent example of the usual attempt to conceal all major political problems vitally affecting the Balkan Peninsula; while Londres treats his subject lightly and reduces it to the level of a thriller, the white Russian puts in the political touch : he glorifies the Yugoslav tyranny against the oppressed nationalities of Macedonia and Croatia. He extolls the “progress” made by Yugoslavia under the dictatorial regime of King Alexander.

The second, the work of a Macedonian emigrant to America, is wider in its scope and tries to present an historical account of *Imro*. The author, limited by his bourgeois outlook, fails to analyse and explain the process of *Imro*’s development and disintegration. He gives a good account of the atrocities perpetrated by the Governments of Turkey, Greece and Yugoslavia (white-washing always Bulgaria) against the

Macedonian masses, but falls entirely short, and even degenerates into a reactionary petty-bourgeois intellectual, when he tries to explain the developments within Imro itself in the post-war years, such as those which gave rise to the establishment of "Imro United"; how this organisation at the head of the toiling Macedonian masses and along with the Communist Parties of Bulgaria, Jugoslavia and Greece is at present fighting against oppression in the Balkans, and for national liberation.

In this area the problem of oppressed nations and national minorities is a most burning question affecting 40 per cent, of the entire population. For over five centuries the Balkans have been the scene of bloody oppression and continual struggle for national liberation. The Serbs, the Greeks, the Bulgarians and the Macedonians have time and time again taken up arms against the Ottoman Empire for independence. In all these countries, terrorist organisations were the essence of the national liberatory movements, the advance guard of the fight against the oppressive tyranny of the Turks. In 1893 two Macedonian fighters, Damian Groueff and Pe're Tocheff succeeded in welding together the different groups of Macedonian fighters and formed the Imro. The programme of the new organisation was the liberation of Macedonia from the Ottoman Empire. It was invested with a certain amount of religious fervour with rather an empty nationalist programme, utterly devoid of class struggle. The fact that no fight was waged by it against the greatest supporters of the Ottoman rule, the Macedonian landlords and rich Kulaks, who were acting as tax raisers for the Porte and played the part of Turkish gendarmerie, defeated its aims from the start. The so-called "Peace Treaties" of Versailles, Trianon, Neuilly and St. Germain in 1919 fatally altered the political structure of the Balkans. Vengeance brought about a pitiful political butchery of the Peninsula. A number of nations who before had been independent or enjoyed certain national

and cultural rights are now fully deprived of these liberties. There are National Minorities in every Balkan country. Greeks in Albania, Jugoslavia and Turkey; Albanians in Jugoslavia and Greece; Bulgarians in Greece and Jugoslavia, and oppressed nations, e.g., Macedonia torn up into three parts and annexed to Jugoslavia, Greece and Bulgaria. Thrace, divided amongst Greece, Bulgaria and Turkey. Croatia, Montenegro, Cossovo, Slovenia, Dalmatia, all in Jugoslavia, while Transylvania, Bucovina, Dombrudja and Bessarabia were included in Rumania. In all these places a policy of systematic denationalisation is carried through, which does not shrink from any method of decimation, extermination and expulsion of the native populations (or as was decreed by the Treaty of Lausanne 1923, for the exchange of nationals between Greece and Turkey, and Bulgaria and Greece), forcible assimilation, forcible colonisation, for the adulteration of national entity and the reinforcement of the dominant national element.

All three states—Greece, Bulgaria and Jugoslavia—which dismembered Macedonia are carrying on a systematic policy of extinction of national culture. In the schools the teaching of the national language is forbidden. Murders of all fighters for freedom, mass arrests, tortures and mass massacres by means of “pacifying expeditions” to which thousands of advanced elements fall victims, are the order of the day. Post-war Imro organised under the patronage of the Bulgarian Government, by two Bulgarian officers of Macedonian extraction, Todoroff and Protogheroff, shirked the responsibility of taking up the struggle against this policy of national extinction. At the behest of its patron it organised masses of desperate expropriated peasants and declassed elements into terrorist bands for raids across the border into Jugoslavia and Greece, or for the “execution” of Yugoslav officials. Imro failed to regain its pre-war influence. Its structure and leadership were unsuited to the maturing revolutionary crisis of the post-war years. While the majority of

Amorites seeing through the manoeuvre of the Bulgarian officers posing as National leaders, turned to the left and joined forces with the Communists, Imro was rapidly asserting itself as a Fascist body allied with the Bulgarian Fascist Government. The true class character of Imro was revealed thoroughly during the workers and peasants' revolution in 1923, when the Imro leaders assisted the Government of the butcher Tsankoff to drown the revolution in blood and have been responsible for the slaughter of 4,000 revolutionaries in Bulgarian Macedonia.

The "left wing" separated itself from Imro, accepted a revolutionary policy and started organising the Imro United. While Imro proper was sinking deeper and deeper into the fascist mire Imro United was rapidly rallying the Macedonian people round its revolutionary banner in a stubborn fight for liberation. And to-day, when the terrorist Mihailovist band has fallen into disfavour with the Sofia militarists and is disbanded, Imro United is there carrying on the struggle.

The leadership of Imro then entered the pay-roll of the Italian Government. The purpose was to bring about a rift between Bulgaria and Jugoslavia from which Italy, with her influence already firmly established in Albania, would benefit. The inquiries into the murder of King Alexander and M. Barthou in Marseilles revealed the complicity of Italian fascism as well as of the Hungarian Government and the Gestapo with the fascist-terrorist movements of the Imro and Ustachi (Croatia). The increasing alienation of Bulgaria from Italy, and its moving towards the Balkan Entente, made it necessary for the Government to dispense with the weapon of Imro which was the instrument for war-like tension between Jugoslavia and Bulgaria. The slaughterer of the Macedonian people, Ran Mihailoff, found refuge in Turkey.

It is a fact that the Balkan peninsula is the focus of imperialist intrigues. The murder of King Alexander and the Greek rebellion proved that, but the Balkan question is a burning

one affecting Europe and peace in Europe, and as such, it deserves a special study. It is a misfortune that no Marxist book on the Balkan question exists in the English language.

The two books under review leave untouched the essential facts, and the workers can derive no benefit from them.

DOROS ALASTOS.

[pp. 647-650]

Book Reviews, In Europe, *The Balkans and Europe*, by Doros Alastos, by Reginald Bridgeman, *The Labour Monthly*, December 1937

The Balkans and Europe, a Study of Peace and the Forces of War. By Doros Alastos. (The Bodley Head.) 73. 6d.

WORLD tension was suddenly and dangerously increased by the conclusion on November 6 of the Tripartite Agreement against the Communist International. This Pact has brought nearer the danger of world war. One of its parties, Japan, has already moved nearly a million of her soldiers to the Asiatic mainland. The other Contracting Parties, Italy and Germany, are subversively intriguing, and looking for assistance to Central and South-Eastern Europe. It will be possible for them to obtain the oil and raw materials necessary for war industries in the Balkans. The author believes that the Fascist States will not venture to unleash war unless assured at least of Balkan neutrality, if not Balkan aid, and he describes in this book the policy which the Fascist Powers are pursuing in the different Balkan States, where they have already gained a foothold, Italy in Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, and Germany in Greece.

The Balkan Governments are bewildered and perturbed. They cannot understand the hesitancy of British Foreign Policy. London has buzzed with Balkan visitors. Mr. Stoyadinovitch, Prime Minister of Yugoslavia, paid an official visit to London in October. In November King Boris of Bulgaria and King George of Greece were both here. The King of Roumania is expected in the New Year.

It is estimated that over £400,000,000 of foreign capital is invested in the Balkan countries. After the war heavy borrowing by Greece and Bulgaria was directed mainly to the relief of

refugees; Yugoslavia and Rumania, though borrowing ostensibly for railway and heavy industrial development, used the loans for armaments.

Doros Alastos explains how extravagantly the Allied and Associated Powers overestimated Bulgaria's economic resources. The original sum of which payment was demanded by the Treaty of Neuilly was 2,250,000,000 gold francs. This was scaled down to 550 millions in 1923 and subsequently suspended so that with the exception of Albania, Bulgaria to-day has the smallest foreign debt of all the Balkan countries, whose freedom is restricted by their foreign indebtedness. Political interference by the moneylending countries is general, and foreign influence is extended under the cloak of economic concessions.

Prior to the war the railways in the Balkans were constructed and maintained almost exclusively by foreign capital. For political reasons no railway was built across Serbia to link the Adriatic with the Aegean, and Turkey refused to allow the union of the Greek railway system with the European by a line through Turkish territory. The lines owned before the war by the Central Powers are now owned by the Balkan States, and to-day practically all the railway systems are State property. Electrification offers to foreign capital an opportunity similar to that presented by railway construction in the nineteenth century. Electrical undertakings in Yugoslavia have been financed by French, Belgian, Swiss, Austrian and German capital. Franco-Belgian capital has supplied Bucharest with electricity. The same concern obtained the concession to extend the power system of Sofia. A British company electrified Athens and Piraeus, while the water supply is in the hands of an American company.

“The German resurrection of the *Drang nach Osten* slogan,” says Doros Alastos, “is a major symptom of contemporary European disturbance, and owing to the inevitable political

interference by which alone it can be sustained, it offers the most ominous possibilities of upsetting the precarious European equilibrium. Europe has enslaved the Balkans financially and politically, but at the same time she has committed herself to the Balkanic entanglement from which she would find it exceedingly difficult to extricate herself.”

Economically the Balkan lands are to-day bound more closely to Germany and Italy than to Western Europe. But Germany has overreached herself. In Bulgaria, Greece, Turkey and Yugoslavia she has paid for her purchases of raw materials with goods of poor quality, sometimes even with unwanted goods, at comparatively high prices, so that the Balkan peoples are dissatisfied with the whole system of international trade introduced by the German clearing system.

For years the British Government has felt an embarrassment which grew in proportion to the rising insistency of Hitler on the need for restoring Germany's colonial Empire. Suddenly came the information from Berlin that Herr Hitler was ready, if he received the slightest encouragement, to offer Britain a ten years' "truce" on the Colonial issue. During the truce the question of Colonies would not be raised. In return, however, for such a concession Herr Hitler would expect the British Government to grant him a free hand in Central and Eastern Europe. Britain did not miss this opportunity. Viscount Halifax, Lord President of the Council, accepted the invitation which he had received as a Master of Foxhounds to visit the Hunting Exhibition in Berlin, organised by General Goering, and it was announced in that false but pompous tone which is nothing but a disservice to British diplomacy that during his "entirely private and unofficial visit "to Germany he would see Herr Hitler. The German idea of a "free hand" in Central Europe is that Britain should not intervene if:

- (1) Germany pressed for a plebiscite in Austria.

(2) Germany presented a demand to Czechoslovakia for the immediate recognition of the right of the German minority in that country to administrative autonomy within the State, and to cultural unity with the people of the German Reich.

Such a demand would at once subject the terms of the agreements between the States of the Little Entente and the States parties to the Balkan Pact to the supreme test. The Revisionist States would tremble with excitement. The peace of Europe would be definitely at stake.

Doros Alastos, the publication of whose book is appropriately timed, has filled a gap in English literature on the Balkans, by covering the period from the formation of the Balkan League in 1912 down to the present day. This League which enabled its members to destroy the domination of their Ottoman oppressor did not prevent them from subsequently attacking each other in the second Balkan war. Regional and economic interests drew them together again, but the Great Powers disrupted the natural movement towards friendship and understanding among the Balkan peoples who in unity had freed themselves from the Turkish yoke, and forced on South-Eastern Europe the fatal policy of the "balance of power," with the result that the Balkans became one of the chief battlefields of the World War.

The Peace Terms left the Balkan States with claims unsatisfied and a host of National Minorities. The Fascist Powers have skilfully exploited Balkan ambitions and deceptions. In each of the Balkan States the alleged Communist peril has been made the pretext for martial law, abolition of civil rights, dictatorship and terror.

This book should be read by all who are interested in European politics, and especially by those who may have lost interest in Balkan developments since the post-war settlements. History repeats itself, and in order to utilise every opportunity of averting the danger of war it is necessary to be perfectly

acquainted with the series of events which led to the signature of the Balkan Pact of February 9, 1934, between Greece, Rumania, Turkey and Yugoslavia, and accurately to appraise the relativity of policy of the members of the Little Entente and their Allies, and of the signatories of the Pact.

REGINALD BRIDGEMAN.

[pp. 765-766]

Greece Under the Nazi Shadow by Odysseus Androutsos, *The Labour Monthly*, March 1939

SINCE HE BECAME dictator of Greece on August 4, 1936, General Metaxas has consistently tried to fulfil two major objectives. The first was to crush the popular movement which, without regard to political and social opinions, had striven to raise the standard of living of the people and for the democratisation of the country's political life. But if such a policy represented the wishes of the ruling classes great misgivings existed amongst them as to the wisdom of putting at the head of a fascist government a politician who, six months before, had received at the general elections only 2½ per cent, of the total votes and who, by a political past of systematic inconsistency exceeding the limits of political decency, had done nothing towards commending himself to popular respect. Thus the attitude of the great bulk of capitalists was one of simple toleration and expectation, while only a small number of them collaborated actively with the regime. Identical was the view-point adopted by the officer corps which, through continuous purges, had been deprived of most of its democratic elements. To change this toleration into active support, and thus acquire for his government a wider basis has been the second objective pursued by the Dictator.

Internally, the policy followed by the regime has been primarily directed against the great mass of the people. Wages have been kept static while the cost of living was rising because of the rise in world prices, the increase in taxation on tobacco, stamps, etc., the increase in duties on articles of prime necessity like coffee, textiles, and the wholesale export of olive oil, which is a basic item of dietary. On the political field the violent persecution of the Communists was gradually extended against the leaders and members of practically all the other parties. At

present 13,000 persons overcrowd the prisons, the concentration camp of Acronauplia and the rocky pocket islands of the Aegean, where treatment and conditions of life are steadily deteriorating. On the cultural field, every progressive thought of the present and the past is being rigorously persecuted—Thucydides' funeral speech of Pericles because of its praise of democracy, Sophocles' *Antigone* because of its attacks on the tyrants.

In his foreign policy, neither the idea of a United Balkans withstanding the German drive, nor the continuance of the traditional policy of collaboration with Great Britain and France (in order to resist Mussolini's expansionist aims) could, with their flavour of internationalism and anti-Fascism, appeal to the General. The internal orientation of his regime drew him towards a collaboration with the dictator powers. Germany was quick to seize upon this opportunity. German money is poured into Greece with the object of acquiring the good graces of newspapers and leading political and business personalities. Nazi leaflets are being translated and distributed for the price of a halfpenny. The German colony in Athens is solidly organised and its newspaper, the *Athener Zeitung*, is being distributed free to well-to-do Greek families. The German newspapers publish regularly enthusiastic articles about the achievements of the "New Greece," translations of which are published immediately by the regimented Greek press. The Government is indeed only too ready to help. While a great number of difficulties confront Greek students wishing to continue their studies in France and England, every facility is being offered by the Government to whomsoever wants to travel to Germany. There has been no official confirmation of the reports that Dr. Goebbels contributed to the fund of the "Special Security Police" and that secret service agents are being sent to Germany for the completion of their training, but it is a fact that in the Greek police headquarters there are four autographed photographs

hanging peacefully together: the King, General Metaxas, Hitler and Dr. Goebbels. German cultural influence in Greece is steadily increasing.

Economically the share of German trade has been constantly on the increase. Already in the Spring of 1936, General Metaxas, then Constitutional Premier, was warned by M. Tsouderos, Governor of the Bank of Greece, and the party leaders of the dangers facing Greece because of the increase in her active balance in the German-Greek clearing relations. Towards the end of 1936, when the reserve of the Bank of Greece began to dwindle rapidly as a result of the German policy, Metaxas accepted payment by Germany through the delivery of armaments of a total value of over four-and-a-half million pounds. The then Minister of Finance, M. Zavitsianos, resigned. Germany had tried to enforce the same method of paying her debts through the delivery of armaments upon all the other Balkan countries; they would thus be compelled to turn again to her for renewals, and their political dependence upon her would be increased. Only Yugoslavia and Greece accepted the proposal. Turkey, realising their political implications, refused extremely profitable offers put to her by the Krupp concern on the subject of the refortification of the Dardanelles. "It is not sheer coincidence," comments P. Einzig (*Bloodless Invasion*, p. 33), "that among the statesmen responsible for the destinies of the various Danubian and Balkan States, General Metaxas and M. Stoyadinovitch, are easily the most sympathetic towards German policy." The German material proved of such inferior quality that the General, who had grandiloquently proclaimed his intention of creating "an army comparable to that of the most advanced states," was, according to Mr. Einzig, obliged to smuggle it to Spain. Meanwhile Germany is spoiling the Greek markets by re-exporting Greek tobacco. This suicidal policy of putting all the eggs of the country's economic life in one basket, thereby obviating any possibility of independence in her foreign

relations, has been pursued by the Government for entirely partisan reasons, its aim being the creation of vested interests favourable to the maintenance of its regime.

In his foreign policy, Metaxas from the first moment of coming to power, opposed the attempted formation of a Balkan Bloc destined to resist German penetration. By his refusal in 1936 to co-operate with the other countries of the Balkan Entente for the defence of all their frontiers he pushed Yugoslavia into the arms of Italy and Germany. In January, 1937, Yugoslavia signed a pact of “ eternal friendship “ with Bulgaria, without consulting her other Balkan friends—thus violating the Balkan pact. Thereby the system of collective security in the Balkans received its first severe shock.

Events since Munich show how contrary to the national interest the policy of Metaxas has been. Owing to her remoteness from Germany Greece is not among those countries whose collaboration Hitler needs for his Balkan drive; on the contrary he might usefully sacrifice her for the purchase of eventual allies and obtain at the same time the much desired outlet to the Mediterranean. As the correspondent of the Paris *Ordre* reported on November 8 and 14, 1938, German propaganda in the Balkans is being successfully directed towards the formation of a Yugoslav-Bulgarian bloc, with the promise of an expansion at the expense of Greece. Already the Bulgarian Government, through semi-official feelers in the European Capitals, the Bulgarian Nationalists, by demonstrations against Rumania and Greece, the I.M.R.O. (I. notorious “Macedonian revolutionary organisation”), through a renewal of its terrorist activity, have raised the demand for the cession by Greece of Alexandroupolis, an entirely Greek harbour situated in close proximity to the Dardenelles. Meanwhile the Greek Government is becoming alarmed by reports of Italian aspirations towards Corfu and Crete.

Against these increasing dangers no real resistance is being organised by General Metaxas. Instead of preparing public opinion he tries by every means to dispel the growing apprehension of the people, fearing an increased pressure for the formation of an all-party democratic cabinet. The same hatred of democracy hinders any determined and convincing attempt on his part to re-orientate the country's foreign policy. In the light of recent experience, one is indeed entitled to serious doubts as to his willingness to uphold any real resistance to the drive of Germany and her potential allies. He might later be faced with the necessity of sacrificing either class interests and personal power or the national independence of Greece, and the decision, as has been illustrated by Czecho-Slovakia, need not be in favour of the former alternative.

The danger of being transformed into a German colony is equally great for all the Balkan countries. This is being clearly realised by the Balkan peoples, for whom indeed the struggle for political democracy, social liberation and national independence are becoming increasingly identified under the general heading of anti-Fascism. Co-operation among the Balkan States is necessary if they are to wage a successful fight for their independence; to this end the formation of an alliance of all the democratic forces and the establishment of progressive democracies, the peaceful revision of the peace treaties carried out with popular consent and under popular control, the granting of equality of rights to all the national minorities and close co-operation on all questions of economic and foreign policy, constitute the *conditio sine qua non*; collaboration with the great democracies would implement this arrangement. In the case of Greece the persecution of the Macedonian minority would have to cease and a commercial outlet to the Aegean be granted to Bulgaria.

Even from the point-of-view of her imperial interests alone the fate of Greece cannot be considered "no concern" of Great

Britain. The domination of the Eastern Mediterranean through the British-Turkish alliance will not be possible without the collaboration of a friendly Greece, whose islands control the principal Turkish ports and the trade route through the Dardanelles. It must not be thought, however, that Greece, under any government whatsoever, will become—because of her “ natural “ interests—the ally of Great Britain and France, once her own independence is threatened. The danger exists, that under M. Metaxas she may be transformed in the “ Franco Spain “ of the Eastern Mediterranean.

[pp. 167-170]

The U.S.S.R., Turkey and the Allies by "Quaestor" *The Labour Monthly*, April 1940

THE WAR IN Finland has ended in discomfiture for Mr. Chamberlain. All his plans were laid on the basis of the war dragging out until May, when the Allies could attack the U.S.S.R. with convenience to themselves. That is the truth behind the Times uneasy doubts whether the Allies acted quickly enough. At all events, Mr. Chamberlain has not secured his "new front" in the North, and with it the chance of switching the war against the U.S.S.R. The Red Army—that "exploded myth, "that" colossus with feet of clay"—has settled the hash of Mr. Chamberlain's schemes. Naturally, he and his henchmen are looking elsewhere.

Here is their authentic voice—that of Mr. Ward Price, prince of appeasement publicists, voice of Chamberlainism in all the capitals of Europe before the war (save one), and lately a welcome guest among the highest Nazi leaders. Mr. Price wrote in the *Daily Mail* on March 14:

The Scandinavian gate to Central Europe, which for three months has been ajar, is now fast-closed again. By so much the more is the importance of the other open enemy flank in South-Eastern Europe increased.

Our defensive alliance with Turkey is constantly being strengthened by personal contacts. At the present moment an important Anglo-French Air Mission is in the Turkish capital.

If Russia should ever make that alliance operative by taking the offensive against Rumania, Iran or any other of her southern neighbours, we are well placed to deliver a dangerous thrust at those Caucasian oilfields which are as vital a spot to Germany as to Russia herself.

But Mr. Price is too modest in suggesting that the half-million French and British troops in the Near East, with their complement of aeroplanes, tanks and attendant warships, must

wait until the Soviet Union “takes the offensive.” The plans of his leaders are much more vigorous. Thus Mr. Gordon Lennox, the diplomatic correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* and *Morning Post*, and as well-informed a writer on British foreign policy as any habitué of the upper circles of the Foreign Office, wrote the same day that the British Government regards the U.S.S.R. as an ally of Germany, but does not necessarily intend to declare war, which is no longer fashionable. It “may well feel justified at some stage in the campaign in considering that a blow against Russia would be a blow against Germany.” For this purpose, the oil supply in Trans-Caucasia is one of the “obvious points of vital strategic interest.”

The leader-writer of “Great Britain and the East”—the self-constituted but none the less faithful echo of the India Office and the Colonial Office—echoed the very same sentiments, also on March 14: “Indeed, there are possibilities more remote from the field of practicable considerations than that the Allies, with the aid of Turkey, might elect to strike in that area (the Caucasus oil-fields) if Russian demands on Finland should prove intolerable.” As we know, the Russian demands proved even worse—they proved successful; and no greater “provocation” to aggressive imperialism could be imagined than the success in war of a Socialist State.

It would be wrong, however, to attribute the threats in the Chamberlain press to the galling sense of defeat in Finland which the War Cabinet must undoubtedly be feeling. There is ample evidence to show that the Near East, as a theatre of war, was in the minds of the British and French Governments months ago. And not merely from the angle of the defence of Rumania against a German attack, under the Franco-Rumanian Treaty of Mutual Assistance and the British guarantee of April 13, 1939—which was the ostensible reason for the assembling of General Weygand’s huge army in Syria, Palestine and Egypt. A still more eloquent piece of evidence is that given by the well-known

French reactionary journalist, Jules Sauerwein, in an article in the *Sunday Times* of January 21, beginning with these words:

Since the beginning of hostilities two long journeys have led me, first to the Baltic coast and then to the East Mediterranean. The purpose of these investigations was to find out whether hostilities, paralysed on the Franco-British front by powerful fortifications, had any chance of extending to the neutral sphere of the North, or in the Near East.

From internal evidence, it is clear that these journeys began early in October, long before the Soviet-Finnish negotiations reached their crisis. Moreover, M. Sauerwein said very little in his article of any danger from Germany in the two neutral regions. His emphasis fell entirely on "Russian aggression," "Bolshevik infiltration," "Bolshevik propaganda."

It should be added that M. Sauerwein, formerly foreign editor of the *Matin*—beloved of the treasuries of imperial Russia and imperial Germany long before propaganda ministries were invented—and now foreign editor of the million-sale *Paris Soir*—yellowest of the yellow French press—is renowned in much the same way that Mr. Ward Price is renowned: a keen sense of news, widespread acquaintance among the great, and the instinct for never straying far from the foreign policies of the most reactionary and most anti-Soviet elements among the ruling class of his own country. This makes attention to M. Sauerwein's writings not a mere tribute to his journalistic talents, but an infallible guide to the paths of the anti-Soviet aggressors.

It is more than a coincidence that, at the same time as M. Sauerwein was beginning his travels, negotiators from Finland and Turkey were preparing to visit Moscow. The outcome of the Finnish negotiations has overshadowed that of the Turkish—so far. The latter will not prove less important, if the anti-Soviet warmakers are able to put into effect the plans discussed by Messrs. Ward Price, Gordon Lennox and Sauerwein.

What in essence was the cause for the breakdown of the negotiations carried on in Moscow, from October 1 to October 17, by the Turkish Foreign Minister, Sarajoglu ? The veil has not been lifted in its entirety, but from the scraps which appeared in the most authoritative British, French and Soviet newspapers it is quite clear what was the main point. On the one hand, Turkey had secured a pledge of mutual assistance from Great Britain and France. M. Sarajoglu therefore insisted that any pact of mutual aid between Turkey and the U.S.S.R. should leave Turkey free to stand on one side, as a neutral, if Great Britain and France were involved in war with the Soviet Union. On the other hand, there was the possibility that Germany might attack Rumania, which Turkey was bound to defend (bound by interest as well as by the obligations of the Balkan Entente) and which Britain and France were also bound to defend. M. Sarajoglu therefore demanded that the U.S.S.R. should pledge itself to come to Turkey's assistance in that case. He wanted, in short, to win both on the swings *and* on the roundabouts.

The position of the U.S.S.R., on the other hand, was simple and logical. If the Turkish Government had a reservation in promising assistance to the U.S.S.R. against an aggressor, so had the Soviet Government. If Turkey was willing to pledge its support to the Soviet Union against all comers except Great Britain and France, then the Soviet Union must take leave to do likewise, and promise support for Turkey against all comers except Germany. What was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander. The fact that the Turkish Government, in its subsequent treaty of alliance with Great Britain and France (October 19), made the reservation that it might stand aside in a war of Britain and France against the U.S.S.R. did not in any way improve matters, since the reservation meant that Turkey *might* equally well join in the attack—as the latest and most authoritative publicists of the National Government, quoted above, now seem to expect.

The importance of these abortive negotiations in October between Turkey and the U.S.S.R. and of the more successful negotiations between Turkey and the Allies does not, of course, lie in the legal technicalities providing a loophole for Turkey. The very fact that Turkey sought such a loophole, thereby immensely encouraging the imperialist plans for war on the Soviet Union which suffered a reverse in the Soviet-German pact of August 23, 1939, is the important fact. As Molotov said in his speech to the Supreme Soviet on October 31:

The Soviet-Turkish negotiations did not lead to the conclusion of a pact, but they did help us to clear up, or at least explore, a number of political questions that interest us. In the present international situation, it is particularly important to know the true face and policy of States relations with which are of serious importance. Many things pertaining to the policy of Turkey have now become clearer to us, both as a result of the Moscow negotiations and as a result of recent acts of the Turkish Government in the sphere of foreign policy.

As you know, the government of Turkey has preferred to tie up its destinies with a definite group of European Powers, belligerents in the present war. It has concluded a pact of mutual assistance with Great Britain and France, who for the past two months have been waging war on Germany. Turkey has definitely discarded the cautious policy of neutrality and has entered the orbit of the developing European war. This is highly pleasing to both Great Britain and France, who are bent upon drawing as many neutral countries as possible into their sphere of war. Whether Turkey will not come to regret it, we shall not try to guess. It is only incumbent on us to take note of these new factors in the foreign policy of our neighbour, and to keep a watchful eye on the development of events.

What induced the Turkish Government to change its policy from that cautious position which was noted in the first of this series of reviews, in the October issue of the **LABOUR MONTHLY**? Not merely the growing measure of financial inducement received from British imperialism—the £3,000,000

advanced for the construction of a metallurgical combine at Karabuk in 1936, the £16,000,000 advanced in cash or provided in credit for armaments and industrial equipment in 1938, the £40,000,000 of credits and gold provided by the Allies in October, 1939—although to secure in a space of twelve months a sum approaching that of the total Turkish Budget must surely be a transaction unique in the history of international—shall we say, “inducement.” The question is, how did the Turkish Government reach such a point of accessibility?

The fact is that the independent capitalist development of Turkey which was made possible by the post-war revolution and the successful War of Independence of 1919 to 1922 has led to the creation of a new national bourgeoisie which was partly already interested in links of all kinds with foreign capital. There were 106 limited companies, with a capital of 1,669,000 Turkish pounds, founded before 1923, and 196, with a capital of 158,000,000 Turkish pounds, founded in the next ten years. There was a corresponding increase in the number of factories; of 1,397 factories and workshops open in 1933, 340 only had existed before 1923, while the rest had been founded since. These figures show the gradual development of a native class of industrial capitalists, sufficiently strong to begin to affect policy, and sufficiently weak to be accessible to the blandishments and mighty financial resources of great foreign Empires. This was assisted by the fact that, for all the anti-imperialist character of the peasant uprising which was the backbone of the War of Independence, foreign capital had still a powerful influence in the country—a significant feature being a big increase of its role in industry and mining, compared with the previous main spheres of penetration of foreign capital in Turkey—railways and banks. This is illustrated by the following figures, taken from the official publications of the Turkish Government itself:

Foreign Capital in £T millions:		
Invested in:	1924	1933
Railways	39.1	88
Banks	10.2	14
Commerce	3.6	5.5
Mines	3.0	20
Industry	2.4	24

It would have been surprising if, on the basis of this development and links with foreign capital, no group had come into existence with a leaning towards the most powerful of all post-1914 foreign influences—those of British and French finance capital. Such a group did in fact make its appearance, with varying influences on Turkish foreign policy. At the Montreux Conference on the question of refortifying the Dardanelles (1936), the influence of this group was sufficient to make the Turkish delegation itself wobble over to the side of its British opponents, leaving the burden of the fight for the principle of “the Black Sea for the Black Sea Powers “more than once to the U.S.S.R. The same influence expressed itself for a short time, during the last months of the life of Kemal, the leader of the new Turkey, in the coming to power of a frankly pro-British nominee of powerful commercial and financial groups, Djelal Bayar. When Kemal died and was succeeded as President by his old colleague in the War of Independence, Ismet İnönü, there was a temporary reversal of policy, back to the old line of independence and friendship with the Soviet Union. But when Europe began to smell of powder, in the summer of 1938, the internal struggle again brought the pro-British group uppermost.

Moreover, the Allies had a powerful support for their blandishments to the Turkish leaders in the growing appetites and widening aggression of Italian imperialism, constructing submarine and air bases close to the Turkish coasts and casting a greedy eye on Asia Minor. It was, indeed, the activities of the Italians which precipitated events, and led that section of the

Turkish national bourgeoisie which for the time being was uppermost to forget the great lesson of the War of Independence—that the Turkish Republic had come into existence in spite of the Bank of England and the Banque de France—and to conclude an alliance with British and French imperialism, enemies of Turkey’s only reliable friend—the U.S.S.R.

Not content with securing Turkey as an ally and potential “ opener “ of a Near Eastern front, Allied imperialism has done its utmost to send Turkey as its vanguard into the Balkans. For there is a bone to pick with German imperialism there, not only on military grounds. Thanks to the peculiar methods of Nazi financial expansion—which differ from those of the City of London approximately in the same way as the methods of Dick Turpin differed from those of Horatio Bottomley—the Balkans in recent years have been falling more and more under German economic domination. Apart from certain mineral production—Rumanian oil, Yugoslav lead and copper—they are agrarian countries; the peasantry constitute 67 per cent, of the population in Greece, 76 per cent, in Yugoslavia, 81 per cent, in Rumania, 82 per cent, in Bulgaria. These States can only exist by exporting their produce, and are almost entirely dependent upon imports for manufactured goods, including the very implements of their agricultural production. During the great years when Mr. Chamberlain was encouraging Nazi expansion by every conceivable means, energetically supported by the Bank of England, the German Government was able to establish almost a stranglehold upon the Balkan States. Here are the figures, published by the League of Nations in 1938, showing what percentage of their exports went to Germany:

	1929	1934	1937
Bulgaria	29.9	42.8	43.1
Greece	23.2	22.5	31.0
Rumania.....	27.6	16.6	17.8

Yugoslavia.....	8.5	15.4	21.7
Turkey.....	13.3	37.4	51.0

The percentage of German imports coming from these five countries and Hungary rose from 7.1 in 1934 to 12.3 in 1937; and in exchange Germany, which could only send them 5.3 per cent, of her exports in 1934, was sending them more than twice as much—11.3 per cent.—by 1937.

Thus the possibility of a new front in the Near East promises, not only to provide a means of striking either at the U.S.S.R. or at Germany, but of eliminating a powerful competitor (albeit fostered and nurtured by the National Government itself).

Skilfully playing on the desperate efforts the Balkan States have made in recent years to shake off the German stranglehold, and on national problems which most of them have to face in their own countries, the Allies sent Turkey into the Balkan Entente meeting on February 2 at Belgrade with the very obvious purpose of pulling the Entente into the anti-German combination, under the banner of combating alleged "Soviet aggression." M. Sarajoglu left for the meeting on January 31 with the statement to the Turkish press that "our country is not neutral, but is outside the war."

With this slogan in mind, he was proposing the modification of the original basis of the Balkan Entente by taking in Bulgaria. "If the original aim of the pact is now out of date, would it not be better, so runs the general Turkish attitude, to turn it outward, that is to say towards solidarity in the face of any threats of aggression from abroad?" (the *Times Belgrade* correspondent, February 2). Turkey was prepared, by its treaty with Britain and France, to facilitate the execution of Allied guarantees to Rumania, said the correspondent; and M. Sarajoglu might well turn to Rumania with the suggestion that she should "take into account the interests of Hungary in Transylvania and of Bulgaria

in the Dobrudja.” The very fact of the omission of the Soviet claim to Bessarabia, seized forcibly from Soviet Russia in 1918, indicates the true measure of altruism of the Turkish proposals. Simultaneously the National Government brought pressure to bear on Rumania to be “reasonable” by stopping exports to that country, with certain exceptions, pending a more satisfactory arrangement with regard to deliveries of Rumanian oil to Germany and Great Britain respectively (Yorkshire Post political correspondent, February 2).

As a result of these efforts, the Balkan Entente, it is true, was not swung into action, or even into a bloc in favour of the Allies against Germany; but the diplomatic correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* was able to report on February 12 that Turkey had persuaded Greece and Yugoslavia to join with her in giving harbour facilities to Bulgaria, and that Rumania had undertaken to grant credits—privileges which would not have been granted unless Bulgaria had agreed to drop her territorial demands for the time being. What all these measures were intended for was shown by the correspondent’s revealing comment: “The hardening of opinion in Britain, on the line that Russia and Germany must be regarded as full partners in schemes for carving up and dominating Europe, has had its effect in the Balkans.” With these achievements in hand, the warmongers began to come out into the open—and it is no mere coincidence of dates that February 11 saw the opening of that tremendous and decisive offensive of the Red Army against the Mannerheim Line. The whole of the interest in the Balkans was revealed as merely one avenue for potential attack on the U.S.S.R. “Scrutator” in the *Sunday Times*—faithful mouthpiece (at second hand) of what Mr. Chamberlain is thinking—announced on February 18 that “many things are more unlikely than a Russian attack from the Caucasus in the direction of Mosul or Persia.” Naturally, the Australian troops in Palestine, in combination with the French Army in Syria, would go to the

help of Irak. “Air raids on Baku from some advanced point in Mosul would, if successful, go near to ending the war, and certainly would be a far less risky operation than an attack on the Siegfried Line.” A special article in the *Times* enlarged on this courageous argument, two days later, by asserting that it was difficult to see the U.S.S.R. inflicting serious harm on England and France, even if it became a belligerent as the result of an Allied attack on “this unwieldy German supply ship operating under a neutral flag.” The Far Eastern Soviet Army and Air Force get their oil from Baku, the sapient writer informed the readers of the *Times*. “The main Baku oilfield is within the range of bombers operating from Turkey and Irak, and Soviet agriculture has scrapped horses in favour of tractors.”

On February 25, the *Temps*—voice of the French Foreign Office—joined in. Finland was already a thorn buried in the flesh of the U.S.S.R. and the Allies have to see to it that the “prodigious efforts” of Moscow to get rid of this abscess were not successful. But there was a second means, just as easy (if this sounds humorous, let the reader remember it was written before the Moscow Treaty of March 12):

To prevent Germany exploiting the oil of the Caucasus and the grain of the Ukraine, by freely effecting intensive transport of supplies all along the northern shores of the Black Sea, advantage should be taken of the weakness of this zone of the Soviet complex, by seeking to break open the badly-healed fractures which formerly separated States who impatiently suffer the Soviet yoke.

For those unaccustomed to diplomatic tongue-twisting, this merely means that the Allies should attack the U.S.S.R. in the Black Sea and endeavour to divide it up into separate bourgeois States, bearing the label of “Ukraine,” “Georgia,” etc., and ruled by loyal governments, candidates for which can be found in all White emigrant cafes of Paris.

But events did not wait. The Red Army was advancing towards Viborg. As we now know, a group in the Finnish

Government had already begun to think of abandoning the anti-Soviet adventure, unwisely begun under the influence of friendly advice from outside. It was necessary to push ahead. So there began, parallel with this propaganda of war—and aggressive war—against the U.S.S.R., a unique campaign of lying provocations about alleged conflicts between Turkey and the U.S.S.R., calculated to incite either one or the other to some hasty measure of self-protection which would precipitate a conflict. After the exercises in imagination of the British and French capitalist Press in connection with the Finnish war, the job was not too difficult. The following are some of the most notorious examples, over the space of one month :

Feb. 13. The Germans are sending 500,000 men to defend the Soviet oilfields. (Denied by Reuter next day).

Feb. 18. Big Soviet concentrations on the Turkish frontier, and Turkish counter-measures. (Denied in Ankara and Moscow).

Feb. 19. Soviet battalion crossed the Turkish frontier, conflict with Turkish troops. (Denied February 20).

Feb. 24. State of emergency proclaimed in Turkey. (Denied in Ankara, February 25).

Feb. 27. All Turkish ships recalled to port. (Denied same day).

Feb. 29. Italy asks permission to send warships into the Black Sea to defend interests, as Great Britain was doing the same. (Denied in Rome and London).

Mar. 4. “The Turkish outlook regarding Russia has recently undergone a striking development. The slow progress of the Soviet war against Finland has encouraged the belief that Russia presented no real menace to Turkey. Among the younger generation the tendency has gone further, and the conviction is growing that the time has come to tackle this traditional enemy while he is still occupied in the north, and not to wait until he makes an attack. Information reaches me from reliable sources that the defences which the Russians are feverishly erecting on the north shores of the Black Sea, notably at Batum and Odessa, are measures against a possible Turkish offensive.” (*Daily Telegraph* Ankara correspondent).

Mar. 14. Turkish ambassador in Rome has taken to Ankara an Italian proposal for collaboration with Turkey against the U.S.S.R., (Denied in Rome and Ankara next day).

While there were doubtless elements of fact in the report of Allied plans for an attack on the U.S.S.R., given by the Daily Telegraph correspondent in Ankara on March 4, in the long extract quoted above, its most characteristic feature was that which it shared with the other reports, namely, its obvious striving at all costs to drive Turkey and the U.S.S.R. into a head-on collision. The reason for this extraordinary flood is not far to seek. Under the influence of events in Finland, not only were the Balkan States drawing back in alarm from the role so thoughtfully provided for them, but the Turkish Government was beginning to wobble once again. On March 1 the Turkish Prime Minister, in a speech on the radio, had flatly declared that Turkey was not disposed to undertake any action whatsoever against the U.S.S.R., and there was no proof whatsoever "at present" which would justify the supposition that the U.S.S.R. would undertake direct action against Turkey. Obviously, strong medicine was necessary for such a fit of vacillation. The same medicine was used as in the case of Finland. The results may be equally lamentable, if the Turks allow the doses to continue and grow.

Here is the picture drawn by Kemal Ataturk, in his history of the foundation of the Turkish Republic, of the situation when the present "friends" of Turkey had the country almost at their mercy, and did not need the services of the Turkish soldier for the moment:

The army was disarmed and armaments and shells continued to be taken away. The Entente Powers did not respect the armistice conditions. Their army and fleet, on various pretexts, were at Constantinople. The vilayet of Adana was occupied by the French; Urfa, Marash and Anntab by the British. Italian troops were concentrated at Adalia and Konia. British forces proceeded to occupy Merzifun and Constantinople Finally, on May 15,

1919, the Greek army landed at Smyrna, with the consent of the Entente Powers.

There is no particular reason for thinking that the Turks would meet with any different treatment, if they turned against the one Power whose aid helped to pull them out of this situation, during the War of Independence. One thing is certain—that the U.S.S.R., here as everywhere, would conduct its war of self-defence, if forced to it, not on its own territory but on that of the aggressor, wherever it could reach him—or them. The experience of the Finnish war, combined with those of the Japanese in recent years, should prove that the U.S.S.R. has considerable means for doing so.

The British working class has the means, for its part, to prevent the monstrous plans of the warmongers coming to fruition—or, if the warmongers make the venture, of bringing those plans to disaster for imperialism, and to victory for the cause of the international working class.

[pp. 220-228]

AFTER SIX MONTHS—WHAT NOW? BY HARRY POLLITT. *The Labour Monthly*, April 1941

AT THE END of the first six months of what Chamberlain has described as “the strangest of all wars,” the ruling class and the working class of Britain are both faced with a series of extremely urgent and grave problems.

The aim of the ruling class, whatever phrases or slogans they use, is to gain at all costs the domination of Europe and the destruction of the Soviet Union, and to prepare the way for a gigantic trade war against their rivals, especially the United States of America—assuming that the present war ends with the capitalist system still in existence.

But the ruling class have to note certain facts—facts that also face the Labour Movement, and which could have an even greater significance for the Labour Movement were it not that the official Labour policy has at present caused a certain degree of paralysis amongst the masses.

In his speech some time ago at Manchester, Mr. Churchill stated that, with “God’s helping hand,” Britain was certain of victory. At the moment, however, the ruling class are showing a preference for more practical weapons than God’s helping hand. They have the B.B.C., the Press, the cinema, and the Labour leaders. Despite the fullest use of all these weapons, one fact emerges plainly for all to note and learn from. It is this. Do what they will, the ruling class cannot get the mass of the people to shout, sing, or wave flags for this imperialist war, any more than they can generate enthusiasm among the armed forces.

The war is being discussed as no other issue has ever been discussed in our lifetime, for it has brought many new and urgent problems into the homes and lives of the workers. Whether these discussions are on wages, prices, evacuation, the neglect of children’s education, the conduct of the war; the contrast between the war on the Western Front and the war on the high

seas; the contrast between Britain's attitude towards Poland in the first weeks of the war and its policy of immediate support to Finland; always there is present an undercurrent of awareness that something is wrong somewhere.

It is not easy for workers to see precisely what is wrong, to put their fingers on the cause of their disquiet, but the uneasiness is there. They are not worried because all is quiet on the Western Front, or that lives are not being lost on land as well as on sea, or that bombing has not taken place. At bottom it is political disquiet, uneasiness regarding the aims, leadership and whole policy of the Chamberlain Government and of the Labour leaders.

There are also, of course, illusions amongst the workers, the most widely held being that this is a war against fascism and that for that reason it is necessary to continue the war. Others believe it is going to be the same sort of war for them as the last one, with plenty of work, overtime, week-ends, and comparatively high earnings. Others still believe that the war may lead to "better times" or to some sort of "new world," but these last two currents do not represent the main current of political feeling amongst the mass of the workers.

But it is not accidental that the principal cause of uneasiness among the core of the labour movement, that is in the ranks of the loyal labour men and women, is the political truce, or as it is now the fashion to call it, the "standstill agreement" that has been reached between the Labour leaders and Chamberlain. This truce has produced exactly the opposite effect to that which was intended. It has aroused suspicion amongst the workers, and this will be considerably deepened now that Chamberlain feels he has got official Labour so hamstrung that he can insolently turn down their suggestion that the Trades Disputes Act should be amended.

The very fact that this can be done by a Government, which Arthur Greenwood, M.P., declared early in the war could not

remain in power a single day without the support of the Labour Party, shows two things. First, that the political truce has strengthened the position of Chamberlain at home, and he knows it, and takes full advantage of it. Secondly, that vital time has been lost by not organising the mass movement for active opposition to the war by the paralysis imposed on the movement by official labour policy. It also reveals that this Act is not a dead letter, but one of the strongest weapons in the armoury of the Chamberlain government for fighting labour when once it is roused to take mass action to fight against the imperialist war on their wages, lives and homes.

In all activities to win the masses for action against the war and official Labour Party policy, it is necessary to explain time and time again the fact that the present war is the principal responsibility of the very government which the Labour leaders keep in power.

For six-and-a-half years the Chamberlain Government helped Hitler with money, arms, and political support. They backed up everything he did in Austria, Czechoslovakia and Spain. They agreed with his attacks on the German labour movement. They smashed up the League of Nations; they refused to sign a Pact of Mutual Assistance with the Soviet Union ; they prevented the building up of a Peace Front that could have made this war impossible ; they forced Poland to refuse any help from the Soviet Union to prevent that country from being invaded. They did all this, to build Hitler's war machine so that he would go and fight against the Soviet Union.

"Oh yes," some workers say, "we agree with you in all that, but now Chamberlain wants to fight Hitler, surely we should help him to do this?"

This is not the case. This is a misunderstanding of the true position.

When the might of the Soviet Union compelled Hitler to make a pact of non-aggression with the Soviet Union, the

Chamberlain Government then declared war on Nazi Germany, *not to crush fascism*, but to extend its own domination in Europe, strengthen the conquests of the British Empire, and find other means through which it could also continue its anti-Soviet policy. Just as Poland became the pawn in the first move, so Finland became the pawn in the new move against the Soviet Union.

The fundamental cause of my own mistake at the beginning of the war is that I did not see this in time, and did not realise that with the signing of the Soviet-German Pact an entirely new international situation had opened up, which meant that the old policy of seeking to bring about a Peace Front in which the Chamberlain Government would participate was now impossible of realisation.

Once war was declared it became for British Imperialism a war to the bitter end—a war against the forces that for the first time in the long history of British imperialism have completely out-manoeuvred them.

It was easy for the Chamberlain Government to get support for their war at the beginning, because of the deep hatred that was felt throughout the whole labour movement against fascism. This played a part in my own case in not enabling me to see the fundamental change in the international situation that I have referred to a little earlier. But there was one mistake that we never did make even in the first days of the war, and that was to believe that the Chamberlain Government would be, or could ever be, the instrument through which fascism would be fought or crushed.

I notice now, when my pamphlet written in the first days of the war is being so lavishly quoted from official labour platforms and its press, that they never, never quote the part that deals precisely with this political point. But the fundamental analysis of that pamphlet was wrong, as I have openly stated on every public platform on which I have appeared, and if there was one

thing that proves above all else that it was wrong, it is the fact that the labour leaders, the *Daily-Herald* and especially Professor Laski approve of it.

It needed only a few weeks to prove that so far from being an antifascist war, this war was even more blatantly imperialist than the last. In any mention of war aims the word fascism has completely disappeared from the language of Tory, Liberal and Labour leader alike. The open flirtation to bring Italian fascism on the side of British and French “democracy”; the flirtation with Japanese militarism to bring it on the side of the “democracies”; the shameless efforts not to limit slaughter but to extend it by bringing every kind of unprincipled pressure on neutral countries to come in on the side of the “democracies”; the efforts behind the scenes to reach agreement with certain leaders of the Nazi Party to do a deal behind Hitler’s back, without any intention of crushing fascism, but in order to reach an agreement that would switch the war in the West to a united war against the Soviet Union ; the refusal to grant India its independence; the refusal to end the partition of Ireland; the refusal to publish the Royal Commission’s Report on the West Indies; while at the same time Daladier was doing more in days to impose Hitlerism on the French workers than Hitler had been able to do in months when he first came to power; the political truce in Britain; the suspension of local elections; the emergency legislation giving absolutely dictatorial powers to the most reactionary government that Britain has had for a century, have all helped to expose the real aims of this imperialist war.

It was on the question of Finland, however, that the ruling class were too clever by half. They have shown their hand too openly for the dirt not to be clearly seen. They were too quick to sing of “their” victory. They were too eager to send war materials, men and money to Finland, when they had refused all these things to Republican Spain when it was fighting a real war against fascism. They were too ready to call together “their”

League of Nations to expel the Soviet Union, and to give help to Finland, when they had previously prevented the same League from helping Republican Spain, or allowing it to be called together to discuss the outbreak of war in 1939.

Every time any move is made for peace, it is Britain that leads the offensive against peace. When the negotiations opened between the Soviet Union and Finland, it was Britain which led the most rabid fight to urge Finland to refuse to conclude any form of peace negotiations with the Soviet Union, by the most open and shameless intimidation, covered over with lavish promises of men, arms and money.

It was Britain which by its opposition to a peaceful outcome of the Finnish question laid millions open to slaughter in France, because peace in Finland at once raises the issue in a sharper form than ever before, why not peace in France?

It is British imperialism that is the pace-maker for extending the war, for embroiling the neutral countries, for egging on other countries against the Soviet Union. It seeks by any and every means to find new forms to help in the war against Germany in the West, and against the Soviet Union in the East.

It is being diplomatically defeated and out-manoeuvred again and again, and this position has two sides to it. First, it only serves to make British imperialism more reckless and aggressive in its war aims; secondly, it shows the strong position of those who fight the imperialist war, and this alongside the power of the Soviet Union, which has so completely spiked the guns of British imperialism, means that the peace forces have been greatly strengthened.

This is the basic reason why Britain has so fiercely opposed any suggestion of a peaceful settlement of the Finnish question. It wanted the war in Finland to go on, because this would help it in its efforts to attack the Soviet Union through the countries in the Near East.

Now that the question of Finland has been settled in the teeth of the opposition of British and French Imperialism, it would be a profound mistake to believe that Britain will give up its efforts to crush its trade rivals in Germany or will ease in any way its efforts to crush the Soviet Union.

It is not so easy to switch the war against the Soviet Union as is sometimes pictured. While undoubtedly there are powerful forces working for this aim in all the belligerent countries, we need to remember that the contradictions between German and British imperialism have gone too deep and too far to permit of any immediate calling-off of the war in the West, when the revolutionary movement of the masses has also not yet reached the point of development where it can basically affect the policy of the present rulers of these countries. At the same time, it needs to be remembered that it is one thing to get the support of the British people for a war which they still think is against fascism, and another to get that support for a war against the Soviet Union.

British Imperialism with the cunning of centuries of experience behind it, on the basis of its traditional policy of divide and rule, will still try, despite its present diplomatic defeats, to get others to pull its chestnuts out of the fire. They will, even whilst intensifying the struggle against Germany, and all the frightful suffering and slaughter that this policy involves, still try and find other ways and means of carrying out the same tactics as they have used in the case of Finland. For every time a door is closed to them through which the Soviet Union may be attacked, this only gives added urgency to them in trying to force other remaining doors. This is why workers' vigilance should not for a single moment be relaxed, and why they need keep a watchful and vigilant eye on Turkey, Irak, Iran and Afghanistan.

It is in this light that the moods of the masses have to be considered. It is this which gives such importance to their disquiet, their concern and their political discussions.

There is on the surface an apparent political silence. But it is an ominous silence. Behind it are feelings that can be organised for mass action against the whole policy of the Chamberlain Government, and the entire capitalist system.

Once the working class can rid itself of some of the present illusions, of the deadening hand of the official leadership, then a really mighty mass movement is going to sweep all before it despite all the obstacles that may be placed in the way. For there is a deep gulf between the feelings of the rank and file of the labour movement and the leadership of that movement.

It is to get this mass movement into speedy action that is the heart of the political situation in Britain to-day, and from it arise the heavy tasks that face not only revolutionary workers but all thoughtful labour men and women as well.

There needs to be widespread explanatory propaganda to convince the people that the ruling class mean business, that they are fighting for the maintenance of their system, that they are not going to hesitate to spend millions both of money and of precious workers' lives, and impose terrible burdens on the workers in their efforts to realise their aims.

The workers must be shown that if the plans of the British imperialists are allowed to mature, this will be a long and bloody struggle with an aftermath far worse than last time. The workers must be shown that the efforts to force down their standards of living to pay the cost of the war, and to drive up exports, are meant to become a permanent feature of working-class life, so that at the end of this war the trade war now being carried on, especially against America, can be intensified. The day the military war ends, the trade war for the domination of the world market will begin and every slogan being used to win the military struggle will then be replaced by new ones to the effect that if Britain is to live "she must win the peace as well as the war."

Any illusions that what happened in the last war for certain sections of the workers is going to be repeated in this war need to be smashed down right now. Unless the workers fight back, and fight back now, they are going to see their standards reduced to a level that may appear unthinkable. No light and airy talk about “the workers will never stand for this” will suffice if there is no class struggle to make certain now it is not going to happen. The ruling class mean business, and they do not hide this fact, as the speeches of their responsible spokesmen go to prove.

There is not a worker in France who, a year ago, would not have laughed at you if you had suggested his working and living conditions would be reduced to the low level they are at now.

The ruling class have powerful allies in the Attlees and Citrines, and these in turn are assisted by the so-called “left” in the labour

movement who support the war, but pretend that they are against the workers having to make heavy sacrifices to help pay for the war. The blunt truth is that if you support the present war, sooner or later you reach the position, whatever phrases you use, where you are forced to support the methods by which the ruling class is carrying on the war.

The propaganda coming from this “left,” the Bevan, Laski and Strauss group, for a Labour Government to come to power is only moonshine and desertion of the masses so far as it suggests that the aim of such a Government would be to fight against war and capitalism. They only want a Labour Government that will conduct the imperialist war “more efficiently,” and to damp down any genuine revolutionary movement for the ending of war and capitalism.

Their type of propaganda is useful to the Chamberlain Government in, at a later stage of the war, taking selected safe labour leaders into the Government to damp down the rising discontent of the workers.

There is urgent need for more fundamental socialist propaganda on what imperialism means—the struggle for markets, for profits, for new territory and sources of raw materials, for cheap labour; how for a time these issues are settled by diplomatic and trading agreements, but that sooner or later a point is reached where the trading and diplomatic struggle gives place to a bloody struggle called war.

There is need to recall time and time again the fact that the Soviet Union is as yet the one Socialist country in the world, and that it is surrounded by hostile capitalist states; that the class enemy never gives up the struggle to crush the Soviet Union in peace time, and that it becomes more urgent to crush it in war time, when the revolutionary example of the first Socialist State in the world gains more and more influence amongst the more thoughtful section of the working class.

There is need to recall all the old slogans of the last war, unknown to millions who are now grown to manhood and being conscripted into the armed forces and industry—the slogans such as “The war to end war,” “Hang the Kaiser,” “Independence of Small Nations,” “England Fit for Heroes to Live In,” “No Territorial Aims”—and to show how they are all being used again with hardly a change in the wording; to recall the lying propaganda about the atrocities of the enemy, the faked war photographs, the wanton slaughter of millions by the Generals who, too late for their victims to be saved, were sacked, censured or exposed.

We need to remind the present generation and their elders of the aftermath of the last war, the trade depression, wage cuts, unemployment, reduced unemployment benefits and pensions; how Britain has become a land fit for the Means Test to be applied in, yesterday to unemployment benefits, to-day to old age pensions, to-morrow to workmen’s compensation and wages.

Above all we should tirelessly encourage and help develop the idea that the workers must end the capitalist system, which is the cause of all their poverty and unemployment, and which twice in our lifetime has dared to send them to the shambles of war.

To do this means far more effective propaganda on the question of what we mean by ending the war. We Communists will support every mass movement for peace, and encourage the development of every anti-war movement, knowing that this can lead to the growth of the idea of the defeat of capitalism, through which alone a real and lasting peace can be obtained. While working alongside all who strive for peace now, we have to show clearly and frankly that when once the war machines of the imperialist states have been unleashed, only the rising mass movement of the workers against the war, its effects, and the ruling class, can give any effective guarantee of peace.

We can never be parties to deceiving the workers about the kind of peace that will be made while capitalism is in existence. All talk of a durable and lasting peace, all talk of an honourable peace, of a new world after the war, of a peace with no annexations, indemnities or territorial gains by the victorious powers is a sham and a fraud.

It is this which makes the Labour Party Peace Aims Programme such a deceitful and shameful document, for apart from the fact that the only way through which a really lasting and honourable peace can be obtained is by the ending of the capitalist system, which is only possible by the development of the very revolutionary movement that the Labour Party is trying to prevent by every means in its power, these so-called Peace Aims contain proposals that strengthen imperialism and deny the right of independence to the colonial peoples.

Only by the German, French and British workers strengthening their mass movement to the point where they can end the rule of the Hitlers, Daladiers and Chamberlains, and the

system they represent, is there any guarantee of a Peace that represents a victory for the workers of all these countries and the defeat of all their class enemies.

This is why now as never before more international propaganda is needed. The slogan of the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels “Workers of the World Unite. You have Nothing to Lose but your Chains, You have a World to Win” has to-day a deeper significance than ever before. It was never meant to mean unite to kill each other, but to unite alongside each other to end capitalism.

Fear that this will happen, fear of the spread of Communism, is now dominant in the minds of the warmongers of Germany, Britain and France alike.

This explains the attacks on the Soviet Union and on the Communist Parties all over the world—for the spectre of Communism does haunt the ruling class, especially in war time, in which, as all history shows, revolutionary movements do tend to develop and, as in the case of the last war, mature to the point where they can overthrow Czarism.

The last war led also to the rise of powerful revolutionary movements in a number of other important countries that were involved in that war, and these helped to end it.

For years the Communist International has declared that the present age is one of wars and revolutions. Never was this so true as at the present time. Every event taking place only serves to emphasise the accuracy of this analysis.

To-day is the testing time for every man and woman in the labour movement. For all it is now no longer a question of standing aside, but of taking sides. There can be no half-way house, no easy course. It is the question which side of the fight are you on, that present history puts to us all—the side of the working class in its struggle to end the war and capitalism, or the side of the ruling class in its prosecution of the war, the crushing

of the labour movement and the whole future of mass misery, unemployment and new wars.

The policy of the Labour leaders, of reformism, leads not to peace and socialism, but to an imperialist revenge, travestied by the name "peace"; an imperialist peace treaty, which will bear within itself the seeds of future wars, different only from Versailles in that the struggle for the domination of the world market will be so severe with the growth of monopoly control and of the productive forces through new developments during the war, that the breathing space between the end of the present war and the beginning of a new world war will be much shorter than between 1918 and 1939.

Or the path of Communism. Not an easy path. Full of fights, struggle, and persecution, fighting against the stream, against popular illusions, against war hysteria and spirit of revenge, facing every foul slander and calumny that a ruthless class enemy and the labour leaders in its service can bring into use. But victory is certain at the end. Workers' power is certain at the end. A real and lasting peace on the basis of a socialist economy is certain at the end.

Those who say "it cannot be done," or "we have to wait until the war is over," are not only taking up a cowardly attitude, they are helping the Chamberlain Government and reactionary labour leaders to strengthen their position and thus make it easier for the imposition of Hitlerism on the British working class and making the future struggle of the workers far harder and more difficult than they are now. For every day that is lost in not fighting now a bitter price will have to be paid in the near future.

Here we are in Britain boasting that we have one of the most powerful labour movements in the world, boasting of our education, our political understanding, our class consciousness, and yet we are a thousand miles behind our Indian comrades in fighting spirit and militancy.

Why, they put us to shame by the magnificence of their fighting capacity and solidarity. We are content to be fobbed off by wage advances that fall far behind the rise in the cost of living, or the promise of a new world after the war is over, but the Indian textile workers and railwaymen are striking to improve their conditions, and this is how to fight also against the war. The workers in Cyprus and the West Indies too are conducting mass struggles against British Imperialism. It is high time the same kind of struggle was organised in Britain.

The fight against war cannot be conducted in the abstract, it must be a concrete fight for concrete things. That is why the ruling class give an inch now, to fob us off, and then to-morrow they will take a yard. Let the British workers be made aware of the danger they are in, that everything they have won from the ruling class, every gain of the past, every hope for the future, is now at stake. It is not in peril from Hitler. It is in peril from Chamberlain. The German and French workers are fighting back against their own real enemies. We must fight back against ours.

This is why if May Day, the day of international solidarity, has any message for us at all, we shall aim to make it a landmark in the age-long struggle against capitalism; that the workers will leave the factories, that they will come on the streets, assert their right to demonstrate for all their immediate demands, and against the imperialist war. The ruling class compel the members of the armed forces to parade the streets to whip up enthusiasm for their war; the workers must assert their right to demonstrate for peace and socialism. Gigantic May Day demonstrations in Britain could give a lead to the workers of all lands now involved in this imperialist war. *Not on the first Sunday in May, but on the first day of May.* The workers' day, the day when for fifty-one years workers of all lands have pledged their common solidarity, their faith in Socialism, their call for international unity, and if ever the call for international unity was necessary to echo over all the frontiers, it is now—the call for solidarity in life for a

fuller life, not in death to reap profits for a handful of British, German and French millionaires.

That is why the question of unity of action must be raised. All the forces opposed to war and imperialism have now the urgent duty of finding the way to such agreement as to how the whole of their efforts, organisations and power can now be exerted in a single direction. There are many difficulties to be overcome, many prejudices and suspicions to be removed ; but the urgency of the position should be the overriding consideration in the thoughts of all who are able to influence and lead the work of such organisations.

But it is inside the labour movement itself that the first drive should be organised. For once the mass movement begins to develop here, it will soon begin to influence all other types of organisations who are opposed to the war. It will at the same time produce its effect among the workers in the armed forces. It is a fact of tremendous political significance that for the first time there are now in the British armed forces tens of thousands of class-conscious, politically educated workers, who are in a position to explain the political situation and the class struggle to the rest of their comrades.

The policy of the labour leaders must be repudiated by action, by mass demonstrations, breaking through every form of the political truce. It was done in the last war, it can be done in this.

The first blows have to be struck in the factories and trade unions. There must be established the will for action and forms of organisation that will make the mass movement indestructible—the strengthening of workshop organisation, the election of shop stewards for every grade of industry, linked up on a factory, district and national basis, backed by the local, district and national trade union organisations; the strengthening of the trade unions, not only by a 100 per cent, membership, but by full attendance at trade union branch meetings, by ensuring

the carrying out of all normal trade union branch procedure, conferences, democratic election of officials, and firm opposition to every attempt to use the war as the excuse for placing dictatorial powers in the hands of the trade union executive committees.

If such activity were generated it would not be long before the political truce was smashed. For the feeling against this grows every day, for more and more it is being realised that it not only applies to parliamentary by-elections, but serves to dampen down the struggle on the industrial field.

Alongside these activities should go the drive for the strengthening of the local trades councils as well as the federation of trades councils, so that they not only reflect more closely the demands of the workers in the factories and affiliated trade unions, but become the local unifying centres of the workers' struggles.

Develop the tenants' associations, and every other form of mass movement which brings the workers together in defence of their rights and conditions.

Seek by every means to increase the power and organisations of the Co-operative Movement, in which there is not only a traditional anti-war movement, but which can be one of the most effective class weapons against monopoly capitalism.

Above all, while carrying out all these types of activities, it is necessary to intensify revolutionary propaganda against capitalism as a whole, to deepen class consciousness and political understanding.

The masses are serious-minded as never before. They are thinking, they are eager to know, to read and study, to have things explained to them. This is a situation of great possibilities, if only the militant section of the working class will but realise it.

Since the last war Marxist education has enormously increased. There are to-day in the factories tens of thousands of revolutionary workers who are able to explain and show the way forward. Inside the armed forces are the same types of workers. None of these can be led astray by imperialist propaganda, they are the steel framework around which the working class must now build up a mass structure.

On these workers in particular is a great responsibility. From them can come the drive, the leadership that can lead the whole mass movement forward to a new level of class activity and initiative. If they do their part, they can be sure that the workers of France and Germany will not lag behind.

We believe that if the policy that has been outlined here is now vigorously taken up in every factory, trade union and local Labour Party branch, Co-operative guild and labour exchange, then we shall soon see the beginnings of a gigantic mass movement of solidarity and struggle against the whole policy of the Chamberlain Government, war and capitalism.

If it is made the central point in all the preparations to make May Day, 1940 a real workers' day of demonstrations of their unity and solidarity, then the coming annual conference of the Labour Party in Bournemouth at the end of May can become quite a different kind of conference from what the labour leaders are banking upon.

For them it is to be a war conference, a conference of support to the Chamberlain Government in carrying on the war, a conference of hostility against the Soviet Union. But there is time to change all this, if the serious-minded section of the labour rank and file will but organise and fight to bring this about.

The Bournemouth Conference can be made to mark the end of the political truce, the end of collaboration with Chamberlain in his war policy; it can be made to end the terrible position where the Labour Party under its present leadership has become

the chief war party in Britain, which means it has surrendered Socialist principles, theory and practice.

We know there are obstacles and difficulties in the way. The workers can surmount them. They can clear out the reactionary leaders, they can change the policy of the Labour Party, they can once more develop that type of working-class activity that will allow the whole labour movement to be guided and led in the fighting spirit, the unity and singleness of purpose and aim that animated the pioneers of the movement, when for them the slogan “Workers of the World Unite” was not a platform peroration in peace time, but the guide to action in every phase of the struggle against capitalism and war.

CIVIL LIBERTY IN THE EMPIRE By DESMOND BUCKLE—The Labour Monthly, February 1941

THE National Council for Civil Liberties is holding a Delegate Conference on Civil Liberty in the Colonial Empire on 15th and 16th February, at which four main aspects of civil liberty will be examined in relation to seven colonies or groups of colonies. These four aspects of the subject are as follows: (1) The Liberty of the Subject; (2) Civil Liberty and Labour; (3) Freedom of Expression; (4) Civil Liberty in War-time.

It might be argued that the present time is not a suitable one for the discussion of civil liberties and democratic rights in the Colonies, when civil liberty is denied in England itself. In the announcement of the Conference, the National Council for Civil Liberties gives the answer:

The British Government has proclaimed that among its objects in the present war are the protection of democracy and the establishment of liberty. The Peoples of the British Empire, irrespective of race or creed, are called upon to make sacrifices in the war. It is essential, therefore, that liberty and democracy on the widest scale possible should be given to the inhabitants of the British Colonies.... If we have learnt nothing else from the last war, at least we must have learned that there can be no lasting peace so long as one people is left in the position of subjection to another.

Further, liberty is indivisible. The encroachment upon the liberties of the people of this country goes hand in hand with, and is an essential part of, the attack upon liberties that is being carried on throughout the world by the ruling classes at war. The destruction of civil liberties in Germany in 1933 was a step in the direction of the loss of those same liberties in this country; the destruction of civil liberties in France by the Daladier-Blum Government brought the peril nearer to us. But throughout this period, and for long years before, the basis and the vitality of our

own liberties have been undermined by the denial of democracy and civil rights to the millions of colonial people of the British Empire.

It is necessary that the British people should know what is happening in “their” Empire, for ignorance can neither absolve them from their share of responsibility nor will it be any consolation if the day arrives when they find themselves subject to the same humiliations and restrictions as an African suffers in the land of his birth.

We have been treated recently to a spate of Empire propaganda emanating from the Ministry of Information: “The Empire Crusade”, “Our Allies and Proud of It”, “A Commonwealth in Arms”, “Democratic Imperialism”, and so on. This expensive advertisement aims at proving that justice and freedom reside within the realms of the King Emperor. The Labour Party has not protested, but on the contrary carries on the same propaganda. We are bound to infer that the basic war aim of the Government is the preservation and extension of the existing imperial system. But to the people of this country and to the colonial people it is a matter of the utmost importance that a new Versailles should not be imposed upon the world together with a re-division of the colonial areas. They cannot agree that the New World Order should be based upon an extension of the British Empire system—even if it calls itself a Commonwealth of Nations.

A detailed survey of civil liberties in each of the subject countries is out of the question here. The Conference now to be held will be able to make such a survey upon the basis of the reports which it is receiving from representative organisations in the countries concerned. In this article I propose to give only a few instances which exemplify the limitations of democracy and civil liberty in the Colonial Empire.

The Union of South Africa boasts of being a Dominion of the British Commonwealth; Southern Rhodesia is virtually also

a Dominion, boasting of being a “self-governing” Colony; Kenya (or rather the white settlers of Kenya) are energetic applicants for the privilege of Dominion Status. But in not one of these countries does the black man qualify for the vote or have any say in the management of his country’s affairs. The freedom which Dominion Status confers is enjoyed only by the small minority of white settlers, planters and other vested interests.

The composition of the Legislative Council in Kenya will make this clear:

	Population	Percentage	Nominated	Elected with
	vote			
Europeans	19,211	33.2	23	17
Asiatics	46,026	25.9	nil	nil
Arabs	12,166	2.7	nil	nil
Africans	3,253,689	nil	nil	nil
TOTAL	3,331,092	0-6	23	17

In Gambia the Legislative Council boasts of 6 nominated members and 4 officials.

In Tanganyika, a mandated territory and therefore an area in respect of which Britain has special obligations to instruct the natives in the art of self-government, the Council consists of the Governor and 13 officials along with not more than 10 unofficial members. There are no Africans amongst the non-officials, the reason officially given being that Africans cannot speak English!

In the West Indies the situation is as follows: The total population is 2,004,543; percentage with vote is 4.8 per cent; nominated members in the Councils are 86 in number as compared with 57 elected on a very restricted property franchise.

In Ceylon, which enjoys the most liberal constitution in the Empire, there is a reactionary move for constitutional revision, and the Governor has on several occasions used his powers to override his Ministers.

In every Colony, the Governor has the right, even where it is not the normal procedure, to rule by Ordinance and executive decree. The Legislative bodies, where they exist at all, are facades behind which bureaucracy rules.

If, as in Cyprus in 1930, they start to obstruct the policy of imperialism, they are superseded.

An elementary right of a citizen of any state is that of complete freedom of movement and equality with his fellow-citizens, subject only to compliance with the necessary rules and laws of society. This right is denied to a great section of the peoples within the Empire, particularly in East Africa where "Pass Laws" and "Segregation" are in operation. These laws, as their names imply, prohibit the movement of individuals (Africans, of course) outside certain reserved and specified areas, and enforce the carrying of one or more "passes" by those to whom the laws apply.

In some places half a dozen or more "passes" have to be carried before an African can safely venture to move about. Judge Krause, a South African judge, recently stated that "the African is a prisoner in his own land". He had no hesitation in saying that 90 per cent of the prison population was due to the Pass and Tax laws. With the increase of these laws and regulations, he said, "a raw native will be lucky if within twenty-four hours of entering an urban area he does not find himself in prison."

This system of Pass Laws (as indeed the whole principle of herding Africans into "reserves" and then by means of poll taxes forcing them to leave the land in search of labour in the mines or plantations) is dictated by the requirements of the white settlers. The African is by tradition an agriculturist; the wages offered to him in the mines and plantations are not much of an incentive to change his mode of life willingly; but the white settlers need an adequate and cheap labour force. The Pass Laws, operated in conjunction with the *Masters and Servants Act*, are

directed towards the organisation and regulation of this labour supply.

Concerning the subject of Forced Labour a great deal has been said and written. The League of Nations laid upon all its member States this obligation of abolishing forced labour in the territories under their control. But forced labour is still a recognised and legal institution in East Africa. In Kenya, in 1937, there were 53 camps for the detention of 19,000 Africans (mainly tax-defaulters) who were employed on compulsory labour schemes. In addition, under the Compulsory Labour Ordinance, 3,414 days were put in by workers called up by the Government. In Tanganyika (1936) the Government requisitioned 15,750 working days.

It would be difficult (says Lord Hailey), and it would be unsafe, to generalise as to the extent to which the restrictions placed by legislation upon the use of forced labour for public purposes are observed in practice.

Where, as in Africa, Trade Unionism is illegal and strikes are expressly penalised under the law, it is inevitable that trouble should occur in cases where the workers are driven to back up their demands by withholding their labour. Recently in the Rhodesian copper mines 17 workers lost their lives and 70 were injured when armed police were called in to deal with a strike situation.

But, whilst action in the shape of organisation of the workers for strikes is regarded by imperialism as a seditious and dangerous activity, equally the free expression of opinions is a danger that the ruling class cannot countenance. Each Colony has its own Sedition Ordinance or Defence Regulations or similar apparatus for the effective control of the spoken and written word.

A few years ago a native of Nyasaland was sentenced to three years' hard labour for bringing into the colony a copy of the *Workers' Herald*, a paper freely circulating in South Africa.

In the majority of African dependencies it is a punishable offence within the meaning of the Sedition Acts to make the remark that employers pay low wages.

The war has been used as an excuse to put even more serious obstacles in the way of popular political and economic organisations and to limit the narrow field within which a man may safely say what he feels. Since the war broke out many working class or progressive newspapers, where such existed, have been banned, for instance: *The African Standard*, *the Jamaican Standard*, *the Worker and Peasant*, *Young Ceylon*, and others.

Not only trade union meetings but even the customary meetings of organisations like the Negro Welfare Cultural and Social Association have been forbidden in Trinidad. It is interesting to note that in this particular case the Commissioner of Police in conversation with one of the organisers, Mr. O'Connor, is reported in *New Dawn* to have said that among the "undesirable features of a previous meeting was a quotation of passages from *Your Liberty in Danger* issued by the National Council for Civil Liberties!

Bustamente (Jamaica), Butler (Trinidad), Wallace Johnson (Sierra Leone), working class leaders in Ceylon and Cyprus, along with many others whose names are not reported, have been arrested and interned or deported since the war broke out for the parts they have played in the organisation of the workers to struggle for their demands.

Behind the optimism of official propaganda about Democratic Imperialism can be heard an undertone of disquiet at the currents of feeling developing among the colonial peoples. Through the blanket of the censorship now and again is heard the voice of the workers in the Colonies, more openly expressed in the "advanced" colonies of Cyprus, Ceylon, Palestine, Malaya and the West Indies, demanding freedom from exploitation by

any imperialist power. But even where that voice cannot at the moment be heard because of the heavy penalties imposed on “sedition”, nevertheless the demand for democratic rights and civil liberties rises to make a mockery of official propaganda about the Empire.

[pp. 83-86]

The Soviet Beacon by E.M. Winterton, *The Labour Monthly*, May 1941

THE IMPERIALIST groups continue at deathgrips, bringing destruction and suffering to millions. On one side of the account the Italian Empire in East Africa is all but liquidated: on the other the Balkans all but conquered by Germany. The fortunes of war in Northern Africa have changed in a short time, from balance in favour of Britain to balance in favour of Germany: but British sea power may be sufficient to change them once again. Mutual destruction of lives and national wealth continues, on the Atlantic and in the towns of both sides, without any visible end, but in ever more devastating forms. The last two great imperialist powers at present outside the conflict—the United States and Japan—hesitate on the verge of intervention, but gradually approach it, pushed by their own imperialist interests.

More small countries have fallen victims of the imperialist war. In the case of Rumania and Bulgaria, the “honours” are even. In each case a treacherous ruling class handed over the country to Germany—in the of Rumania, owing to direct corruption of the Government by Berlin, in the case of Bulgaria thanks to the anti-Soviet policy of Great Britain which discouraged the Bulgarian Government from considering the Soviet offer of a pact of mutual assistance, even when the German was at the gates. In the case of Greece and Yugoslavia, the peoples are fighting against incredible odds, have fallen victims for the time being of the German war machine in its fight to deprive the British war machine of any foothold on the European continent.

It must be pointed out that Greece, although formally it had accepted British protection, in fact during the imperialist war did its utmost to maintain neutrality: while in the case of Yugoslavia the ruling clique of Prince Paul did not even accept a formal British guarantee in the teeth of their powerful neighbours. In both cases the ruling classes resisted successfully the popular demand for an early agreement with the U.S.S.R. which could have saved them. Only in Yugoslavia did the people’s revolt at the last moment give an opportunity to a section of the ruling class, anti-German and pro-British in its connections, to take power and adopt, as a last desperate

expedient, a measure of rapprochement with the U.S.S.R. which the people demanded—in the shape of a pact of non-aggression and friendship. Unfortunately, this came too late to prevent the over-running of the country.

At the time of writing, the fate of more Near Eastern small countries is in question—Egypt, dragged into the orbit of British imperialism without its people being consulted, and now possibly under the direct threat of German invasion; and Turkey, whose rulers have hesitated so long in the twin horns of an anti-German and anti-Soviet policy that it is, far from clear whether they have not committed themselves irremediably.

Outside this bloody welter is the war of the heroic Chinese people against Japanese imperialist aggression, a war which has been steadily draining Japan's resources. Here too imperialist intrigue is placing the fate of the whole popular struggle in question, thanks to outside influences, almost certainly backed by American and British loans, which have encouraged Chiang Kai-Shek to attack the New Fourth Army and thus sow the seeds of civil war again.

The Soviet Union stands aside from the imperialist struggles, towering amid the warring States like a different world. Tranquil strength, peaceful constructive work, cultural intellectual and moral progress shine out from its frontiers like a beacon, and even penetrate the thick black fog of cynical lies and slanders which the entire capitalistic press of all bourgeois countries, from the *Voelkisdwr Beobachter* to the *New Statesman*, attempt to surround it. At the same time the Soviet Union is armed to the teeth and paying more attention daily to its armament, its workers and collective farmers are displaying a high degree of political vigilance and preparedness, and its diplomacy, though not noisy, is alert and active. It would not perhaps be out of place at this point to re-state, for the thousands of new readers whom the *Labour Monthly* has gained in the last six months, the outstanding features of the Soviet Union's foreign policy during the present war.

1. The Soviet Union is an independent Socialist State, independent precisely because it grows more powerful every day, both absolutely and relative to the warring imperialists. It has its own interests, which it pursues whether or not they coincide with those of

British, German, Japanese, American or any other imperialism. Soviet interests, being rooted in the building up of a Socialist community and in the maximum retention of peace, are identical with the interests of the working class and working people generally in every other country.

2. The Soviet Union is ready to maintain friendly relations with any capitalist State which reciprocates this desire, and proves it. The Soviet Union is ready to collaborate in preventing any extension of the war. But (those who reckon on the U.S.S.R. being dragged at the tail of one or other of the big capitalist groups, automatically quarrelling with one or falling into the arms of the other, are miscalculating—and doing so at their own peril.

3. The Soviet Union is willing to help peoples who really fight in defence of their national independence, or for national or social emancipation. It showed this in Spain and in China, in its offers to Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, in its six months' effort in 1939 to induce the British and French Governments to sign a pact of mutual assistance as a means of preserving European peace. It has shown it lately in the joint declaration it signed with Turkey on March 24 that, "if Turkey should be actually attacked and find herself forced to enter the war in defence of her own territory, Turkey could then, in accordance with the Soviet-Turkish Non-Aggression Pact, count on the complete understanding and neutrality of the U.S.S.R."

4. If threatened, the Soviet Union will give back blow for blow, and does not bind itself necessarily to wait until its enemies have their blow ready (as was shown in the Finnish war of 1939-40, which was the defeat by the Soviet Union of Anglo-French plans to "switch the war").

5. Again and again, during the present war, the Soviet Union has shown its willingness to improve its relations with Great Britain; but its efforts have always broken down in face of the hostility of the British ruling class, which invariably found one pretext or another for throwing up an artificial obstacle at the critical moment of negotiations.

Recent events in Soviet relationships with other countries must be judged in the light of these principles.

One big field has been the Balkans, where the U.S.S.R. has been particularly interested in maintaining peace, if that were possible, because the small people of the Balkans are its neighbours, and because of its concern for peace in the Black Sea- and not at all because of some fancied Soviet interest in "Pan-Slavism," that reactionary propaganda which Tsarist Russia invented as the equivalent, for its own imperialist purposes, of the British "white man's burden" and the German "Nordic supremacy." There were only two main outstanding questions at issue for the Soviet Union in the Balkans when war broke out. One was the return of Bessarabia, occupied by the Rumanian landlords in 1918, and the other was the establishment of diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia. Both these questions were settled peacefully in the course of the war. During the last seven months the Soviet Union was given repeated proof, both of its concern for the Balkans, and of its unwillingness to lit in with German plans there.

On September 10 the German Ambassador in Moscow was told that the Soviet Union insists on participating in the regulation of Danube navigation; and this insistence was successful. On October 16, the Soviet Union issued an explicit repudiation of the story that it was informed beforehand about the despatch of German troops into Rumania (which had just taken place). On November 25, a special Soviet envoy offered the King of Bulgaria either a Pact of mutual assistance or a Soviet guarantee of Bulgaria against any aggressor, whichever he preferred: an offer which was rejected. On January 12, when German "tourists" were penetrating Bulgaria, the Soviet Union published a statement making plain to the Bulgarian people that this was not with Soviet knowledge or consent. On March 3, after the Bulgarian Government had yielded to Germany, the Bulgarian Minister in Moscow was given a sharp statement of Soviet disapproval of this action, as facilitating the extension of the war. On March 24 there was the joint Soviet-Turkish declaration already referred to. On April 5, the pact of neutrality and friendship was signed with Yugoslavia. A week later, when Hungary had joined in the vulture attack on Yugoslavia, it was reminded by the Soviet Government of what the consequences might be for Hungary itself, if it were likewise attacked.

Whether Turkey is to be saved will depend upon whether its rulers draw the lesson from these Soviet acts, and give up the last vestiges of the anti-Soviet period of their policy, in which they were associating with those sinister figures, Neville Chamberlain and Lord Halifax.

The other sphere in which the principles of Soviet foreign policy have recently won a resounding success has been in the Far East. In 1931, the Soviet Union first offered Japan a pact of non-aggression, an offer repeated several times since. Only in July 1940 did the Japanese ask for such a pact, after nine years of war on China (since 1937 on a grand scale). When it is borne in mind that since 1937 Soviet help for China, in the way of war supplies, runs into hundreds of millions of dollars, while British help has been more for Japan than for China, and American help for China has only begun in recent months on a small scale, it is obvious that the Japanese offer of July 1940 was a direct victory for Soviet policy. This is all the more striking because, in the course of later negotiations, the Soviet Union, in the first place, decided to sign only a neutrality pact with Japan (i.e., covering cases of attack by third parties on either signatory) and not a full non-aggression pact: secondly because the Soviet Union, in November, 1940, refused an invitation to join the Tripartite German-Italian-Japanese Pact. The independence of Soviet policy was further underlined by the fact that on December 6, 1940, the Soviet ambassador in Japan told the Japanese Government that the Soviet attitude to China remained unchanged. In January, 1941, proof of this was given by the granting of Soviet credits to China for war supplies, totalling another \$100,000,000.

But the Soviet-Japanese Pact of April 12, 1941, was also a crushing defeat for the intrigues of the other imperialist camp—Britain and the U.S.A. For years the Governments of these two countries have done their utmost to incite Japan against the U.S.S.R. When Churchill could no longer do so as openly as Chamberlain, the job fell on the Australian Prime Minister Mr. Menzies. Simultaneously *The Times*—the biggest organ of British finance-capital—has preached the advantages of such a war for Japan, and the disadvantages of its present policy, year in and year out. Such insistent advice to a country as vulnerable as Japan, backed moreover by many tangible inducements like continued oil for Japan's war against China, can only

be explained by the most lamentable illusions among the ruling classes of Britain and the U.S.A. about the true strength of the U.S.S.R. Thus the attempts to incite Japan against the U.S.S.R. fall into the same category as the attempts to incite Hitler, and the Soviet-Japanese pact is a *second* stinging reminder of the true facts. Will the British ruling class learn the lesson? There is no more sign of that than at any earlier period of the war; and the consequences will, be disastrous. The British people, however, can if they have a mind visit the main burden of the disasters upon those really responsible—the British ruling class. That more and more class conscious workers are realising this, after eighteen months of imperialist war, can be seen from the decision of the annual conference of the Scottish Mineworkers' Union, by fifty votes to twenty-one, repeated on a card vote by 38,700 to 12,500, to declare its “appreciation and approval of the Socialist policy of Soviet Russia,” and particularly for its policy of maintaining peace in the Soviet borders “for the further advancement of international Socialism.”

[pp. 218-221]

Turkey and the U.S.S.R. by “Quaestor”, *The Labour Monthly*, May 1942

THE opening of the spring campaign of 1942 finds Turkey in an extremely ambiguous and extremely dangerous position. The whole Turkish people finds itself imperilled by the wobbling and often two-faced policy of the Turkish bourgeoisie. It was the Soviet Union which, in 1919-22, helped the Turkish people to shake off its semi-colonial status, and enter on the path of independent development—albeit as a capitalist State. The Turkish people know that; they also know of the constant political and economic assistance which the Soviet Union gave Turkey in after years. There have been many signs, particularly since 1936, that the Turkish bourgeoisie fears excessive gratitude to the Soviet Union among the Turkish people, particularly the Turkish workers deprived of the right to form free trade unions or their own political party, and the ragged and hungry peasants who are still in an overwhelming majority. These fears were, even before the war, leading to attempts to find some other Great Power to play off against the Soviet Union. Since September, 1939, the preoccupation of the Turkish ruling class with this problem led to violent changes and fluctuations in Turkish foreign policy, which have had a damaging effect on Turkey's international position.

Between September, 1939, and the German attack on the U.S.S.R. at the end of June, 1941, there were already no less than five distinct periods in Turkish foreign policy, turning on whether the Turkish Government judged the situation favourable or unfavourable for anti-Soviet manoeuvres.

The *first* lasted until the spring of 1940. It began with the breakdown of negotiations in Moscow for a Soviet-Turkish Mutual Assistance Pact (October, 1939), because Turkey would not accept full reciprocity. Turkey wanted guarantees from the U.S.S.R. for help against every possible aggressor, without

offering the U.S.S.R. similar guarantees. After the breakdown of these negotiations, the Turkish Government pursued a more and more hostile policy, trying to turn the Balkan Entente (the loose understanding of Yugoslavia, Rumania, Greece and Turkey which then still existed) against the U.S.S.R. by means of concessions to Germany, allowing its severely controlled Press to hint at attacks on Russia as the "traditional enemy," and allowing foreign planes to cross Turkish territory in order to carry out reconnaissance flights over the Baku oilfields and their outlet at Batum. This, of course, was during the period when the mistaken policies of Chamberlain and Daladier had brought Britain and France almost to the point of war on the U.S.S.R. The characteristic feature of this phase of Turkish foreign policy was precisely its readiness to try to find common ground with both of the then belligerent camps against the Soviet Union.

In April, 1940, after the crushing defeat of the Finnish fascists by the Red Army, there was a slight improvement in Turkish foreign policy. Without in the least worsening Turkish relations with the two belligerent camps, the Turkish Government and its unofficial spokesmen brought much more clarity into relations with the U.S.S.R. There were official declarations that Turkey desired to co-operate more closely with the Soviet Union in preserving peace in the Near and Middle East, and that the Turkish Government had no wish to involve the Soviet Union in war. This *second* phase lasted only, however, until July, 1940. The dispute which began in that month between the British and Soviet Governments, over the status of the Baltic peoples who had decided to join the Soviet Union, was immediately reflected in Turkish policy.

A *third* phase began, lasting until November, 1940, and marked by a new worsening of relations with the U.S.S.R. As before, Turkish bourgeois politicians attempted to combine this with the friendliest possible relations with both Nazi Germany and Great Britain. British correspondents in Turkey at the time

noted that the controlled Turkish Press was treating the Soviet Union as a greater menace to its existence than Germany. When the Nazis began to take advantage of the rift in Anglo-Soviet relations to push their intrigues and their Fifth Columns in key Balkan countries like Rumania and Bulgaria, the Turkish politicians virtually encouraged them by proclaiming that the greatest danger in the Balkans came from Communism.

Only when this suicidal policy, in the general setting of Anglo-Soviet misunderstandings, found itself face to face with the brutal Italian attack on Greece and the virtual seizure of Rumania by the Germans was there once again a modification of Turkish policy. After the fall of France, Britain was temporarily unable to give material aid to Turkey, and the growing Axis aggression in the Balkans found Turkey with no Great Power to lean on. November, therefore, heard new Turkish declarations of friendship with the U.S.S.R., which became more and more insistent as the months went on, and turned to positive alarm when the German grip was extended to Bulgaria in February, 1941. On March 24, 1941, this *fourth* phase was summed up by a joint Soviet-Turkish declaration of loyalty to the existing pacts of friendship and nonaggression between the two countries, and a pledge of neutrality and full understanding by either party, should the other be attacked.

Yet, on the very eve of the Nazi invasion of the U.S.S.R., there were signs that yet a further wobble in Turkish foreign policy was beginning. A pact of neutrality and a trade agreement favourable to the Nazis were signed with Germany. Simultaneously all kinds of rumours hostile to the U.S.S.R. began to be circulated in Turkish political quarters. Thus, on June 16, 1941 (six days before the German attack), both the *News Chronicle* and *The Times* carried a message from Ankara reporting that, in the opinion of Turkish political circles, the Soviet Union was about to give way to Hitler's pressure, was likely to yield economic control of the Ukraine to Germany, and

even would participate in the Nazi “peace conference” stage-show which was then expected to establish the Fascist New Order in Europe.

When these anticipations were made to look foolish by the heroic resistance of the Red Army and the Soviet peoples to the Nazi onslaught, the anti-Soviet elements in Turkish public life changed their methods without altering their objective. So far from renouncing the anti-Soviet tendency which had manifested itself during this last, *fifth*, wobble of Turkish foreign policy, they were emboldened to pursue it further by the widespread expectations at the time—by no means confined to Turkey, of course—that the Nazis would “go through the Red Army as a knife goes through butter.” On July 1, 1941, for example, we find *The Times* Istanbul correspondent writing:—

Political observers notice a Turkish tendency to differentiate and discriminate between the Anglo-German war and the German-Russian struggle. From the outbreak of the war between Great Britain and France and Germany, until quite recently, Turkey’s policy as stated by responsible statesmen has been one of non-belligerency. As soon as war broke out between Germany and Russia, Turkey proclaimed her neutrality.

In a further message the same correspondent pointed out on July 9 that the Turkish Prime Minister had taken at their face value, in a Parliamentary session, a flood of German lies about Soviet “offers” to Germany and Bulgaria at the expense of Turkish territory. These revelations, said the correspondent, had “left a deep impression,” and he did not hesitate to say that opinion in Turkey was overwhelmingly in favour of a German victory. In fact, of course, he was judging from the tone of the Turkish Press and Turkish politicians, since the mass of the Turkish people had no opportunity to express themselves, either in that sense or in any other.

On July 14 almost the entire Turkish Press attacked Litvinov for uttering a warning, in his broadcast to England,

about the fate of small countries who trusted to a pact of friendship with Nazi Germany.

“The anti-Russian campaign is giving the Government some concern,” reported the *Daily Telegraph* Ankara correspondent on July 15. But the Turkish Government itself bore a major share of responsibility for the campaign, which it had allowed to grow beyond all bounds. That is hardly to be surprised at, when the Associated Press was in a position to reveal (July 17) that the German Ambassador von Papen had had the assurance to raise with the Turkish Government the question of allowing German troops to pass through Turkish territory to the Caucasus—and that all the Turkish Government could answer was that the question was “premature”!

A sharp and sudden end came to this latest period of illusions about Turkey’s ability to play with fire. On July 27, 1941, the Soviet Government handed the Turkish Ambassador in Moscow a series of captured German documents providing irrefutable proof of German plans for the occupation of Istanbul, the Bosphorus, the Dardanelles and other strategic parts of Turkey. This had the effect of stiffening the Turks. By August 2 the *Daily Mail* correspondent at Istanbul was able to report that Turkey would emphatically refuse transit to Italian naval forces into the Black Sea, and would resist if necessary by force. This was enlarged, six weeks later, into an assurance that Turkey would refuse passage through the Dardanelles and Bosphorus to warships or auxiliaries of all but really neutral States (*Daily Telegraph* Ankara correspondent, September 19).

In the meantime, the British and Soviet Governments had gladly responded to the first faint signs of Turkish resistance to Nazi influence. On August 10 the British and Soviet Ambassadors at Ankara had made identical declarations to the Turkish Foreign Minister, pledging their loyalty to the Montreux Convention of 1936, which gave Turkey control of the Straits, disclaiming any aggressive intentions with regard to the Straits

or to Turkish territory, and announcing their preparedness “to render Turkey every help and assistance in the event of her being attacked by a European Power.” When the Turkish Government showed that it appreciated the stronger position in which it now found itself, thanks to Allied support—by refusing a German demand for the delivery of large quantities of chrome ore, essential for armament production—the Allies in their turn gave Turkey still more encouragement. On December 2, 1941, *The Times* Istanbul correspondent reported that three tankers had arrived from Batum with 25,000 tons of much-needed oil on board, and had been escorted across the Black Sea to the very entrance of the Straits by Soviet warships. This was followed on December 31 by another Soviet tanker of 9,000 tons. Meanwhile, on December 3, President Roosevelt had announced the extension of the Lease-Lend arrangements to Turkey, and it became known that big consignments of howitzers and military lorries had already been released.

It seemed as though Turkish policy has every reason now for stability and loyalty. But this was not to be. One can only guess that, just as nearer home, certain influential people in Turkey, after their alarm at the peril from Germany, were now beginning to feel disquiet at the Red Army’s success. At all events. The *Time* Istanbul correspondent was already reporting before the end of the year:—

The Turks themselves are breathing more freely now that the menace from the Caucasus has been removed and the German and Italia forces pushed away from Egypt. A German attack on Turkey from Bulgaria is considered unlikely, and information to that effect published by the British Press is causing some irritation here. Thinking perhaps a little wishfully, the Turks consider themselves immune from dang in that quarter.

And six weeks later (*The Times* February 13), reporting on Turkish Press comment in connection with the well-known speeches of Sir Stafford Gripppe the same correspondent wrote:—

The point which is particularly interesting to Turkey is that which relates to the recognition of advantages for Russia, and the suggested occupation of Berlin by Russian troops. Turkish opinion has always been highly sensitive on the question of Russian expansion, and between the lines of the guarded comments a creeping uneasiness may be discerned lest the free hand for Russia suggested by Sir Stafford Cripps might mean the surrender of the vital interests of neighbouring countries, including Turkey.

The correspondent had already indicated what Turkish politicians might have in mind by “the vital interests of neighbouring countries” when he reported, this earlier message of December 29, that according to reports received in Istanbul “in Rumania the people are showing sign of panic lest further German reverses in Russia should expose their country to invasion by the Red Army.”

This is the background on which must be judged the latest astonishing performance in Turkey—the trial at Ankara which began on April 1, in connection with an alleged attempt on the life of the German Ambassador von Papen. Every thing about this affair smells of provocation. On the very night of the “attempt (March 5) the Turkish authorities issue a communique stating that foreigners were implicated, and that they were suspected to be Communists. A cordon was known round the Soviet Consulate, where 50 guests were seeing a Soviet film, and they were kept there till next day without the slightest explanation or apology. Two members of the Soviet Commercial Mission were arrested. On March 11 the Turkish authorities gave it out that a Bulgarian Communist connected with the affair had taken refuge in the Soviet Consulate. When the trial opened, no Bulgarian was produced, but the examining magistrate announced that the two Soviet citizens arrested were definitely implicated in the “plot” against von Papen.

Soviet War News of April 11, in an illuminating article, has revealed that 1) interrogation of the two Turks indicated brought out that neither of them were Communists; (2) they had heard the name of one of the Soviet citizens, Pavlov, for the first time during the investigation; (3) whereas the other Soviet citizen, Kornilov, was supposed to have been met by the Turkish “plotters” at the Soviet Embassy in Ankara in September, 1941, Kornilov was immediately able to prove from the police registers that he had only arrived in Ankara for the first time on January 15-16, 1942. As though to underline the suspiciousness of the behaviour of the Turkish legal authorities in sending such a flagrant frame-up or trial, the court refused Pavlov and Kornilov written Russian translations of [the records of the preliminary investigation and the court proceedings—an unheard-of discrimination against foreigners unacquainted with the Turkish language.

It was so obvious from the very outset that an attempt on the life of the German Ambassador, if it were real, could only be intended either to drag Turkey into war with Germany, or to provoke war between Turkey and some enemy of Germany, that the desperate attempts of the Turkish legal authorities to drag the Soviet Union into the case arouses the gravest suspicions as to the whole purpose of the trial. Well might a Tass message (April 6) report that “foreign circles in Ankara express surprise at the anti-Soviet bias of the court and prosecutor.” In reality, as we have seen, preceding events link up with such an anti-Soviet demonstration with much consistency. And well might *Izvestia* write, on the same day:—

Sooner or later the real authors of the Ankara provocation, who now endeavour to cover up their traces, will be exposed and put on trial before the Turkish public. But already the Turkish public is naturally asking the following questions: Who could benefit from the bomb

explosion in Ankara? How could it happen that two honest Soviet citizens would be associated in any way with provocation designed to facilitate for the Germans the task of drawing Turkey into the war, contrary to the interests of the Soviet Motherland? Is it permissible, from the viewpoint of Turkey herself, that some Turkish circles or other should attempt to pay ransom to the blackmail intrigues and threats of Hitlerite Germany at the expense of the interests of the U.S.S.R. and its citizens? And will it not yield results directly opposite to those expected by people who tend in this way to appease Hitlerite provocateurs? We do not doubt that the Turkish public will without any difficulty find the correct answers to these questions.

Equally pertinent was the remark of Lozovsky to a number of foreign Press correspondents at Kuibyshev that “this case has aroused the indignation of Soviet public opinion, which did not expect that the Hitlerites would be allowed to fabricate such provocation in Turkey.”

Indeed, it is precisely the fact that they were allowed to carry on their criminal work that gives a sinister atmosphere to the Ankara trial. It recalls only too many of the methods of the Nazis at the Reichstag Fire “trial.” But the present is a dangerous time to undertake manoeuvres of that particular provocative brand—more especially because of the doubtful diplomatic record of Turkish policy during the last 30 months.

[pp. 154-157]

STRATEGY AND THE SECOND FRONT By WILLIAM RUST—The Labour Monthly, September 1942

THE background to the Churchill-Stalin negotiations in mid-August was the sharp deterioration in the military situation of the United Nations. Since our review of the war in the June issue of LABOUR MONTHLY the Nazis have made a deep advance into southern Russia and have driven the Eighth Army out of Libya and across the borders of Egypt. The shipping position has also worsened as a result of the intensified U-boat warfare. Only the Pacific front shows a certain improvement, but even this may be set at naught by the political disintegration in India.

A heavy price is thus being exacted for the failure of the Allies to operate a united strategy and to take advantage of the initiative wrested from the Nazis by the winter and spring successes of the Red Army. The continued postponement of the opening of the Second Front in Europe has enabled the enemy to regain the initiative on a vital sector of the Eastern Front and he is now desperately striving, before the onset of winter, to turn these successes to strategical advantage by blows aimed at crippling the war economy of the Soviet Union and undermining the offensive power of the Red Army as a whole. If these efforts are successful, incalculable harm will be caused to the military position of the Allies on *all* fronts.

It is not enough for governments to possess the prerequisites for victory; they must be turned to account without loss of time. With this fundamental of strategy in mind our June survey, although strongly confident, ended with this warning:—

Thus the perspective is clear—victory this year. But let there be no underestimation of the enemy, and the magnitude of the tasks before us. The German Army is far from being destroyed;

every inch of ground will have to be fought for, and progress, will not be even and unbroken. The growth of any tendencies in Britain to sit back and leave it to the Red Army would be fatal to our own interests, would prolong the war and enormously increase the sacrifice.

The desire of the people for the achievement of a united strategy and their understanding of its fundamental importance has been amply demonstrated by the upsurge of the mass movement in both Britain and America. All the attempts to befog this movement with a spate of technicalities and gloomy forebodings have failed of their purpose; the people feel the urgency of the times and they are ready for action and sacrifice. They have not suffered the experience of two world wars in the course of twenty-five years, they have not witnessed the fall of Spain, Czechoslovakia and other nations without learning that victory is dependent upon unity in action.

This fervour of the mass movement is, indeed, one of the most inspiring factors of the present situation. Morale is high. The people believe in victory. They are not dismayed by the successes of the enemy. The problem is to bring into decisive action this unbending will of millions of anti-Fascist fighters.

The Second Front has long ceased to be regarded as a purely military-technical question to be left to the leisurely attention of experts. The people also claim the right to be consulted. They refuse to reconcile the propaganda about the growing strength of the Allies with the constant pleas for delay in the full utilisation of these resources. They are alarmed by the obvious contradiction between the "full understanding" reached by the Governments "with regard to the urgent tasks of creating a Second Front in Europe in 1942" and the way in which the favourable months of 1942 are being allowed to pass without action.

They note with growing concern the emphasis laid on policies alternative to the Second Front, especially the widely

propagandised view that Germany can be brought to its knees by the heavy bomber. This is the theme of innumerable newspaper articles in America and is strongly supported in influential R.A.F. circles here. It was hinted at by Mr. Bevin when he claimed at a public meeting that the Second Front "is not the only way to win the war." This babble of tongues does not spread confidence in official policy, but creates the belief that there is lack of certainty in high places which must be ended by decisive action.

It is also quite impossible to persuade the masses that the attitude of the politicians and generals to the Second Front is entirely uninfluenced by political considerations, as *The Economist* attempted to argue in an article which stated that it is "mischievous nonsense" to suggest that ideological differences are holding up the decisive thrust in the West. Unfortunately for *The Economist*, this assertion of righteousness was speedily followed by Lady Astor's infamous outburst which, coming from the social head of the Cliveden set, must be regarded as something more than an exhibition of class spleen. The fact that prominent politicians (Lady Astor this year and Moore-Brabazon last) dare to utter publicly the sentiments of the late Neville Chamberlain at moments of extreme crisis is sufficient to awaken the class instincts of large numbers of workers, who regard these utterances as expressive of policies that are being fought for behind the scenes.

Without specialised military information it is, of course, impossible to determine when and how such an operation as the Second Front should be undertaken. But in retrospect it is not difficult for the average man to reach a judgment on the course of the war even without that "inside information" which the experts always lay claim to when justifying their passivity or lack of initiative. Thus, when Hitler subsequently admitted that his troops had reached "breaking point" last winter, at the time when such an accomplished military strategist as Stalin was

publicly calling for the Second Front, it was not illogical for the man in the street to conclude that there had been a chance then to strike a blow in the West that the British Government had failed to utilise.

The winter was allowed to slip by to the accompaniment of gloomy prophecies as to what would happen to the Red Army in the spring, when Hitler launched his new offensive. But the promised spring offensive did not materialise and the launching of the summer campaign was delayed by the attack in the Kharkov sector which Timoshenko opened on May 17. Consequently, Hitler's all-out offensive, by which he hopes to crumple up Soviet resistance, did not begin until June 29. In the light of these facts it is not surprising that the Trafalgar Square demonstrator, despite his lack of inside information and expert training, should conclude that the second major opportunity to strike at the enemy in the West had been allowed to pass in the spring and that Hitler was consequently given the opportunity to regroup his forces and to complete his preparations for the present attack.

Goebbels's own newspaper, the *Volkischer Beobachter*, states that the people's movement in Britain and the U.S.A. for a Second Front "smacks of an organised mass-hysteria." Our own critics of this movement, being a little more delicate in their choice of derisive terms, prefer to dismiss it as "popular clamour." Both home and foreign critics are correct in recognising the power of the mass movement which is rising to a higher point than ever before precisely because, with the lessons of the lost opportunities in their minds, the masses again see the Nazi forces fully stretched out on the Eastern Front and their defences in the West reduced to the minimum.*

* According to official Soviet estimates there are now only nine divisions of worth-while German troops in France. The other divisions are garrison troops of elder classes.

This is our third chance in fifteen months. History may not give us another. If Britain does not act now it may be driven into the opening of the Second Front out of sheer desperation at a later period, but under far more unfavourable circumstances. The essence of the Nazi strategy is to strike such blows at the Red Army as will cripple the offensive power of the Soviet Union, and then, while holding the defensive on the Eastern Front, to turn the full fury of the panzer divisions against Britain and the Middle East at the same time as the Japanese pass over to an extended offensive in the Pacific.

Nothing will be gained by speculation on what degree of success may attend these far-reaching aims. It is impossible to calculate the surprise factor in military operations or to make provision for the influence exercised by the shifts and changes of policy on the course of military operations. It is axiomatic to prepare for the worst and to act with daring in order to frustrate the strategic aims of the enemy. The starting point must be the achievement of a united strategy which will relieve the pressure of the Red Army and bring the mighty forces of the United Nations into action in the most decisive places.

The basic cause of the deterioration of the military situation is the fact that the Red Army has had to withstand alone, for a period of fifteen months, the concentrated attacks of Germany and its satellite powers. Remembering that in the last war Germany, with less allies than it now possesses, held six great powers at bay for more than four years, the wonder is not that the Red Army is being again forced back, but that it has been able to withstand the pressure for so long.

Even so, it would be an unpardonable error to be dazzled by the Nazi victories and to conclude that these are the fruits of an unbroken strength. There are numerous faint-hearts and

defeatists in this country who are ready to throw their hats into the ring as soon as Goebbels announces one of his annihilating victories, complete with a fanfare of trumpets. But it is indeed surprising to find the *Tribune* in this bad company, suggesting that the Red Army must inevitably go down under the sheer weight of German metal and so receptive to Nazi propaganda as to believe that “the Germans have won their recent victories in the South at almost as small a price as in France.” (August 7.) Such a melancholy and lop-sided view, although it may have been put forward in an effort to emphasise the dangers confronting Britain and to arouse people to action, can actually have the contrary effect of causing discouragement.

The danger is great; it was never greater. But Hitler's desperation is born of fear. The Fuhrer is gambling against the threatened Second Front, internal disintegration and the oncoming winter.

In a captured Order of the Day issued to the 17th German Army on July 10 it is stated:—

The Fuhrer demands that the schedule of operations be strictly adhered to, so that the necessary forces may be released in time for subsequent transfer to the West. Although according to the available information there are no grounds for fear, all the operations connected with the reaching of the northern Caucasus must be completed in the shortest possible time.

—(*The Times*, August 11.)

In this attack on a relatively short front the Nazis have, by reason of their superior communications, concentrated an enormous force of troops and tanks which have already forced the Red Army back a considerable distance. The aim of the panzer divisions is the capture of Stalingrad. The mortal danger that this advance threatens has not been concealed by the Soviet Government. In fact, the harsh realities have been made known

to civilian and soldier alike in order to spur them on to mighty heroic efforts. The economic losses suffered by the Soviet Union are already extremely severe and if Stalingrad were to fall the Volga communications would be cut, Russia would be deprived of its main oil supplies and the Central and Southern Armies would be separated.

Although the Nazis have secured startling results by this concentrated attack on a vital sector of the front it is well to note that in 1942 they are no longer able to strike on the entire front as in 1941, and that they have not so far succeeded in coordinating this blow with an offensive by air-borne troops against Syria and Palestine through Cyprus. Moreover, the attempt to seize Stalingrad is not being carried out with the strict adherence to schedule as demanded by the Fuhrer. The original plan to strike at both Moscow and Stalingrad through Voronezh has been frustrated and although Timoshenko has been compelled to give ground rapidly in the Caucasus, all attempts to approach within striking distance of Stalingrad, either from the North-east or South-east, are meeting with a mighty resistance. The German forces are being bled white and large numbers of their tanks, which now act in close co-operation with other arms, have been destroyed.

One must also count as negative factors the lengthening of the German communication lines and the dangers attendant upon the concentration of a large force in the Caucasus separated from the main front. The heavy strain that the intensity of the fighting imposes on the mechanised vehicles as well as on the manpower is bound to affect the momentum of the offensive. Within Germany transport difficulties increase and there is an acute shortage of locomotives and trucks. All reports indicate that the German morale is still declining and that underground activities against the Nazi regime are increasing. On the other hand, despite severe losses and the bitterness of retreat the Soviet Information Bureau is able to refer to the "enhanced organisation

and staunchness of the Red Army” in 1942, in comparison with 1941.

There is little reason to succumb to the fascination of German “ strength,” writes General Shilovsky, a Soviet staff officer who accompanied Molotov to London, in an article on the lessons of the German rout in 1918. Shilovsky continues:—

When Germany, after having seized tremendous territories, was already on the eve of catastrophe, the General Staffs of England and France still considered that her military might could not be broken before 1919. So strong was the misleading impression created by Germany’s spectacular military successes. Germany’s rout in the first world war came as a result of joint active operations by the Allies, who were superior in strength and resources. In four years of war the German army won no small number of battles, captured large territories, and to the very last fought on foreign territory. In the long run, however, it gorged itself to death with victory, and in November, 1918, Germany capitulated.

To-day, too, the Germans are conducting big offensive operations and trumpeting about their victories. But the experience of history shows that in spite of her temporary successes Germany can be defeated. This collapse will not come of itself, but as the result of a bloody and stubborn struggle.

This summing up of the military lessons of the last war is a polite but pointed reminder of the differences between Britain and the Soviet Union in the sphere of strategy which were undoubtedly discussed during the Churchill-Stalin negotiations in Moscow. These negotiations, described by Pravda “as a major political defeat for Hitler,” resulted in a reaffirmation of the close friendship and understanding between the Soviet Union, Britain and the United States. In the sphere of military action “a number of decisions were reached covering the field of war against Hitlerite Germany and her associates in Europe.”

These decisions undoubtedly herald the introduction of a more offensive spirit into the conduct of British military operations. This is greatly to be welcomed, especially if one of the results is the application of a more consistent and united strategy, and a stronger fight against the Munichites.

It is difficult to believe that a consistent strategy is being applied by all concerned. Certainly those air marshals who are permitted to parade their pet theory of victory through the bomber are expressing views in direct conflict with the official Government opinion, endorsed by the Chief of the General Staff, on the urgency of the creation of the Second Front in Europe. (See communique of June 11 on Molotov talks.) These air marshals appear to be sublimely indifferent to what must be done in order immediately to influence the fighting in the East, and in the Second Front they are not interested one little bit, whether it is proposed for 1942, 1943 or 1944. They stake everything on the offensive power of the heavy bomber (and the defensive qualities of the English Channel!) regardless of the might of the Luftwaffe, which could be released for battle with the R.A.F. and directed against Britain once Hitler succeeded in carrying out his immediate aims on the Eastern Front.

The school of thought that rejects the victory - through - bombing theory and stands for the Second Front, but only in 1943 or 1944, is in conflict with the air marshals, but for the time being at least is mainly relying on the bomber and the Channel. At the same time it should be noted that offensive action in Libya, although not a substitute for the Second Front, could be a means of bringing a certain relief to the hard-pressed Red Army.

The changes in the Middle East Command and the increased naval activity in the Mediterranean suggest that an abandonment of defensive tactics is contemplated. We have vast forces in the Middle East of which only a tiny proportion have ever been used in the desert fighting.

Rommel's hopes of reaching Alexandria and the Suez were frustrated by the dogged resistance of the Eighth Army, but it is certain that he will attack again. According to reports from Soviet sources, part of the Luftwaffe was transferred from Egypt to the Don and this may account for the holding up of a further Rommel offensive. Nevertheless, the hour of decision in Egypt is approaching. The Suez is threatened. The British forces must resort to a bold offensive policy and utilise the powerful reserves in the Middle East area: they must do this as much in their own urgent military interests as those of the Red Army.

The American attack on the Solomon Islands, which began on August 8, is a welcome example of initiative directed against the Japanese preparations for an attack on Australia, but this does not mean that the Allies have now succeeded in passing to the general offensive or that the second stage of the Japanese operations in the Pacific have been frustrated. Neither can the events there exercise an immediate influence on the course of military events in Europe.

Allied air and naval strength in the Pacific has grown considerably during recent months and heavy losses were inflicted on the Japanese when they attempted to seize Midway Island in June. But the Japanese have been obviously taking full advantage of the long lull in order to strengthen their lines of communications and their new jumping-grounds. The seizure of the Aleutian Islands has strengthened the strategical position of the Japanese and has enabled them to establish a base for striking at the American supply route to the Soviet Union. The cutting of the Burma Road has deprived the Chinese armies of vital supplies, has weakened their offensive power and has enabled the Japanese to wage new offensives on Chinese soil aimed at pinning down the Chinese forces, securing control over air bases that could be used for the bombing of Japan and Japanese communications and cutting the land supply route through which Soviet armaments and war

materials continue to arrive.

Where will the Japanese strike next? This is the question that must be faced, as their offensive power has not yet been undermined. According to Chungking the bulk of the Japanese army is distributed over Manchukuo, Burma and China, with the main concentrations in Manchukuo, facing Mongolia and the maritime provinces of the Soviet Far East. An attack on India offers tempting prospects now that the repressive policy of the Government has succeeded in arousing such bitterness amongst the Indian masses and continues to be directed against the formation of a provisional National Government without which the Indian people cannot be rallied in their full strength to meet the threatened invasion. On the other hand, the Japanese offensive may be directed against Australia in the event of the present fighting in Papua and the Solomon Islands turning in their favour. Finally, there is the question mark that must be put against Japanese intentions in relation to the Soviet Union. Of late there has been an increase in the rumours about Japan's hostile intentions which suggests that the usual type of sudden blow will be struck in the event of a further deterioration of the Soviet military position in Europe. But the Japanese know, of course, that Vladivostok will not be a Pearl Harbour.

This review of the various fronts again leads to the conclusion that the only way to upset the world strategy of the Fascist powers is by the opening of the Second Front in Europe which would draw off part of the forces that Hitler is now concentrating against Stalingrad and, incidentally, bring relief to our armies in the Middle East and finally end the Fascist dream of a Hitler-Tojo junction to India.

The case for the immediate opening of the Second Front has been strongly reinforced by the positive experiences of the enlarged raid by shock troops on Dieppe which further stimulated the struggle of the French people and called forth great enthusiasm throughout Britain. Valuable experience has

been gained in the landing of tanks and the effective protection that the R.A.F. can render. But such raids are not yet the Second Front.

The Second Front demand is now so overwhelmingly supported by the masses and the case for it is so startlingly clear that Government spokesmen have been compelled to renounce arguments based on the exposition of the old strategical conceptions, namely, that Britain's main task is to guard this island against the dangers of invasion and to scatter what troops can be spared in various parts of the world in defence of imperial strong points. The march of events has demonstrated the bankruptcy of this policy of passivity and has compelled the recognition, although not yet the operation, of a strategy based on the full use of Britain's land forces on the soil of Europe, as well as the Navy and Air Force.

Officially, only so-called practical arguments are put forward against the operation of the new strategy, although the resistance has far deeper roots. All opponents of the Second Front play a trump card: shipping, this is the argument of the Munichites, of the victory-through-bombing school and also of those who accept the new strategy but who, appalled by the magnitude of the task, plead for delay.

That the shipping position is grave is undeniable. Is it worse to-day than it was a year ago? There are no figures to go by, but it is officially stated that the situation has worsened. Delay has not strengthened our shipping position and further delay is hardly likely to do so. To divert shipping for a Second Front in Europe may mean risks elsewhere, but these will have to be faced as the biggest risk of all is that of hanging on in the hope that things will improve. In any case, much of the type of shipping required (invasion barges and coastal steamers) necessary for the landing and supply of troops should now be available. Have we not had fourteen months to prepare?

Neither Britain nor America are ship-less countries. Construction may not yet be keeping pace with destruction, but there is no reason why this should not be possible of achievement if the methods of anti-U-boat warfare are improved and vested interests in the shipbuilding industry are swept aside. The mass production of ships for wartime purposes is a realisable policy, as American experiences have already proved.

The opening of the Second Front in Europe is the key to victory. Further delay is dangerous to the extreme. There is the danger that the Nazis will secure far-reaching successes on the Eastern Front, that the heroic mood of the enslaved peoples of Europe will be turned by frustration into channels of desperation and despair and that the people of Britain will turn with bitterness against those who ignore the lessons of history and fail to grasp glorious opportunities. The moment is grave. Let the Government take heed.

[pp. 269-273]

BOOK REVIEWS. Patrick Geddes: Maker of the Future, by Philip L. Boardman, The Labour Monthly, October 1945

Patrick Geddes, *Maker of the Future* by Philip Boardman, with an Introduction by Lewis Mumford (Chapel Hill Press, 1944, \$5.) and O.U.P. 30/-.

PATRICK GEDDES (botanist, biologist, sociologist) was a teacher of great popularity and vitality. He was an active reformer and town planner.

Very early in his academic career it was rumoured of his botany lectures—"they say he drags in matters of economics at the slightest provocation." This did not please his superiors, who were frequently criticised by Geddes. He wished to "end the separation of the school of industry from the school of science, which creates pedants in the universities and Philistines in the factories. "He was an untiring critic of the university system. He hated unchanging curricula, and once said "the universities are frankly museums for the preservation of intellectual antiquities."

The main weakness in Geddes' life appears to have been an overdeveloped habit of progressive and semi-idealistic thinking, offset by an underdeveloped appreciation of the need for realistic political action. He was an active man, but most of his reformist activity took a very individualistic form. He never really got down to suggesting "how" we should create the conditions for progress. He objected to "hate-encrusted political labels." For Geddes hate was not a positive factor in life.

Despite the fact that he detested "labels," despite also his mechanical discipleship to Le Play and Auguste Comte, P.G. was a "socialist at heart." His soundness of heart, however, was not always equalled by his depth of understanding. He was rather inclined to attack social problems "by himself" and by segments. For example, he tried, vainly, to show what a "good" colonial

policy might do for Cyprus, instead of seeing that colonial policy was tied up with the whole economic structure of the society he was living in. He therefore failed to appreciate the need for attacking the whole idea of colonial domination.

[p. 319]

**BRITAIN'S ECONOMIC BALANCE SHEET, Margot
Heinemann, The Labour Monthly, September
1946**

.....

So far the Government has been hesitant in operating its promise to purchase imports in bulk, at prices guaranteed for a period ahead (though the ending of the Liverpool cotton market is a step forward). It has not negotiated trade agreements and short-term credits with the U.S.S.R. and to those liberated countries, such as Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, which, though poor now, will be the stable and expanding planned economies of the future and therefore our best potential export markets. Soviet timber and cotton, Yugoslav non-ferrous metals and Balkan tobacco could be invaluable to Britain as an alternative to U.S. supplies, but trade with these countries is only a trickle. The building-up of colonial workers' standards (and hence colonial markets) has not begun—not even in the form of elementary support for trade union rights in Cyprus or South Africa.

[pp. 266-270]

EGYPT AND THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS by George Audit. *The Labour Monthly*, September 1946

NO promise has been given more often by Britain than the promise to evacuate Egypt. Nehru, writing a decade ago, counted nineteen promises made since 1882. It might almost be said that the promise to leave Egypt, always made when expediency demanded, has been one of the main foundations of the sixty-four-year-long Occupation.

For generations of imperialist statesmen, from Kitchener to Killearn, it has been an axiom that the control of Egypt is the *main key* firstly to the domination of the Middle East, and secondly to the defence of the empire against colonial revolt and aggression from outside. It was clear, immediately after Attlee's promise in March to evacuate Egypt, that as *The Times* said (May 16), the decision must lead to "the attempted readjustment of imperial strategy in the whole Middle East."

The main alternative base is Palestine. It will be recalled that it was in 1916-1921 that the British tactic of setting Jew against Arab in Palestine took shape. It was in that same period that the Egyptian national liberation movement in its mass form came to birth, with the struggles of the Wafd. This development added both to the difficulty and the importance of continuing the Occupation. It was the fear that Egypt would get out of control, and the desire to check the developing Arab unity against imperialism, which led to the building of the alternative base in Palestine, behind the shield of the policy of the Jewish National Home.

Egypt is the richest, most economically advanced, most populous and most-influential of the Arabic-speaking countries. The winning by Egypt of real independence and real sovereignty most-influential of the Arabic-speaking countries. The winning

by Egypt of real independence and real sovereignty is the most important issue for all the Middle East peoples. Today, as in 1919, the mass independence movement runs more strongly there than in the other countries. After the war there was a brief British attempt to ride out the storm, but the great Independence demonstration and General Strike of February 21 swept away the openly “collaborationist” Government of Nokrashy Pasha, and revealed the strength of the popular demand for independence and sovereignty. In March Attlee told the House of Commons that the Government had decided to evacuate “freely and without conditions.” Morrison said that if Britain did not give this promise a revolution would break out.

The old promise had been repeated. Was it once again merely a move to appease Egypt in order later, to bind her chains tighter? Or was this indeed a statesmanlike and progressive act of a Labour foreign policy, aimed at guaranteeing peace and security in the Middle East by winning the friendship of its peoples? The history of the negotiations since March, in which the two delegations have been working out the conditions on which this “free and unconditional” evacuation is to be effected, have given the answer. The halo with which Bevin decked himself (“They (*the Tories*) did not agree with me on Egypt”) has vanished. The demands, raised during the negotiations, for a five-year evacuation period, for a special regime for the Canal, for the retention of British military advisers, for a Joint Defence Council which would be nothing but GHQ Cairo in an Anglo-Egyptian disguise, and the refusal to discuss the question of the Sudan, have shown that British policy still follows the basic Tory line, and will evacuate Egypt only in exchange for a treaty of alliance which keep’s the real control of Egypt in Britain’s hands. The rejection by the British delegation of the Egyptian reservation that the alliance will only come into effect if Britain is attacked and not if Britain

is the aggressor, and the British amendment of the phrase “bordering countries” to “neighbouring countries” in the article providing for mutual aid in case of a crisis—thus embracing such countries as Persia, Iraq, and Turkey—also show the unchanged imperialist motive of the British negotiators. Unconditional evacuation was a fraudulent promise. One must remind Mr. Bevin of his own remark at a U.N.O. session dealing with Iran, that “it is a cardinal point of my policy” that you cannot negotiate with a country while your troops are in occupation of that country.

Light on Mr. Bevin’s own attitude to Egypt and the Middle East was shed by a speech he made on November 1, 1945, to the Anglo-Egyptian Chamber of Commerce:—

I began when I took office to tackle this problem of the Middle East, and may I say that I have approached it as an entity. . . . I have seen indications of rising nationalism in Egypt, but I beg you not to overdo this nationalist business. A United Nations organisation, you know, presumes a sacrifice of a certain amount of sovereignty. . . .

We do not want to dominate Egypt. I would like to see our defence built up, not on a basis of our protecting you, but on joint co-operation, a partnership paid for and: manned by both of us on a common basis of partnership between the Middle East and ourselves (where does the “United Nations” come in? G.A.).

In that way I can see the mutual interests, mutual character, and great design of that area contributing not only to its own security and prosperity, but contributing a great example to wider regions of the world by its mutual understanding and common effort.

Stripped of the sickening cant, Bevin’s words about the Middle East “great design” mean one thing only—the resolute attempt to defend imperialist control of the Middle East peoples

against all comers, and especially against the peoples who are “overdoing this nationalist business.”

Three main trends within this “great design” have become clear, particularly during the last six months: The first has been to stall on the decision to evacuate Egypt, the second to organise an alternative system of bases, and the third to give increased support to the most reactionary and anti-Soviet forces within the Arab League.

The alternative system of bases is centralised in Palestine. New bases have been added since the war (Tobruk, Benghazi). The treaty granting so-called independence to Transjordan gives Britain unlimited garrisoning rights. New bases are under construction at Gaza and at Famagusta in Cyprus. It is the pressing need for a new main base (Palestine instead of Egypt) which has produced the latest public appearance of the monstrous imperialist project for the partition of Palestine, in order to make solid and permanent the military base in Transjordan by linking it with Haifa, terminus of the Iraq oil pipeline and main naval port—after Alexandria—in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Here the chief obstacle, apart from the opposition of Jews and Arabs to partition of their country, is the reluctance of the U.S.A. to underwrite such a policy either morally or materially. American reluctance to do the dirty work involved in the protection of imperialist rule, while at the same time taking a bigger and bigger share of the plums (viz., the “agreement in principle” announced in August that the new pipeline from the Saudi Arabian wells will end in Alexandria or Port Said, instead of Haifa, thus strengthening U.S. influence in Egypt) provokes Churchill to threaten, “If the U.S.A. will not come and share the burden of the Zionist cause, we will return our mandate to U.N.O., and evacuate Palestine within a specified period. At the same time we should inform Egypt that we stand by our treaty

rights and will by all means (*i.e., by force*) maintain our position in the Canal Zone. “

The third trend culminated in the arrests and repressions which occurred simultaneously in Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Transjordan, Iraq, and even Saudi Arabia, early in July. These arrests showed that the official Arab leadership was bent on developing Arab unity, not against imperialism, but against the democratic, trade-union and progressive movements. In Egypt the repression had an obvious and direct connection with the negotiations. Since March the popular independence movement, in conditions of mass unemployment, ceaseless strikes for better conditions, and persecution by the Sidky Pasha Government of big capitalists and ultra-Conservative landowners, grew steadily in strength. The Government, whose main basis is the Egyptian Federation of Industries, representing foreign monopoly capital interests in Egypt, was eager to reach a compromise with Britain, but could find no way of putting the deal across the Egyptian people. It finally launched its notorious “Communist Plot” scare on July 10-11-12. Arresting over two hundred writers, journalists, trade unionists, leaders, students and foreigners, and suppressing eight newspapers, including the official Wafdist daily *Al Wafd Al Mysri*, Sidky announced the discovery of a Communist plot to subvert the social order and sabotage the negotiations on the instructions of a foreign power. Word went round that the treaty would be signed very soon. But at the moment of writing fresh difficulties have arisen, and it seems doubtful whether Sidky’s brand of the bolshevik bogey will help in any way to make Egyptian public opinion accept any treaty with Britain which does not secure speedy and unconditional evacuation.

Another indication of the growing unity of policy between Britain and Arab reaction is the dropping, perhaps temporarily, of the Greater Syria Plan, threatening the independence of the advanced and progressive Lebanese states, and of the plan for

the union of Transjordan and Iraq. These favourite schemes of six months ago are too fruitful of dissension between the Hashemite and Wahabite groupings and their respective British and American backers to be proceeded with at the present moment. The following quotation from Akher Saa, organ of Egyptian Palace circles, shows, however, that the threat to the independence of the Lebanon—that key-point in the struggle of the Middle East peoples for their national liberation—has now taken another form:—

Sidky's campaign against the Communists will have repercussions all over the East. Indeed, the Governments of Damascus, Beirut and Bagdad have taken similar measures . . . now that the principle of common Arab nationality has been approved, and that passports will be abolished, it is not right that Communists should continue to enjoy full liberty in the Lebanon while in other Arab countries they are being prosecuted.

It is clear that the support now being given by British policy to the worst Arab reaction is intended to obtain as a quid pro quo the Arab leadership's acquiescence in the "strategic readjustment" of the area in the interests of Anglo-American imperialism and its war preparations against the Soviet Union in this most vital of all strategic areas.

But the real independence struggles of the Middle East peoples, their fight for sovereignty and independence grow stronger daily, and it is with them that the "strategic readjustment" brings Britain into full conflict. As a result of this policy, Labour today is faced with the prospect, not of voluntary evacuations followed by the establishment of independent and sovereign states, but of bloody work of repression in Palestine, Egypt and perhaps soon elsewhere. The recent despatch of troops to Basra in order to terrorise the workers in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company's fields, with its threat of aggressive intervention in the internal affairs of Iran, shows that the effort

to preserve monopoly capital and its allies in the Middle East, is not only a dishonour to the Labour Government, but also a serious threat to peace.

The pledge to Egypt must be fulfilled. An independent and sovereign Palestine state must be constituted. And if any special international arrangements are necessary in relation to the Middle East countries—arrangements in the interests of international security, and not merely aimed at the continued enslavement of the area to unrestricted exploitation by British and American monopoly capital, then the United Nations and not any self-appointed Anglo-American Committee, is the only body with the right and authority to decide them. Any other course leads in the Middle East only to increased violence and anarchy, discredit for the Labour Government, deeper hatred of Britain and increased danger of war.

[pp. 276-279]

**MR. BEVIN AND BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY By K.
ZILLIACUS, M.P., The Labour Monthly, March
1946**

WHEREAS in home affairs the Labour Government are supported by a united and enthusiastic Party and are being bitterly fought by the Tories, in foreign affairs it is Tory roses, roses all the way for Mr. Bevin, while Labour back-benchers and the Party in the country are getting more and more puzzled and dismayed. It is important to understand just what is happening in our foreign policy, and why.

In 1938 Mr. Attlee wrote a book called *The Labour Party in Perspective* in which he said that the chief fault of the Labour Party in foreign policy after the first world war was that it had been content to borrow its ideas from the Liberals instead of hammering out a Socialist foreign policy of its own. He added that "there is a deep difference of opinion between the Labour Party and the Capitalist parties on foreign as well as on home policy, because the two cannot be separated. The foreign policy of a Government is the reflection of its internal policy. Imperialism is the form which capitalism takes in relation to other nations. A Capitalist Government in Britain ... is nationalist, not internationalist in outlook. It may on particular occasions take action in foreign affairs with which the Labour Party agrees... but such particular instances of action which can be approved by Socialists do not affect the truth of the general proposition that there is no agreement on foreign policy between a Labour Opposition and a Capitalist Government."

In spite of these brave words, the Labour Government after the second world war have thrown overboard the Labour Party's statements on foreign affairs and are continuing, in national unity with the Tories, the foreign policy they inherited from their Conservative predecessors in the Coalition.

The result is that whereas the world is changing and our position in the world has changed, our foreign policy remains unchanged.

Anglo-Russian relations have generally been the acid test of British foreign policy. Let us take them as the starting-point of this analysis. To give the necessary perspective, let us begin with the Russian Revolution.

“Hate of the revolution and fear of its consequences in England were the dominant reactions of Conservatives. . . . I found the same fears among the Labour patriots,” wrote Bruce Lockhart in *Memoirs of a British Agent*. “The Allies greeted the revolution first with feigned enthusiasm and then with increasing alarm. They wanted—and on the part of the military advisers the wish was natural—things to be put back where they were before.”

The Tories are still in the state of mind that these quotations reveal. Between the wars they lost the peace because they first fought the Social revolution in Russia and Europe, then boycotted the Soviet Union, and finally appeased the fascist aggressors. They view the second wave of the social revolution, released by the second world war in Europe and the Far East (where the French and Russian Revolutions have arrived hand in hand) with the same hysterical hatred and dread that they fought the first wave in 1918-21. The ex-appeasers of yesterday still sitting on the Tory benches have turned into the frustrated interventionists of today. Their view of what ought to be done now is still that of Lord D’Abernon in his book, *An Ambassador of Peace*, when he wrote, defending the Locarno Treaties (The Western bloc of those days):—

It was apparent to those who took a world view that Western civilisation was menaced by an external danger which, coming into being during the war, threatened a cataclysm equalled only by the fall of the Roman Empire. This danger arose from the sweeping success in 1917 of the revolution against the Czarist regime and the establishment in Russia of a

fanatical Communist Government, animated by hatred of all political organisations which stood in the way of a world victory of the Soviet creed. . . .

Resistance to communistic propaganda, the maintenance of peace in Europe, the avoidance of another Great War, the establishment of security for respective frontiers, the preservation of society on existing lines, were capital objects of British policy. But there was more than this. England's stupendous and vital interests in Asia were menaced by a danger graver than any which existed in the time of the old Imperialistic regime in Russia. Hostility to England or jealousy of the intrusion of British civilisation into Asia were indeed of old standing. For the last seventy years of the nineteenth century, rivalry between England and Russia had been a dominant fact in history. But the Bolsheviks disposed of two weapons which Imperial Russia lacked—class-revolt propaganda, appealing to the proletariat of the world, and the quasi-religious fanaticism of Lenin, which infused a vigour and zeal unknown to the officials and emissaries of the Czar.

“Resistance to communistic propaganda,” “the reservation of society on existing lines,” and the determination to defend Britain's “stupendous and vital” interests in Asia by excluding the U.S.S.R. from the Middle East, are the operative parts of this statement. They were the “capital objects” pursued above all others by British foreign policy between the wars. That is why our foreign policy played a big part in bringing about the second world war.

The Tories are so enthusiastic about Mr. Bevin's foreign policy, because they see it apparently pursuing the same traditional aims and animated by the same 19th century motives as those so ably summarised by Lord D 'Abernon twenty years ago. Mr. Bevin's speeches in the House and in the Security Council pour balm on the suffering souls of the frustrated interventionists on the Tory benches.

Mr. Bevin's outburst on February 1 in the Security Council against the Communist Parties of the world aroused the utmost enthusiasm in the press of Franco Spain and Fascist Argentine, not to mention the Greek Royalists, General Anders' Polish Army in Italy, the Hearst press and the *Chicago Tribune* in the U.S.A., the Kemsley and Rothermere papers here and the whole rag-tail and bobtail of the fascist and reactionary down and outers throughout Europe. For they all dream of another war of intervention that will put them back where they were before. And did not Mr. Bevin say that "It has been the incessant propaganda of Moscow and the incessant propaganda of the Communist Party in every country in the world to attack the British people and the British Government as if there has been no friendship between us. That is the danger to the peace of the world. It sets us against one another, causes suspicion and misunderstanding, and makes one wonder what the motive is?"

On the same occasion Mr. Bevin admitted that British troops had gone into Greece, not to liberate the country from the Germans, but in order to prevent the resistance movement, E.A.M. (then a broadly-based coalition including nearly all democratic elements) from taking charge of the country. Instead, we put into power a pack of reactionaries, Royalists and ex-collaborators, who instituted a reign of terror against the Left.

In December, 1944, Mr. Bevin told the Labour Conference that Greece had been invaded because "The British Empire cannot abandon its position in the Mediterranean." That is a return to the Imperial strategy of the last century, which was directed to keeping Russia out of the Balkans and Middle East and bottled up in the Black Sea. The same strategic conception appeared in Mr. Bevin's remark when, speaking to the House on November 7 about the Soviet desire to be made trustee of an Italian colony, he said, "One cannot help being a little suspicious if a great Power wants to come right across, shall I say, the throat

of the British Commonwealth. . . . One is driven to ask oneself the motive.”

Again, when on November 21, Brigadier Maclean asked for an assurance that “it is the intention of H.M. Government in all circumstances to safeguard our imperial interests in South Persia and the Persian Gulf,” Mr. Bevin answered grandly that “It is the intention of His Majesty’s Government to safeguard British interests in whatever part of the world they may be found.”

The Brigadier then asked how the Government proposed “to carry out this assurance in this particular case.” Mr. Bevin replied: “I cannot divulge to the hon. and gallant member, in answer to a question, all the strategy of the Chiefs of Staffs and everybody else concerned.”

Even the Brigadier felt bound to protest the next day that “That was not at all the answer that I expected or desired. Strategy and Chiefs of Staff are brought into play, not in keeping order in our outlying part of Asia, but in a major war, and that is exactly what we are out to avoid. “

Mr. Bevin’s outlook on Europe, the Middle East and the Soviet Union, it will be observed, does not differ by a hair’s breadth from that of Lord D’Abernon twenty years ago, in the days when we lost the last peace. Our Foreign Secretary stands with one foot in the Crimean Conference and the other in the Crimean War.

The truth is that the War Office, the Admiralty and the Foreign Office are running our foreign policy, not the Labour Government. And in Europe, the Middle East, the Far East (Indonesia) alike, they are pursuing the traditional social and Imperial aims of the old governing class, who may have lost the election, but are still overwhelmingly represented in the Foreign and Colonial Offices and the fighting services.

But the world has changed, and our position in the world, including the things for which the British people are prepared to fight, have changed.

The Soviet Union has emerged from the second world war as a first-class world power, and bids fair in ten or fifteen years to be the greatest world power. There is a tremendous ferment and stir among the peoples of the East, where the demand for national independence and political democracy, and the desire for social change, are working together powerfully in men's minds.

The Communists of today are not the Communists of 1919. They are incomparably more mature and powerful. They are the leaders of most or all of the working-class in nearly every country in Europe except the old democracies of the North-West fringe, Switzerland and Austria. They represent the mighty Soviet Union and nearly all the forces of democracy and progress in that vast country, China, where they rule over whole provinces. They lead most of the organised workers in Latin America. They played a heroic and central part in the underground resistance movements, and have emerged in leading positions in the progressive coalitions that alone are capable of reconstructing the war shattered countries where democracy and where the old social order has broken down beyond repair. They are working hand in hand with the Socialist parties in most countries.

This country, at the present rate of demobilisation, will still have over 2,000,000 men under arms next June—a higher figure than the United States. We cannot afford to maintain much more than a quarter of that figure for any length of time. Let the fate of France serve as a warning. General de Gaulle's policy of prestige and megalomania brought that country to the verge of economic collapse, and has necessitated drastic cuts in France's military establishment and armaments.

If we are not to wreck our economic reconstruction we must cut our commitments, armaments and military establishments ruthlessly. We are not physically able to fight the Soviet Union

and the British people would make short work of any Government insane enough to go to war about oil or strategic or any other of the "vital interests" in the Middle East so dear to the Foreign Office and the War Office and Admiralty, but about which British workers know nothing and care less.

Mr. Attlee said on January 29 that our vast military commitments were necessary to world peace. Let the United Nations Security Council be the judge of that. Offer to share with our fellow-members of the Security Council all our commitments to maintain peace, including such matters as Indonesia; Greece; Palestine; control of oil resources and irrigation and development schemes in the Middle East; control of the inlets and outlets of the Mediterranean and Black Sea; and the demilitarisation of the Straits (Dardanelles) the Dodecanese and Cyprus.

In the conditions of power-politics and international anarchy, it is the pleasant habit of War Offices, Admiralties and Air Ministries (under some such body as the Imperial Defence Committee) to prepare plans ceaselessly for war against States with whom we might be at war. Our fighting services no longer go through that routine against the United States. War between the English-speaking nations is regarded as unthinkable and is left out of our defence calculations. That is also true of France.

The Labour Government should instruct the Imperial Defence Committee and the fighting services to cease preparing plans, for possible war between any or all of the permanent Security Council members, since they cannot under the Charter declare each other aggressors and are jointly charged with the maintenance of world peace. That means no more preparations for war or disposal of forces according to strategic calculations, against the Soviet Union. That would enable us to bring most of our soldiers home from the Near and Middle East in double-quick time.

Nearer home, we should apply Labour's declared policy of cooperating with the governing coalitions that have issued from the resistance movements, in order to unite, reconstruct and pacify Europe through a sweeping advance to Socialism and on the basis of the Anglo-Soviet and Franco-Soviet Alliances.

On those lines we could make peace. On present lines we are drifting to disaster.

[pp. 71-74]

NOTES OF THE MONTH. *New Stirrings* by R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, October 1946

....

IV. End of Imperialism?

“Imperialism”

Nothing has angered British official expression more than Wallace’s indictment of “British imperialist policy.” Tory and official Labour editorials unite in remarkably similar language to rebuff this incredible charge. They find it “absurd,” “obsolete,” “out of date.” Have we not freed India? Are we not freeing Egypt? And all the colonial countries as fast as they are fit for freedom? This virtuous indignation is overdone. It is time for public opinion in this country to get a little more used to “seeing ourselves as others see us.” The traveller abroad finds one question facing him from progressives in every country wherever he goes: “How long will the British workers tolerate Bevin’s policy of armed maintenance of imperialism and reaction all over the world?” When Soviet spokesmen make the criticism, it is dismissed as partisan Communist malevolence against social democracy. When a leading member of Truman’s Cabinet makes the same observation, it is dismissed as absurd American demagogy. No doubt, if the whole world were to make the same criticism, our sapient editorial writers would conclude that the whole world has gone cock-eyed. But the world pays little attention to the endless self-glorification of British editorial writers and statesmen. The world is more interested in crude facts. The world observes the operations of British armed forces all over the world (by no means only, or even mainly in enemy countries), in Greece and Cyprus and Palestine and Transjordan and Irak and India and Burma and Malaya and Indonesia and crudely concludes that this military occupation

and domination of one-fifth of the human race is an expression of imperialism.

...

Cyprus

But we are not responsible for what happens in South Africa? Then let us take Cyprus, where constitutional figments have long been destroyed, and open autocracy of the Colonial Office is maintained against the opposition of the entire people. In January of this year (that is, under the Labour Government) the entire leadership of the Cypriot Trade Union Congress, a partner with the British Trade Union Congress in membership of the World Federation of Trade Unions, was sentenced to imprisonment for terms of twelve to eighteen months for the crime of maintaining an "unlawful association," i.e., the Pan-Cypriot Trade Union Committee. The possession of socialist literature was declared a crime. The following exchange took place between the President of the Court and the Solicitor-General of Cyprus:—

President: Is Marxist theory a crime?

Solicitor-General: According to Cyprus law, yes.

President: Is the possession of Marxist books a crime?

Solicitor-General: Yes.

Social Democracy versus Socialism

Still more remarkable is the answer of the Colonial Office Parliamentary Secretary, Mr. Creech-Jones, when an anti-imperialist Labour M.P. raised the question in March. So far from repudiating the sentences and rulings, Mr. Creech-Jones replied that the law in England is really the same:—

Mr. Solley raised the question of the imprisonment of the eighteen leaders of the Cypriot trade union movement. They were, he said, imprisoned at the end of a thirty-four days' trial after being found guilty of being members of an unlawful association. . . . It was fantastic that while there was a Labour

Government at West-minster socialism was a crime according to Cyprus.

Mr. Creech-Jones said that the charges against the trade union leaders concerned were made under the Criminal Code in Cyprus, which was precisely similar to the law in this country. The law of this country was the basis of the law in Cyprus. He regretted the rather intemperate language which Mr. Solley had used. The prosecutions were not matters for the Colonial Office whatsoever. They were matters within the jurisdiction of the administration of the local authorities. (*Times*, June 3, 1946.)

If the day should come when the colonial peoples place Social Democracy on trial for its crimes against the peoples of the world, let them not plead, like the Nuremburg hypocrites, that they “did not know” what was being done in their name. They knew; the questions were raised by sincere anti-imperialist members of their own party; and they defended the official outrages.

V. Man-Power and Reconstruction

Price of Empire

-What is the price of this policy of imperialism, of armed intervention and domination and backing of reaction and monopoly interests in so many countries all over the world, of Anglo-American sabre-rattling and atom-bomb bluster and anti-Soviet threats, for the British people at home? That price must be squarely faced; for it is at the root of all our problems and not least, of our home problems. The first part of the price, which is felt in every household, is the crippling of the prospects of British reconstruction. The second part of the price is the hostility of peoples abroad, when we need friendship and cooperation. The final price is war. If the policy of the Anglo-American line-up against the Soviet Union is maintain edit is

Britain that is the most vulnerable and has to pay the most, both now and hereafter.

[pp. 293-303]

WHAT IS RUSSIA AFTER? By QUAESTOR. The Labour Monthly, April 1946

ONE of the methods of maintaining ignorance of the U.S.S.R. and fostering hostility to its policy, most widely practised by the capitalist press of this country before 1939, was to ignore or mutilate important statements by Soviet leaders. It was this practice, among others, that millions of British people had in mind, during the first twelvemonths after Hitler attacked the U.S.S.R. in June, 1941, when they said with indignation: "We've been told lies about Russia!" or "Why didn't they tell us the truth?"

Stalin's speeches suffered particularly from this habit of our free and independent press. An example was the treatment of his speech of March 1939, with its penetrating analysis of the war danger, its offer of an alliance with peace-loving countries to prevent war and its warning that, if war broke out because such an alliance were rejected, the U.S.S.R. would not pull the chestnuts out of the fire for others. Coming on the eve of Hitler's march into Prague, it interfered with hopes of yet another Munich—this time at Russia's expense; so it was almost completely suppressed.

During the war, when the crisis was past, i.e., after the Red Army had gone over to its giant offensive at Stalingrad in November, 1942, the same tendencies began to show themselves. Practically all references, in Stalin's speech of November 6, 1943, to the Socialist character of the Soviet social order were deleted by the agencies and newspapers; and the speech of a year later was handled in the same way. Since the end of the war, of course, the mutilation or non-publication of important Soviet statements (particularly in the newspapers with a mass circulation) has become a commonplace. This was essential if babble about the "mystery" or "uncertainty" of Soviet intentions and policy were to have any effect.

...

No doubt another reason for the maltreatment of Stalin's speech in the news-columns of the British press, after the treatment of his speeches of 1943 and 1944, can be safely put down to his statements: "The war has shown that the Soviet social system is a truly popular system, which has grown from the people and enjoys its powerful support The Soviet social system is a better form of organisation of society than any non-Soviet social system. . . . The Soviet State system has proved to be a model of the multinational state . . . in which the national problem and the problem of co-operation among nations have been solved better than in any other multinational State." At a time when the degree of democracy (won for the people by organised Labour) in capitalist countries like Britain and the U.S.A.; and the regimes maintained in India, Burma, Cyprus, etc.; are loudly advertised as the highest pinnacle of democratic achievement, any other claim is best shoved out of sight and hearing.

[pp. 107-110]

NOTES OF THE MONTH. Britain and Empire. R.P.D. *, The Labour Monthly, February 1947

IN a famous statement Mr. Churchill declared during the war that he had no intention of being Prime Minister of Britain in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. He was right. He is not Prime Minister of Britain. This does not mean, however, that the liquidation of the British Empire is already taking place. Neither the paeans nor the laments over its supposed demise are yet justified. But both the British people and the peoples of the Empire are coming to realise with increasing clearness that the old relations must end and that a new relation of free peoples must take its place.

Two Conferences

This month two Conferences will be discussing the new problems of Britain and the post-war world. The first is the Communist Party Congress, which will have to consider all the manifold questions of home and foreign policy arising in the second year of the Labour Government. The second is the Empire Conference of Communist Parties—a new venture which will bring together for the first time accredited delegates from the growing Communist movement in all parts of the British Empire. At this Conference representatives from the Communist Parties in the Empire, from the Dominions, from India and Ceylon and Burma, from Malaya and Hong Kong, from Cyprus and the Middle East, from Africa and outlying regions will be able to meet in common with the representatives from Britain to exchange experiences and discuss common problems. This is a significant new development of the modern world situation. Previously there have been Commonwealth Labour Conferences: but these have been in the main confined

* *Rajani Palme Dutt—STC-LB*

to representatives of the privileged sections of the white workers. Here for the first time the representatives of the vanguard of the working masses of the five hundred millions of the Empire, without distinction of colour, race or nation, will beagle to proclaim to the world from the heart of the Empire, in London, the aims and the needs of their peoples, their views of the policies that are being pursued, their demands and their struggle. It is appropriate that this wider Conference should follow immediately on the Communist Party Congress. For the problems before both Conferences are closely related. Socialism has long taught the unity of interests of the British people and the peoples of the Empire in the common struggle for liberation. Events today are proving the truth of this in a hundred forms.

From the Old to the New

Alike for Britain and for the peoples of the Empire a new situation has arisen since the war, the defeat of fascism and the advance of the liberation movement over the world. The old basis of British imperialism, of world domination, colonial monopoly and overseas tribute, which has for so long held one quarter of the human race in its grip and governed the social and political structure in Britain, is breaking down. It will not work any longer. Both economically and politically, and also in a military sense, it is proving bankrupt. Altho desperate attempts to shore up the old basis in a new dress can neither reverse the changed relations of world power nor stem the tide of popular advance. The peoples of the Empire press forward to freedom and are not content with shams. The British people, more alert than the representatives of the old ruling class, are also seeking new paths. More and more clearly the inescapable choice opens out before them. Either to cling to the old crumbling basis and go down into the depths with world reaction, squandering manpower and resources to defend the indefensible, unequally yoked to the Wall Street moneylenders, and sinking into an

economic slough, financial dependence and eventual war. Or to strike forward along the path of basic social and political reconstruction and establish anew non-imperialist basis in the world in unity with the advancing progressive peoples. This is the essential choice underlying all the problems and controversies which are now agitating public opinion and the labour movement.

Man-power and Empire

There is not a single problem of British reconstruction today, of British home and foreign policy, which is not inseparably linked up with this question of Empire, that is, with this necessity of advance to a non-imperialist basis. Take the question of man-power. There is a crucial shortage of man-power. The Cabinet is issuing a Whitepaper on this shortage and on the urgent need of half a million additional workers in the key industries. Proposals are put forward that the only solution is to be found in the importation of half million foreign workers into Britain. The solution is sought to be found in the settlement of Polish fascists in Britain or in the retention of German prisoners of war. *The Times* writes in an editorial on January 17:—

The case for a selective immigration of up to 500,000 foreign workers during the next few years is exceedingly strong, and it is regrettable that neither the Government nor the labour movement appear to have given much thought to it.

Yet where is Britain's man-power? What is the main cause of the shortage? Every one knows the answer. The latest return, for November, shows 1,510,000 in the armed forces, and 474,000 engaged on making equipment and supplies for the armed forces: a total of close on two millions or one-tenth of the available man-power, and multiplication of the armed forces more than threefold on the pre-war figure of 480,000. Yet, when the question is raised why demobilisation has been slowed down, and why these enormous numbers are necessary, Mr.

Attlee in reply points, not merely to the needs of defence or obligations under the United Nations and in ex-enemy countries, but to imperialist commitments in the Near East or the Far East. If all armed forces were brought home, except for ex-enemy countries, and the level of armed forces brought down, it should be possible to release one million men. How can the crucial question of man-power be discussed without relation to the problem of the Empire?

....

[pp. 33-43]

THE GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM (Features of the Home and Foreign Policy of the Capitalist Countries during the Epoch of the General Crisis of Capitalism) by E. Varga, The Labour Monthly, January & February 1947

THE home and foreign policy of the capitalist countries during the period of the general crisis of capitalism exhibits certain specific features which distinguish it from the policy of capitalism prior to this period. Stalin, in his speech of February 9, 1946, pointed out: “Marxists have more than once declared that the capitalist system of world economy conceals within itself elements of general crisis and war conflicts. . . . “In point of fact, during the periods when capitalism was still developing along an ascending line, Marx founded the theory of the inevitable collapse of capitalism, showing that capitalism is a social order that is historically transitory and far from the final form of the organisation of human society, as all bourgeois economists and politicians at that time maintained.

Historical experience demonstrates that the transition from one social order to another everywhere in the world demands a fairly prolonged period of time. This period can be called that of the general crisis of the particular social order in question. Lenin, as is well-known, called imperialism—capitalism in decay; it is quite obvious that to say that a social order is in decay is the same thing as saying that it is in a state of crisis.

In order to characterise the foreign and home policy of the capitalist countries during the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism, it is necessary, first of all, to make clear when this crisis began. It would, of course, be incorrect to designate any particular year, month or day as that when the general crisis of capitalism began. But on the basis of what Lenin has said of imperialism as capitalism in decay, the conclusion can be drawn

that the general crisis of capitalism began when the transition from free capitalism to monopolistic capitalism was completed in the most important countries of the capitalist world, i.e., approximately at the beginning of the twentieth century.

As has been pointed out in the *Short History of the C.P.S.U. (b)*, the first world war was already a reflection of the general crisis of capitalism. Although, however, the general crisis of capitalism existed already before the first world war, the existence of this crisis was not then a political factor such as could exercise a decisive influence on the foreign and home policy of the capitalist countries. Marxism teaches that with an alteration of the economic basis there is an alteration also of the political superstructure of society, of ideology, of the consciousness of the masses. But this process of change of the economic basis and of the political superstructure does not proceed simultaneously. The general phenomenon to which Marx, Lenin and Stalin pointed is the lag in the change of the political superstructure in relation to the change of economy. This, indeed, is understandable. Persons who experience the changes taking place in the economic basis do not immediately draw the corresponding political conclusions. The bourgeois revolutions constitute a forcible explosion, an adaptation of the political superstructure to an economic basis that has already long before undergone alteration.

As a matter of fact, prior to the first world war, apart from Lenin and the Bolsheviks in Russia, no one in the capitalist world saw the existence of the crisis of capitalism, or that the replacement of the capitalist system by a socialist system was a task that had become historically mature.

Besides the general tendency for political consciousness to lag behind the change in the economic basis, there existed also concrete historical causes why the fact of the existence of the general crisis of capitalism had still not penetrated into the consciousness of people. The half century which preceded the

first world war was a period of the greatest progress of capitalism. In this half century capitalist production increased approximately four-fold; it was a period of great technical progress, a period when the capitalist countries took possession of numerous colonies and thereby extended the capitalist market. The bourgeoisie utilised colonial super-profits to buy the labour aristocracy. During this period reformism struck deep roots in the labour movement. It should also be remembered that during this half century there were no wars between the Great Powers. The last war between Great Powers was the Franco-Prussian War; after it only a number of local and colonial wars took place.

The participants in the first world war were bourgeois countries of the same kind. There was, of course, a difference between Great Britain, France and America—countries in which the bourgeois revolution had been completed—and Germany, which still possessed strong relics of feudalism, and Tsarist Russia; but basically these were bourgeois countries of the same kind, the peoples of which were convinced that whatever the outcome of the war, all the countries participating in it would nevertheless remain bourgeois countries.

This “conception” was shattered by the October Revolution in Russia. It came with great unexpectedness for the bourgeoisie throughout the world (including the Russian bourgeoisie) and forth working-class outside Russia. The victory of the October Revolution at one stroke demonstrated to the whole world the existence of the general crisis of the capitalist system, which found its political reflection in the fact that the socialist country made its appearance alongside the capitalist countries. From that moment concern for the preservation of the capitalist system became the chief content of both the home and foreign policy of the bourgeoisie. The danger for capitalism was most real in the conquered countries, where the bourgeoisie that had lost the war was discredited and the governmental authority shattered, while

the defeated army did not form a reliable bulwark of bourgeois rule. The bourgeois capitalist world was faced with a problem: how to preserve the capitalist system.

The bourgeoisie attempted to solve this problem, first and foremost by making an alliance with the reformist labour leaders. The chief method used by the bourgeoisie was the isolation of the still young Communist parties from the basic masses of the workers. With this aim in view the bourgeoisie made a number of political concessions to the working-class: the bourgeoisie agreed to satisfy those demands of the working-class which were compatible with the preservation of bourgeois power. At the same time the basic factors of bourgeois power—private ownership of the means of production and governmental power—remained untouched. The bourgeoisie succeeded in isolating the Communist parties. Simultaneously it combined its political manoeuvres with the employment of the most savage terror, destroying part of the most revolutionary-inclined workers and left leaders of the working-class.

This policy can be most vividly traced in the history of Germany after the first world war. Parallel with it a struggle was conducted against the Soviet Union. This fight was waged by various means—ranging from various forms of ideological struggle to direct intervention, which, as is well known, proved unsuccessful.

Of course, the struggle against the Soviet Union does not exhaust the content of the foreign policy during that period; there continued to exist very acute internal imperialist contradictions. The chief of these in Europe were the contradictions between Great Britain and France. Britain did not want France to become the strongest power on the Continent and therefore supported Germany against France. The chief contradictions on a world scale were those between Britain and the U.S.A.

In the period between the two world wars, the general crisis of capitalism was considerably deepened. This was reflected in

the very profound and prolonged economic crisis of 1929-1933. This crisis was succeeded by a depression of a special type, characterised by mass unemployment on a huge scale. The economic features of the general crisis became very clear and tangible for the working masses in the capitalist countries. A political consequence of this was that fascism found it more and more difficult to fulfil its role as the bulwark of the bourgeoisie. In some countries, reformism proved to be incapable of fulfilling this role. In Germany, for the Communist party won a majority of the workers in the industrial centres—in Berlin and the Ruhr area. Under ions the German, Italian and Hungarian bourgeoisie was look for a new party, a new lever, for holding the working-class under its influence. Such a means was found in fascism, the fascist movement and the fascist party. Fascism is a political product of the general crisis of capitalism, and, as Stalin has pointed out, the passing to fascism indicates not only the strength, but the weakness of the bourgeoisie. Especially characteristic of the fascist movement in connection with the general crisis of capitalism is the fact that, as a rule, the fascists did not come forward as open defenders of capitalism, they did not say that they were backing capitalism, and that the capitalist order was the most perfect social order. On the contrary, they came forward everywhere with anti-capitalist demagogy, because, to come out with an open defence of capitalism in the conquered countries of Europe would have prevented them from acquiring influence among the toilers.

This circumstance confused, for a time, even some of the leading elements of the working-class. The theory that fascism is the power of the petty-bourgeoisie, the power of declassed elements, that it is Buonapartism, a power above classes, etc., acquired a certain popularity. All these views, of course, were completely devoid of reality. We know now that Italian, German and Hungarian fascism was financed by monopoly capitalists in these countries.

Fascism, of course, has its specific features in the different countries, for it is everywhere connected with the old reactionary forces of the given country, but basically fascism is the political expression of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. Fascism was victorious and came to power first and foremost in those countries which were conquered in the first world war or which were virtually in the position of conquered countries as, for example, Italy, despite the fact that she belonged to the camp of the victors. In those countries where the bourgeoisie achieved a new, forcible-division of the world, the bourgeoisie helped the fascist forces because the fascists were not only anti-Marxists, but also chauvinists who undertake the task of defending the capitalist social order and preparing the people for a new war. It should not be forgotten that after the first world war, the majority of the people in all the conquered countries did not want a new war; social-democracy was pacifically inclined, which also lowered its value for the aggressive bourgeoisie of these countries.

This article does not aim at giving an analysis of the causes the second world war. We shall limit ourselves merely to pointing out that the second world war, unlike the first, did not begin between countries of the same kind. On one side were the fascist aggressors, on the other—the democratic countries; moreover, in the camp of the latter were both the highly developed capitalist countries and the Soviet Union. It is obvious that this circumstance was bound to exert a strong influence on the entire home and foreign policy of the capitalist countries.

The fact that the Soviet Union and the highly-developed capitalist countries were in the same camp of powers fighting against the fascist aggressors meant that the struggle between the two systems in the democratic camp was temporarily mitigated, suspended; but this, of course, did not signify the end of the struggle. At the sometime, the struggle between the two systems assumed its most acute form when the fascist aggressors

attacked the Soviet Union. The Allies assisted the Soviet Union, but it cannot be said that, in so doing, they forgot about the difference in social systems. The secrecy about the atom bomb is sufficient as an example of this. In the sphere of domestic policies, the Communist parties of the countries of the democratic camp—Great Britain, America, etc.—on the basis of the just nature of the war, helped their governments in the war against the fascists, urged them towards the opening of the Second Front, despite the efforts of reactionary circles in the Allied countries. They defended their people from the danger of German fascism.

It goes without saying that the Anglo-American contradictions—the decisive inter-imperialist contradictions—were also relegated to the background during the war, while the contradictions between the democratic countries and the fascist aggressors came into the foreground; but the Anglo-American contradictions did not disappear and the struggle between America and Britain continued even during the war years. Thus, during the war the Americans took good care that the commodities exported from England should not include more than 10 per cent, of the materials which England received by lease-lend. During the war American capital endeavoured, not without success, to squeeze out British capital from its positions in Latin-America, and to obtain markets in India and the British Dominions. The Americans put on the black list of firms with which trade was forbidden, not only purely Argentine enterprises, but also those which had British capital. In the Near East, the struggle for oil continued also during the war.

When the second world war came to an end, the struggle for the preservation of the capitalist system once more became the chief problem in the domestic policy of the capitalist countries, just as it had been after the first world war. The bourgeoisie is scared by the general swing to the left in the working-class movement throughout the world after the end of the war. The

forms taken by this swing to the left, and its degree, differ in the different countries. If we take such first-ranking capitalist countries as the U.S.A. and Great Britain, it will be found that the swing to the left there was expressed above all in a strengthening of the reformist labour movement. As is known, the Labour Party in Britain won a victory in the Parliamentary elections. In the U.S.A. mass strikes are taking place and the trade union movement has grown stronger. In these countries, although a strengthening of the Communist parties has taken place, they are not yet an important factor in the domestic policy of these countries. The capitalist system in these countries has not been shaken in consequence of the war. This is understandable. In the countries which were victorious in the war, the bourgeoisie was not discredited, the State apparatus remained as before, while the army was even strengthened as compared with the pre-war period. One of the characteristic features of post-war policy is the strengthening of militarism in the Anglo-Saxon countries and especially in the U.S.A., which has become the most powerful military State of the capitalist world.

The situation is quite different in the countries of continental Europe. In these countries the bourgeoisie is discredited. In the life of one single generation, the population of the European countries has experienced two big wars. Now it is forced to starve and, moreover, it is, of course, the industrial workers, the intelligentsia and the urban population who are starving first and foremost, and not the bourgeoisie or the well-to-do peasantry. Under such circumstances, radicalisation, a swing leftward of the working masses and toilers in general, is inevitable. To this must be added, also, another factor, namely, the strong polarisation of capitalist society during the war. Millions of people from the middle strata—artisans, traders, middle bourgeoisie—lost their independence during the war and became workers. Inflation during and after the war reduces to

nothing the savings of the middle strata. The tendency towards the polarisation of modern society, to the formation of two camps—the big bourgeoisie and its immediate environment on the one hand, and workers, office employees, intelligentsia, who do not own property, on the other—is extremely strong. This tendency found expression in the defeat of the typical parties of the middle bourgeoisie of town and village as, for example, the Radical-Socialist Party in France or the Liberal Party in Britain. The bourgeoisie of the countries which were subjected to German occupation became particularly discredited, because, in the main, the big bourgeoisie of France, Belgium, Holland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary collaborated with the fascist invaders. True, there were isolated exceptions: there were some capitalists in each country who took part in the resistance movement. In the main, however, the bourgeoisie collaborated with the occupationists and this, side by side with the military defeat, was the chief factor in its discrediting.

In addition, however, a number of new, important political factors distinguish the present situation from that after the first world war. *One of these new factors is the changed role of the Communist parties of Europe.*

(Continued in next Issue).

AS is known, the Communist parties of Europe won great popularity as a result of the leading role they played in organising the resistance movements in all the European countries.

“The growth of the influence of the Communists,” declared Stalin in his interview with a *Pravda* correspondent on Churchill’s speech, “cannot be regarded as an accident.”

It is sufficient merely to recall the figures of the latest post-war elections in the European countries to be convinced of the tremendous growth of influence of the Communist parties in Europe. In France the Communist Party is practically the largest

political party in the country: at the elections on October 21, 1945, and June 2, 1946, it obtained more than five million votes. In Italy, the Communist Party has a membership of two million and is one of the leading political parties in the country. The influence of the Communists has grown considerably also in such countries as Holland, Belgium, Norway, Luxembourg. In Czechoslovakia the Communists obtained about 2.7 million votes and have become the strongest party in the country. In Hungary about 800,000 people voted for the Communist Party. In almost all the countries of the European continent Communists are taking part in the government and are playing a leading role in restoring the economy of their countries. Finally, Communist parties have achieved outstanding successes in Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, where they are the leading force in the Popular and Fatherland fronts.

In all the countries which were subjected to Hitlerite occupation and where the big bourgeoisie collaborated with the invaders, the resistance movement against the invaders was inevitably also a movement against the big bourgeoisie of the country concerned. The Communists gained their successes as a result of the policy which their parties are now pursuing in all countries on the basis of the experience of the first world war. The Communist parties defend the interests of all the working people—workers, office employees, peasants and intelligentsia. This policy makes impossible the old tactics of reaction—the isolation of the Communists from the working people.

The second new factor distinguishing the present situation from that created after the first world war is the radical change in the position and role of the Soviet Union in world politics. The growth of the influence and prestige of the U.S.S.R. as a world powerhead to be recognised even by the enemies of the Soviet Union.

After the end of the second world war the main line in the home and foreign policy of the capitalist countries is once more, as after the first world war, the defence of the capitalist system.

It should be mentioned that Great Britain followed this line during the war itself. Thus, for example, reactionary emigrant bourgeois governments found asylum in Britain. Preparations were carried on to ensure that after the liberation of the countries in question they would be able to return to their countries as the lawful bourgeois rulers.

After the liberation of a number of Western European countries, the question was raised of disarming the guerrillas and of excluding, as far as possible, the leaders of the resistance movement from the newly-formed governments. Of course, it is far more difficult now than it was after the first world war to come forward in open defence of the capitalist system in the form in which it existed before the war. In America, it is true, there are influential persons and groups, like Johnson, Senator Vandenberg and the circles supporting them, who call for the return to pre-war capitalism. But there are exceptions. In the main, it is everywhere admitted that a profound reform of the capitalist system is necessary; everywhere ideological trends are to be found, such as the striving for a planned economy under capitalism, the introduction of social insurance, the strengthening of State capitalism, etc.

In Britain, as is known, certain important branches of industry are being nationalised. The fact that the bourgeoisie itself is compelled to begin nationalisation of the means of production is, in itself, an admission that the system of private ownership of the means of production is obsolete. There is, of course, a vast difference, between nationalisation in Great Britain and nationalisation in those countries of Eastern Europe which may be called countries with democracy of a new type. In these countries, feudal survivals in the form of large-scale land ownership have been abolished, a considerable part of the means

of production has become State property and the State itself is not an apparatus of the rich for suppressing the working people, but operates in the interests of the latter.

In the countries of the old type of democracy, for example, in Great Britain, nationalisation does not alter the distribution of the national wealth and national income, because the owners receive compensation approximately equivalent to their former incomes. In the countries with a new type of democracy, on the other hand, nationalisation means a profound change in the distribution of the national income at the expense of the former owners of the nationalised means of production.

By what methods is the struggle being waged now to preserve the capitalist system, in the first place in Europe?

Firstly, attempts are being made to strengthen reformism in the labour movement, to convert once again the Social-Democratic Party and the reformist labour movement in Germany, Hungary, Italy and France into the main social bulwark of the bourgeoisie.

In the European countries, an intense struggle to win the Social-Democratic movement is developing between the progressive and reactionary forces. This constitutes the chief content of the domestic policy of the capitalist countries. At the same time, of course, this struggle goes on inside every social-democratic party, between the right and left wings, between the social-democratic working masses, who are much more inclined to march together with the Communists, and the reformist leaders of the Social-Democratic parties, who are endeavouring to revive Social-Democracy in its former, pre-war form.

This struggle can best be followed from the example of Germany. A considerable part of social-democracy has broken with the former policy of its party and called for unity with the Communists. On April 21-22, 1946, a unity congress of the Social-Democratic and Communist Parties of Germany took place, at which a united party of the working-class was formed—

the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. A large majority of the Social-Democrats in the Soviet-occupied zone were in favour of the amalgamation of the two workers' parties. Despite the counter efforts of the British and American occupation authorities, the union of the Social-Democrats and Communists in the Soviet-occupied zone met with a warm response also in Western Germany.

The emergence of a united party of the working-class in Germany a serious blow to the reformist movement. It is natural, therefore, that all the reactionary elements are up in arms against the new party. Ruling circles in Britain and the U.S.A. immediately came out against the unification of Communists and Social-Democrats and are now giving decisive support to the group of reactionary social-democratic leaders headed by Schumacher, who are trying to revive the old reformist Social-Democracy in the Western zones of Germany for defence of the capitalist system of society.

It is characteristic that the Schumacher group has been joined by the majority of the old compromised leaders of Social-Democracy, such as Severing, Noske, Paul Loebe, etc., who are tried and tested defenders of the bourgeoisie. The British press openly calls for reliance on this wing of Social-Democracy.

Undoubtedly, the further internal political development of the capitalist countries to a considerable degree depends on the outcome of this struggle to win over Social-Democracy and on the struggle within Social-Democracy.

The second line defence of capitalism lies in increasing the influence of religion, of the church. The Catholic Church, headed by the Pope, is creating something in the nature of a "Catholic International." The Vatican recently appointed as Cardinals thirty-two prominent Catholics of various countries in order to increase its influence in those countries. The same effort is characteristic also of the Protestant Church. Definite attempts

are made to use the Moslem Church as a means of political struggle. The clearest expression of this is seen in India.

Most peculiar tactics are adhered to by the bourgeoisie.

In those European countries where the extreme Right-wing reactionary parties are prohibited, the bourgeoisie employs very special tactics. In those countries the bourgeoisie tries to influence the most Right-wing of the permitted Left parties and to get into its hands the leadership of these parties and to obtain a majority for them in the country. A classic example of these tactics is the behaviour of reaction during the recent elections in Hungary. The closest to the Right of the Left parties in Hungary is the Smallholders Party. It was found, after the elections, that this party had obtained the majority of the votes in Budapest, in districts where there is not a single bit of land suitable for cultivation. The whole bourgeoisie and those elements which still follow the bourgeoisie voted for it.

Capitalism's third line defence, which so far is manifested still in a very veiled form, is encouragement of the fascist movement. If it is true that fascism is the political expression of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, it is to be expected that fascism will be revived. Lenin pointed out that the domination of monopoly capitalism inevitably engenders reaction. In his article entitled "On a caricature of Marxism," he wrote: "The political superstructure of the new economy, of monopoly capitalism (imperialism is monopoly capitalism) is a swing from democracy to reaction. Free competitions accompanied by democracy. Monopoly is accompanied by political reaction."

In the capitalist countries at the present time a certain revival of political reaction and fascism is undoubtedly taking place. There are also fascist countries, such as Spain and Portugal. In addition, there is an illegal fascist movement in countries where fascism formerly ruled: Germany, Italy, Hungary, etc.

But there are undoubtedly signs of the revival of the fascist movement in the democratic countries also. Evidence of this is the activity of the fascist party in Britain, the Ku Klux Klan and other fascist groups in America, etc. In Greece, where the British virtually control policy, after dozens of changes of government Royalist reactionaries have finally been established in power; objectively and subjectively they differ little from fascists.

Of course, in the countries with a new type of democracy the revival of fascism is made very difficult because agrarian reform has done away with the landowning class and because nationalisation of the basic means of production has undermined the economic power of the big bourgeoisie. If we add to this the fact that State power in these countries is in the hands of progressive forces, it becomes clear that the revival of fascism there is made extremely difficult.

As always, the domestic policy of the capitalist countries at the present stage is closely interwoven with the foreign policy.

The methods of struggle against the Soviet Union at the present time differ, of course, from those employed after the first World War. "Intervention" in the old sense is impossible. But the reactionary forces of the different countries are conducting an intensified campaign against the Soviet Union, and are endeavouring to isolate her and build up an anti-Soviet bloc.

In his statement on May 27, 1946, Molotov pointed to certain extremely characteristic tendencies in British and American postwar policy which had been shown during the preparation of the peace treaties. Molotov repulsed the attempts of the reactionary forces to belittle the importance of the Soviet Union and to minimise its role in the post-war world.

Very typical of the policy of the bourgeoisie is the way British reaction uses the Right wing of Social-Democracy in Europe forth struggle against the U.S.S.R. Naturally, the Labour Party and the Labour Government are the most suitable for using this wing of Social-Democracy to achieve the foreign-political

aims of the British bourgeoisie. In this respect, the existence of a Labour Government is more advantageous to the British bourgeoisie than a Conservative Government would be. To this must be added that, whereas supporters of the Labour Party sometimes came out against the foreign policy of the Conservative Government, and thus there existed a potential opposition to this policy, the Conservative Party has no grounds for opposing Bevin's foreign policy. Of course, the British workers do not approve of this reactionary policy of Bevin and the Labour Government. This dissatisfaction finds expression in the opposition to Bevin's policy within the Parliamentary Labour Party.

Today also, the struggle between two systems is not the sole expression of the foreign policy of the capitalist countries. Imperialist contradictions between the big capitalist countries, in the first place between Britain and America, are reviving, despite the fact that on a number of international issues these Powers form a common diplomatic bloc. The British-American contradictions, which were the basic contradictions of the capitalist world before the second World War, or, rather, before German fascist aggression became a menace to both Britain and America, have since the defeat of Germany once again become the decisive contradictions within the capitalist world. American policy strives now first and foremost to smash the British colonial empire and to win equal conditions for American capital in the competitive struggle throughout the world. This is its chief aim.

The striving to put an end to the British, French and Dutch Empires shows itself in a great variety of forms. During the war one manifestation of this was the draft British-American Alliance, the proposal for joint tutelage over colonies, etc. Sometimes this striving even assumes ludicrous forms. For example, an American publicist recently wrote a book in which he sharply criticised British, French and Dutch colonial policy.

After such a criticism one might have thought that he would propose that the colonial peoples should be given their independence. Instead, however, the author declares that the colonial peoples are not yet ripe for independence and proposed that all of them should themselves select their guardians, but should not have the right to select as their guardian the imperialist Power which rules them at the present time, i.e., the British colonies may not select Britain as their guardian. The author assumes that they will all most certainly choose the Americans, because the latter, he thinks, behave so well towards colonies and can ensure their prosperity.

The movement against the colonial regime has become stronger. An important factor in this is that the British, French and Dutch have lost their prestige in the colonial countries; the colonial peoples no longer feel their former fear of them. The colonial peoples took part in armed struggle side by side with the troops of some imperialist countries against other countries; they witnessed the defeat and capture of American, British and Dutch soldiers.

Economic causes also exert an influence in strengthening the anti-imperialist movement. During the war some of the colonies grew very strong economically; some colonial countries became financially independent of Britain and themselves became creditors of her. It goes without saying that public opinion in the Soviet Unionist in favour of satisfying the just demands of the colonial peoples.

The plan for a Western bloc is also connected with the colonial problem. A Western bloc which would unite Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Portugal and perhaps some of the Scandinavian countries in one political alliance is directed first and foremost against the Soviet Union and represents an attempt to revive the notorious *cordon sanitaire*, only not now on the frontiers of the Soviet Union, where it is politically impossible,

owing to the existence of friendly neighbouring countries, but in Western Europe.

But another aspect of this Western bloc should be borne in mind. A Western bloc comprising Britain, France, Belgium, Holland and Portugal would unite 95 per cent, of the colonies of the world. Its creation would be an attempt to defend the colonies against the endeavour of the U.S.A. to smash the old colonial regime and assimilate these territories economically, and also an attempt to strengthen resistance to the national liberation movement in the colonies.

Naturally, within the limits of this article it is only possible to state the most fundamental lines of domestic and foreign policy during the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism. A full elaboration of this theme, and especially of the political consequences of the second World War, is a task requiring a series of special studies.

The Labour Monthly, January 1947, [pp. 23-38]

The Labour Monthly, February, [pp. 56-61]

**Notes of the Month, *America and Britain*
by R.P.D., *The Labour Monthly*, April 1947**

PRESIDENT TRUMAN has proclaimed his challenge to the free world. His speech to Congress on March 12 extends in its significance far beyond Greece, Turkey and the Middle East. It stakes the claim of the Wall Street millionaires and the high-power generals who today control the American administrative machine to dominate the political system of every country in the world and lay down for them their "way of life." It stakes their claim to bolster up every corrupt and reactionary regime from monarchist-fascism in Greece to the Kuomintang clique in China by every means of open intervention, economic, financial and military. It stakes their claim to impose their technical, economic and military missions and establish their strategic bases thousands of miles from American shores in every continent. And, taken in conjunction with the Waco speech a week earlier, it stakes the claim of the United States as "the giant of the economic world" to impose its economic system on the rest of the world and lay down "the future pattern of economic relations." Such are the simple, modest claims of the little lawyer from Kansas, suddenly pitchforked into the limelight by the death of Roosevelt. A long road has been travelled since Roosevelt set his signature to those accords of Teheran, by which Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union proclaimed their "determination that our nations shall work together in war and in the peace that will follow . . . we are sure that our concord will make it an enduring peace." A different path is being attempted by the reckless aggressive forces which at the moment control American politics and which have made Truman their wax puppet.

Lafayette in Reverse

America is repaying Europe for Lafayette in strange coin. A century and three-quarters ago the officer from monarchist France sailed to Georgetown and arrived in Philadelphia to fight on the side of the American Revolution and assist the victory of the insurgent Republic against the mercenary Hanoverian soldiers of King George. Today the United States, no longer the young insurgent Republic, but grown old and corrupt and rotting in the last stages of imperialist decay, sends its dollars, its arms and its military missions to maintain monarchy in Europe, and to preserve on his throne a King George who was smuggled into his country in a foreign plane and whose regime was established by foreign tanks and bombers against a people struggling to be free. The statue of Washington is thrown down from its pedestal and is replaced by the new idol of King George. The Monroe doctrine is cast to the four winds. The old Monroe doctrine proclaimed that no European Power should be allowed to impose its political system or domination in any State of the American Continent, and that conversely the United States would not intervene in any way in any question of the internal political regime in any European State. That doctrine was originally the weapon of self-defence of the young American democracy to protect itself and the rising democratic forces which were striving to overthrow the old European colonial system in Latin America against the intrigues and aggression of the Holy Alliance in Europe. Today the United States seeks to lead the new Holy Alliance against the rising democratic forces of the advanced democracies in Europe. The wheel has turned full circle. And today there is need of a new Monroe doctrine for the self-protection of the peoples of Europe and Asia against American intervention and aggression.

Neither Kaiser Nor Hitler

It is doubtful if in all the records of international politics, whether in the most flagrant “mailed fist” “shining armour” speeches of a Kaiser, or the megalomaniac frenzies of a Hitler, there has ever before been set out in any speech of a responsible leader of a Great Power, such an open and even nakedly proclaimed programme of world domination, expansion, intervention and dictation as in this Presidential Address of March 12, uttered in the prim precise accents of the mild Truman. Once again the aims of world domination are decked out in the threadbare trappings of the holy crusade against Communism and the Soviet Union, as in the technique made familiar by Hitler. The world will not be so easily deceived twice. The challenge is plain and unmistakable to every free people and to every people struggling for freedom. The peoples of the world today are awake and marching forward along the path of freedom, to build their lives anew and to set up a new social order based on brotherhood and justice. They who have been through the fires of hell to break Hitler are not disposed to bow their heads to the dollar dictators. But if the Presidential Address of March 12 sounds its challenge for every nation, it sounds above all the hour of choice for Britain. For Britain is still officially bound to the crazy chariot of American imperialism. But even the dullest in Britain are beginning to understand that, within the yoke of an unequal partnership, the sharp edge of that policy of expansion and domination is directed not least against Britain and the countries of the British Empire; and that, while the British people are struggling in the grip of cruel economic difficulties and under the intolerable strain of reactionary imperialist adventures, the embrace of the Anglo-American bloc is the embrace of death.

Hypocrisy Enthroned

Once again, as with the Kaiser's dreams of Berlin-Byzantium-Baghdad, and Hitler's dreams of "the march to the East," the Near and Middle East becomes the central scene of imperialist aggression and expansionist dreams. But when the United States sends its battleships and warplanes to the Eastern Mediterranean, all pretences of the needs of security and "living space" are thrown to the winds. The Dardanelles are no life-line of the United States. The United States has no lack of "living space." And so hypocrisy has to reach a height which would leave the Kaiser or Hitler pale with envy, when President Truman invokes the "defence of democracy" to maintain the foreign-imposed monarchist-fascist regime in Greece, based on the quislings who served Hitler's occupation during the war, or the foreign-subsidised brutal autocracy in Turkey which made its treaty with Hitler during the war. Only the prophets of the Ku Klux Klan and lynch law could here invoke their divine right to impose their "way of life" by arms and subsidised intervention against other nations. Greece is to be "defended" against the imaginary menace of a non-existent aggression, at the very moment when it is the victim of a real aggression which has occupied its land with foreign troops and under cover of those troops imposed a puppet regime which maintains a reign of terror against its people. Greece today, like Spain and Czechoslovakia ten years ago, like Spain still more than ever today—Greece and Spain today are the acid test of real support of democracy and of the freedom of nations. There could be no more sickening international transaction than the negotiations which passed between the British and American ruling authorities, bargaining over the body of Greece for sixty million pounds. That depth of shame was only surpassed by the open calculations of the holders of the American moneybags, when they declared that they were prepared to put up the cash provided Britain supplied the man-power to continue to police and hold

down the Greek people. The British people have still their word to say on these transactions made in their name. For the people of this country have no wish to be the hired gangsters and gunmen of American imperialism, maintained on a stinted ration to do the dirty work of policing and holding down other peoples all over the world, while the American profiteers draw the spoils.

Timing the Blow

Significant is the timing of this offensive. The Presidential declaration of March 12, proclaiming the right of lawless intervention, without even pretence of United Nations sanction, in the internal affairs of any country whose people might be adjudged guilty of communist tendencies (and the term "communist," in the eyes of the Inquisition grandees of the Committee on Un-American Practices, includes, not only anything socialist or liberal or savouring of planned economy, but anything to the left of Diehard Republicanism[^] was made on the self-same day as the climax of the House of Commons debate which was revealing all the sores of Britain's economic dilemmas and the miseries resulting from a grandiloquent foreign policy pursued by an impoverished and overstrained country. It was made immediately after the opening of the Moscow Conference, which was to test the capacity of Four Power co-operation for the settlement of Germany on lines already pledged by international agreements; and the character of the American approach to such co-operation had already been ominously indicated by General Marshall's statement prior to his departure expressing himself as "very doubtful" of the conference achieving any result, and by the appointment as chief Republican adviser to the delegation of the notorious J. F. Dulles, former business associate of Germany monopoly interests under Nazism, who had just openly proclaimed his programme for a Western European Federation, including Germany or Western Germany, on the basis of the Ruhr, as a

bulwark against Communism and the Soviet Union. Finally, the offensive was launched at the very moment when British-Soviet negotiations had been reopened for the reinforcement of the British-Soviet Treaty.

“Heirs of the British Empire”

The American press made no concealment of their interpretation of the significance of the moment chosen for launching the offensive. In lengthy dispatches Britain was described as “down and out.” “An old run-down country” was the description of the *New York Times* London correspondent, who contrasted the backwardness of British factories and technique, not only with American factories and technique, but also with European factories and technique, and forecast that the present crisis may become “a steady slide to conditions of poverty unknown in the modern world in modern times.” “Collapse of the British attempts at reconstruction is not inconceivable,” was the verdict of Walter Lippmann; “it is even probable if heroic measures are not taken in time.” The basic trouble, declares the *New York Herald-Tribune*, is that “Britain’s world commitments are greater than her present economic and financial strength. It may prove impossible to beat the man-power shortage without considerable reduction in the armed forces.” The journal then speculates whether this will not mean Britain leaving the Middle East: “United States policy is inevitably affected.” From all this analysis and reasoning follows the grand conclusion. The long-predicted hour is supposed to have arrived when the United States takes over the legacy of the British Empire. The notorious Karl von Wiegand, described as the “Dean of American Foreign Correspondents,” writes in the Hearst press:—

The British Empire is passing into history. The great pageant of British power, glory and grandeur which paraded over and dominated the world for more than two centuries is coming to an

end. . . . America is the natural heir to the legacy of power and world leadership so long held by the British Empire.

The True Heirs

Not so fast. The greedy heirs-designate, or self-designated heirs of the supposedly dissolving British Empire are licking their lips over the legacy which they believe is falling into their laps. They are a little premature; or, to tell the truth, they are a little out of date in their ambitions. They have failed to note and study sufficiently the required reading for all would-be world empire mongers in the present age—the fate of Hitler and his companions. They have failed to ponder adequately why the super-perfect streamlined demagogic, military and pseudo-scientific technique of Hitler, which seemed to have moved every piece into position and to have spread its corruption in every ruling class of the Western world, nevertheless miscarried and ended in ignominious catastrophe, because it omitted to take into account one factor above all—the will of the peoples to freedom, and the decisive leadership of the working-class, of Marxism, with its highest embodiment in the Soviet Union, to mobilise that will throughout the world for victory, even in those countries where the ruling class had sunk in corruption and betrayal. They have forgotten the five hundred and fifty millions of Britain, the Dominions, India and the empire countries, who have no reason to lament the passing of the empire of domination and slavery, but who have no intention to fall victims to the new American overlords, but are already pressing forward as the true heirs to win mastery of their countries. Not the least significant lesson of the Empire Conference of Communist Parties held in London in the beginning of March was its demonstration of the rising strength of the people's movements which are pressing forward with close fraternal understanding and co-operation to take over in all the countries of the moribund Empire.

End of the Bevin Road

Nor is the warning signal of Truman's proclamation lost on the British people or even on those sections of the British ruling class which have not yet sold out to the American paymasters. Just as Hitler waved the flag of the grand crusade against Communism and the Soviet Union to cover his drive against the British Empire, so the American chauvinists sound the big drum about the menace of Communism and the aggressive intentions of the Soviet Union, at the same time as their actual drive is most actively pressed forward on every side, from East Asia to the Middle East and South America, to penetrate the former strongholds of British capital and the British Empire. Just as Chamberlain swallowed the bait, and was ready to give everything away along the path of appeasement, so long as it was wrapped in an anti-Soviet dressing, amid the applause of the gentry behind him, so Bevin, inspired by the same neurotic anti-communist frenzy of Transport House, eagerly swallows the same bait and is ready to give everything away in appeasement of American imperialism, amid the applause of the same gentry who applauded Munich. But the path of appeasement proves stony and costly with every week that passes. The full economic squeeze is only beginning, with the approaching Trade Conference to shatter inter-empire trading arrangements, the approaching date for the convertibility of sterling into dollars, and the approaching exhaustion of the American loan. In vain Bevin may once have sought to thump the table like a twentieth century Palmerston, or to inflate his chest like a Kerensky; he has to end by piteously complaining that he lacks the coal and the man-power to implement his foreign policy. The British people also want coal, but not necessarily for the purpose of Mr. Bevin's foreign policy.

An Anxious Note

In vain the Foreign Office may formally declare its “complete concurrence” with Truman’s declaration. But its spokesman has next day to admit under questioning in Parliament that “naturally, we were not consulted.” And the alarm which begins to spread in new circles over the bankruptcy of Bevinism is revealed, not merely in the debate on the economic situation, but in the anxious note of the editorials of such papers as *The Times* and the *Daily Herald* over the Truman declaration. *The Times* finds it ‘revolutionary’ “in ‘the blunt readiness it expresses to go ahead with a controversial American policy, without preliminary Great Power agreement or discussion by the United Nations.’” *The Daily Herald*, official organ of the Labour Government, finds the declaration “grave,” “disturbing” and “frightening,” and goes on to declare (March 15, 1947):—

Our first reaction to President Truman’s speech was one of uneasiness. Our second thoughts are no happier. . . .

The attitude of Britain should be one not of complacency, but of anxiety; it becomes more than ever necessary that she should throw herself heart and soul into the strengthening of U.N.O. and into the parallel task of mediation between America and Russia.

Hard facts begin to teach lessons even in quarters where Communist warnings were at first ignored. But it is more than a question of “mediation between America and Russia.” It is a question of ranging Britain with the camp of the progressive forces of the world, which will finally win the day, even in the end in America.

Capitulation or Independence

The choice before Britain is inescapable, and is being driven home with a physical relentlessness even of the very elements. This choice is at once economic and political; it expresses itself equally in domestic and foreign policy. Either continued

capitulation to American imperialism, along the path of the reactionary Anglo-American bloc, which places crippling burdens on British resources and man-power, and by which Britain would lose all possibility of independent economic reconstruction, waste its strength on policing jobs for the Anglo-American bondholders, sink deeper in the mire of debt and mortgage its last resources to the American creditor, and finish up a suppliant dependant on American charity, a hired condottiere among the nations, and finally a military outpost and atom bomb base for the plans of American war against a Socialist Europe. This is the glorious future which modern Toryism, already increasingly sold out to its wealthier American partner, prepares for Britain—the path of Fulton. Or the alternative path of independence and social reconstruction; to break the shackles of the Anglo-American bloc and end the reactionary overseas commitments; to return to the basis of the British-Soviet Treaty and Crimea and Potsdam; to concentrate all strength on rebuilding British economy; and to march forward in unity with the European peoples who are building their lives anew, with the Soviet Union and with the peoples of the dependent empire who are pressing their way to freedom, to shape with them a stable and prosperous economic and political future which need have no fear of the threats of American reaction.

Our Allies in America

Nor is such a policy in any degree hostile to the progressive aims of the American people. On the contrary, it is the best aid to all the progressive sections of the American people, which are equally struggling against the present dominance of the blackest monopolist reaction, and striving to bring back America to the path of Roosevelt, of Three Power co-operation and of the United Nations. The American Colossus, the Colossus of American monopolist reaction, which its chauvinist

propagandists seek to paint in such terrifying and awe-inspiring colours of irresistible might to paralyse the nations into panic and submission, is not so terrible, if the free nations stand firmly together before its threats. In face of all the intensified war of nerves, the dark threats of atom bombs to wipe out every Russian town and factory, the concentration of bases and strategic preparations on every Soviet border, the Soviet Union has shown its cool confidence by accelerating its demobilisation, concentrating on peaceful tasks of economic reconstruction, and instructing its scientists to devote their main efforts in the coming year, not to the invention of new war weapons as in America, but to cancer research. Every visitor to the newly advancing free countries of Eastern Europe, to Czechoslovakia and Jugoslavia and Bulgaria, which have faced the American threats and refused to be intimidated, which in the face of the appalling economic difficulties are by their own strength building up their resources for a prosperous future, has spoken of the atmosphere of exhilaration, of exulting joy and freedom and self-confidence, in spite of every difficulty and hardship, and has contrasted it with the still widespread moods of depression, bewilderment, frustration and anxiety in this country, where the burden of the old order is still heavy and the change is only beginning. But the change is coming also in this country, and finally even in America. It is our urgent task in this country, in co-operation with all progressive sections in the United States, to hasten the change of policy which can guarantee the future and prevent the forces of darkness letting loose their final frenzy on the world.

Clay Feet

The Colossus has feet of clay. The domination and the aggressive plans of the tiny handful of giant monopolists who rule America and have gathered the majority of the wealth and productive resources of the wealthiest nation in the world into

their grasp, and dream to use their mighty power to shatter all the hopes and plans of mankind for a future of social co-operation, are built on shaky and already trembling foundations. They live in panic fear of the approaching economic crisis whose inevitable onset, arising from their bankrupt system, they can already see and find no way to escape. They know the American people do not want a new war and that they resist even the suggestion of" drafting American soldiers to new commitments overseas. The institutions and traditions of America are those of a commercial nation, which it would take heavy internal changes to transform. Hence the ruling finance capitalist oligarchy dream to achieve their aims of world domination by the power of the almighty dollar, by the giving and withholding of billions of credits; they dream to achieve their aims by the threat of new forms of press-button war, by the atom bomb and miraculous new weapons, without committing their population to the dreaded hazard of full-scale war against free peoples who stand for the aim of socialism; they seek to use and subsidise and control the troops of other nations. Herein lies their fatal weakness. Money will not buy everything. In the world today the money of the rich moneylenders is no longer the only power; for the free peoples of the advanced democracies have learned to stand up to its threats and build their own economies. Four hundred million dollars will not buy domination of the Middle East; it will not end the revolt of the Greek people, or hold in submission fifteen million Turks and forty million Arabs. Already the hesitations and cross-currents alike in the ranks of the Republicans and the Democrats reveal their fears that this commitment will only be the beginning of further commitments, drawing them deeper and deeper into the morass. The time is visibly approaching when the British people will no longer allow their soldiers to be used for the sordid aims of the Anglo-American bloc, of the oil companies and concession mongers. When that time comes, the inflated outlines of the American

Colossus, which hangs like a nightmare over the world, will begin to be pricked. It is, above all, here in this country that the key lies to the future of the world's freedom—and our own.

Economics of Liberation

The test of every nation in these coming years is the test of economic reconstruction. This is, above all, true for us in Britain. Liberation from dependence on America and economic reconstruction go hand in hand. If we would be free, we must build our own self-supporting economic basis to stand on our own feet. We must end the old parasitic basis of imperialist tribute which has led for the past three-quarters of a century to increasing neglect of the country's resources, industry and agriculture, to technical backwardness and chronic depression, and which already before the war was turning one half of England into a pleasure park for the rich and the other half into derelict areas. It is the bankruptcy of this system which we are living through today. Now it is becoming obvious to all that we must place production first, and give the basic producers first place in our country. The old apologists of imperialism, whether Tory or reformist, still mumble and fumble and try to attribute the present troubles to the consequences of the war, and to suggest that with a little extra effort everything will become normal again. But the old normal conditions of imperialist England will never return. The blast of harsh experience is shattering all easy-going dreams, and is compelling the whole nation, including the labour movement in the first place, to face facts and think afresh. All the illusions of reformism, which were built on the assumption of imperialism, have received a merciless blow. The shallow, flashy, brittle formulas of Fabianism and Keynesism, of easy panaceas without inconvenience to any one, are shrivelling up in the ordeal of the present tornado. We are brought face to face with the stark realities of production, not of make-believe manipulations and

parliamentary legerdemain and civil service adjustments, but of men and labour and materials—the world of concrete realities where Marxism alone is master and guide and where the working-class must lead. We must win the battle of production, breaking every vested interest that stands in the way, if we are to win the battle of national survival and independence.

White Paper Fiasco

The weakness of the Government's White Paper, "Economic Survey for 1947," is that it completely fails to face the realities of the present situation. It rehearses at length some of the most familiar superficial facts of the situation (while hiding the most important) with the insufferable patronising air of an Economic League lecturer instructing an audience of ignorant workers. It stresses the urgency; it speaks of desirable aims and requirements. But by treating the whole problem as primarily an outcome of two wars it completely fails to touch the heart of the disease. It does not dare to face the real factors which are crippling reconstruction. It slides over the Economic Consequences of Mr. Bevin. It makes no attempt to set out a plan of action. Its "targets" are only desirable requirements with no relation to a positive policy or plan. Therefore it has completely failed to ring the bell or evoke a response. It was only necessary to listen to Mr. Attlee's broadcast to feel the helplessness of Utopian reformism when required to grapple with an urgent concrete situation. The plea that the principles of so-called "democratic planning" make it in practice impossible to plan only covers the surrender to big business interests at home and to the squandering of resources in imperialist adventures abroad. Britain alone among the progressive nations of Europe remains without an overall economic plan.

An Unfruitful Debate

Therefore the House of Commons debate turned into a hollow exchange of platitudes and polemics, and failed to dispel the clouds of uncertainty and confusion. It does not make sense for the House of Commons to debate for three days on the desperate urgency of the economic situation, and then next day to vote eighteen million pounds of precious foreign exchange to maintain the monarchist ex-fascist armed forces in Greece. It does not make sense to speak of the urgency of increasing home food production, and then to export three times the agricultural machinery of pre-war. It does not make sense to speak of the urgent need of coal, and then to export coal to Franco or desperately needed mining machinery. It does not make sense to speak of the urgent need of raising productivity and then to place capital re-equipment low down in the list below the requirements of military expenditure placed at the top of the list. It does not make sense to warn against increases of wages, and to ignore the enormously greater increase of profits and capital appreciations. The list of crazy contradictions could be infinitely extended. The whole economic structure of this country, both in respect of home production, balanced use of resources and man-power, and in respect of foreign trade and use of foreign exchange, is still topsy-turvy and hopelessly distorted; and only a strengthened Government, really representative of the best forces of the entire labour movement, with the full weight of a united working-class behind it, can take the necessary measures to remedy the situation.

Tory Strategy

Toryism has its “plan” after its own fashion: the old plan of deflation, rising prices and lowered standards of the workers, and dependence on America, with final calculations on the deepening of the crisis and American financial pressure to compel a reconstruction of the Government and a Tory come-

back. The danger is that the Government Front Bench, by failing to present an alternative plan, slips into capitulation to the Tory plan, towards a coalition in practice in economic policy, alongside the existing coalition in foreign policy. The great Tory financial interests are already tied up with American financial interests, just as their ruling families are half-American by intermarriage. When it comes to the problem of coal, their solution is "Import American coal" (at £10 a ton). When it comes to the problem of man-power, their solution is: "Import foreign labour." When it comes to the problem of their own political eclipse, their solution is to trust to the deepening of the economic and financial crisis, when the American loan is approaching exhaustion; they openly calculate that the country, still economically helpless and dependent, will have to go cap in hand to the American paymaster, and that the lords of Wall Street will then insist, as a condition of any further assistance, on a reconstruction of the Government to bring Toryism back to effective power. The present dominant pro-American sections of the ruling Tory circles have become the agents of American power and the enemies of the country. Despising in their hearts Labour Britain, knowing they have lost touch with the people, seeing no future for the country, and looking to Washington as their metropolis, they see their own class future as the agents and bailiffs of American power and penetration, and are prepared to sacrifice for this the interests and future of the British people. The story of Toryism and treason is a long one, from the days of Carson to the days of the "Red Book," whose names the Government still protects from publication. Today it is approaching its climax. This is the strategy of a dying class, which is already on the way to joining the ranks of White emigres in the service of a foreign power. This is not the path which the people of Britain will follow.

Our Path

The people of Britain are not dead or dying. They are very much alive and determined to solve their problems. They will not follow the Tory path of capitulation to the American financiers. Changes will have to come, very much more far-reaching than are yet contemplated, if we are to master the present crisis. We must organise and carry out a national economic plan, which puts first things first, gives first priority to the basic industries and re-equipment of industry, together with the protection and raising of social standards, and cuts out the present waste of resources and manpower in luxury and non-essential directions. We must immediately bring to an end the senseless waste of resources and man-power and foreign exchange on imperialist adventures and subsidies for reaction abroad. We must end the crazy system of trading which sends abroad the most urgently needed productive machinery in order to pay for luxury imports of high-priced exotic fruits, Hollywood films or Swiss skiing tours of the sons and daughters of the rich. We must develop the closest trading relations, and integrate our planning and economy, with the countries which are building up their planned economy, with the new democracies in Europe, and with the Socialist Soviet Union. We must change the whole attitude to the colonial empire, and work to plan mutually beneficial economic development with a free India and with independent or autonomous former colonial countries. All this basic re-direction of the main lines of economic and political strategy to meet the present crisis will undoubtedly require a reconstruction of the Government—along very different lines from those contemplated by Toryism. The Communist Party Congress has set out in clear and concrete form the policy that must be followed. The fight for this policy is the fight for the future of Britain.

“Open the Door, Richard”

Sometimes the songs which win the passing popular appeal of the moment reflect, in however twisted a form, not only the mood of a moment, but the history of an era. Just as the “silver lining” and the “long trail” reflected the dark, interminable torment of the first world war, and the “spare a dime” and the “dancing with tears in my eyes” reflected the onset of the world economic crisis so today the strain of “Open the door, Richard” has spread from the United States to catch the ear of millions. Mankind is indeed knocking at the door of the illimitable plenty and liberation which modern science and technique already visibly holds within reach, and at the same moment finds itself still struggling and writhing within the conditions of the most primitive shortage and hardship to an extent scarcely equalled within modern times. But it is not unfitting that this song should arise precisely in the United States, where the people, in the midst of the greatest accumulation and abundance of wealth, are the most anxious, uncertain and fearful for the future, shut out from the confidence and security which their technical advance should bring them, beginning to become conscious of the burning blast of scorn and hatred which the policy of their rulers is bringing on them from the free peoples of the world, and not yet finding the path of political liberation and purpose which can alone give them hope and inspiration for the future. It is the free peoples of the new democracies of Europe who already, in the midst of poverty, destruction, privation and united endeavour, have found the key and opened the door; they are on the other side. And the British people have shown, and are showing, in these hours of trial their unshakable determination that they also will find the key and open the door to lead the way to that new world which is waiting to be won. R. P. D. March 19, 1947.

[pp. 97-108]

Notes of the Month, *Six Months of Decision* by R.P.D., *The Labour Monthly*, June 1947

SIX months of decision have opened. Between the Moscow Conference of April and the London Conference of November steps have to be taken which will determine the future of Three-Power co-operation, the settlement of Germany and Europe, and the safeguarding of peace against the offensive of those who are seeking to overturn the results of the war and prepare a new war. The Moscow Conference registered disagreement of the Powers on the major issues of Germany and the peace. But it did not register the breakdown and rupture which the offensive of reaction had planned and which the Truman Declaration had been designed to precipitate (Dulles, Republican Adviser to the United States delegation, proposed immediate break-up of the Conference, following the Truman Declaration). The firm, unperturbed and conciliatory stand of the Soviet Union in the face of unexampled provocation and bellicose threats averted disaster and saved the situation. All the unresolved issues were remitted for six months to a fresh conference. Precious time was thereby gained for world democracy to exert its influence in order that wiser counsels should prevail. But the time is short.

Whither Bevin?

In his report on the Moscow Conference to Parliament Bevin declared that, if agreement were not reached at the London Conference in November,

“No one can prophesy the course the world will take. I regard that conference as probably the most vital in the world’s history.”

Yet in the rest of his speech he showed no glimmering of a positive policy to resolve the deadlock and restore Three-Power co-operation. He remained the faint and lifeless echo of His Master’s Voice, the Wall Street millionaires, without hope or

perspective. He showed no realisation of the bankruptcy of his own policy which had been revealed at Moscow, as it is being revealed in Western Germany, at Geneva, in Egypt, in Palestine or at New York. He showed no realisation how critical the present situation is for Britain or for Britain's economic recovery. The first faint signs of a return to sanity after Moscow, the new attitude to Poland, the ratification of the Anglo-Polish Trade Treaty, which will bring coal and food to Britain, the more positive attitude to the British-Soviet trade negotiations, these encouraging and fruitful signs of a possible and practical alternative were not followed up in his speech by any basic review or re-orientation of policy. That change has still to come.

Upper and Nether Millstones

Yet no country has a more vital concern and need for the restoration of Three-Power co-operation than Britain. The Soviet people can stand firm, while the frenzy rages through the capitalist world, can face the consequent harsher conditions of reconstruction—they have faced worse—and win through. The United States, gorged with war profits, intoxicated with dreams of world empire, can still indulge in a thousand megalomaniac adventures, financial bullying and military-interventions, and not yet awhile pay the price save in the sufferings of other peoples. But for Britain there is no margin, no reserve. Britain has to pay, is paying, for every error of policy with crippled reconstruction. Britain, tied to United States imperialism in an unequal partnership, is ground between the upper and nether milestones of the dollar dictators and democracy. Britain, tied to the Washington atomaniacs, has as much hope for the future as a tin can tied to the tail of a mad dog. Britain becomes the despised tool of one camp, while it loses the friendship of the other. Britain pays in man-power and economic hardship, while the United States draws the profits. The more Britain sinks, the more the American moneylender turns the screw. Yet Britain

had never such an opportunity as today to change the course, and thereby to save, not only itself, but the world. The present anti-national policy, dictated by financial monopolist interests which have become the agents of a foreign Power, will have to be changed, as the policy of Munich had finally to be changed. But it is better that the change should come sooner rather than later, before the price in ruin and catastrophe becomes too heavy for recovery. These six months of decision are Britain's supreme hour of opportunity.

On Which Side?

It is necessary to face the hard realities of the present new world situation and cease to live in a daydream of an imaginary middle course which only conceals subjection to American domination and Western imperialism behind a smokescreen of self-deluding phrases about "Western ideals" and the "social democratic alternative." Britain is not above the battle. Britain is not immune from the same choice which every country has to face. That choice is not a three-cornered choice between elaborate ideological formulas, labelled Communism, Social Democracy and Capitalism. It is a plain choice between democracy (any kind of democracy and the monopolist offensive to destroy democracy; between national independence or subjection; between peace or war. After the Truman Declaration and the Moscow Conference deadlock that choice has become inescapable.

Mad Dogs' Chorus

The offensive of the enemies of democracy and of the protagonists of a third world war is in the open. The mad dogs of reaction are baying for blood. Their howl screams across every column of the American press, in the cacophony of their Congress proceedings or their witch-hunting committees; its echoes can be heard in the Tory contributions to the foreign

policy debate. They demand an immediate end of Three-Power co-operation. They demand that the Western Powers shall go ahead on their own independently of the Soviet Union. They demand the partition of Germany and the establishment of Western Germany as an Anglo-American colony. They demand the partition of Europe (in the name of Hitler's slogan of "United Europe"!). They are exerting their pressure, financial, economic and diplomatic, fifth column penetration, subsidies and underground intrigues, to shift every Government in Europe and outside Europe to the Right, and to undermine democracy. Behind the folds of their banners all the vermin and remnants of fascism, the feudalists and exiled princelings and unemployed S.S. men, are fostered and protected and subsidised, and await with tongues hanging out for the hope of future booty.

Truman Doctrine in France

The Truman Doctrine has gone far beyond Greece and Turkey—those models of "democracy" according to the Western ideals of Park Lane and Fifth Avenue. France is now placed on the operating table. In France the Cabinet Ministers of the premier party chosen by the electorate have been forced out of the Government—not by the will of the electorate, who chose the Communist Party as the first party meriting their confidence before all others, but by outside American pressure and the dangling of financial loans. £62,500,000 has been paid over as a first instalment in reward for this subservience, with a promise of more to come if Bidault and Blum prove sufficiently docile: if not, De Gaulle is being prepared in the background as the American Franco for the destruction of parliamentary democracy in France. It is not surprising that Wallace wrote in the "New Republic" after his visit to Paris:

"I was welcomed in France in 1947 as a liberal American. If the present trends continue it may be that no American will be welcome in Europe in two years."

From Italy to Brazil

In Italy the same game is being played, with the resignation of De Gasperi in the attempt to force out the Communist Ministers, immediately after the electorate had shown an enormous swing of support to the Communist Party in the Sicilian elections. Because the Italian Socialists, wiser than the French Socialists, would not accept the rupture of working class unity and Anglo-American orders for a split with the Communists, American money was poured out to pay for a split in the Italian Socialist Party and is now financing the secessionist so-called “Socialist Party” of Saragat, whose only tenet is anti-Communism. In Brazil, American pressure through General Dutro has secured a declaration of illegality of the Communist Party on the eve of the elections, and in the face of a popular support which within two years of legalisation had placed the Communist party in control of the capital of Brazil. Democracy a l’Americaine Are there any innocents who still believe that the issue is an abstract ideological conflict between two “conceptions of democracy”—“Western democracy “or parliamentary democracy or “ social democracy,” on the one hand, and “eastern democracy” or soviet democracy or the advanced institutions of the new People’s Republics in Europe, on the other? Then let the example of France undeceive them. No one can pretend that the present French constitution does not fulfil all the canons of parliamentary democracy—certainly much more completely than the very mixed, anomalous and tricky constitutions of Britain and the United States. No one can pretend that the recent parliamentary elections in France have not been completely “free elections”—beyond the capacity for even a “Manchester Guardian” leader-writer to insinuate a sneer or a British Embassy report to indicate scepticism. Yet the French people of their own free choice decided to place the Communist Party first. If only there could have been found a

single Soviet soldier in some corner of France, everything could have been explained; it would of course have been a “terror vote” under “the pressure of Soviet troops,” as every popular vote in the countries of Eastern Europe has been so easily explained by the wiseacres. Unfortunately for this theory, in the recently fascist countries like Austria and Hungary, occupied by Soviet troops, the Communists have come out lower in the elections; while in a democratic country like France, without any Soviet troops or other convenient explanations ready to hand, the notoriously backward, primitive, illiterate and uncultured French people have chosen the Communists first. This might have been thought embarrassing to the grand theorists of “democracy” versus “communism.” Not at all. The State Department has its answer ready: If French parliamentary democracy chooses a communist majority, wipe out the majority, and, if necessary, wipe out the parliamentary democracy.

Cat Out of Bag

Is this an exaggeration? Then study carefully the following dispatch from Washington, in which an experienced correspondent, Stuart Gelder, reports “on high authority” the present policy of the State Department: “America is preparing plans to stop the growth of Communism as part of a worldwide policy of resisting it wherever it has prospects of gaining control of Governments...

“I am informed on high authority that the State Department policy is that ‘it is in the interests of America to see the establishment of an independent democratic moderate Government in France.’

“It is expected that very substantial aid will have to be given during the next two years.

“This decision means that **even if the French people decided to elect a Communist majority under the present**

French constitution, the American State Department would not regard this as democratic government, nor France as an independent country.” (“News-Chronicle, 10.5.47). Read this last sentence again, and then again, in order to understand correctly the Truman Doctrine and the American theory of “Western democracy.” No nonsense here about the will of the people or the sanctity of free elections or the rights of a constitutionally elected parliamentary majority. American Big Business goes straight to the point. If you don’t like them, kick them out, and damn the constitution and damn democracy. And if it happens in some other country that the people’s choice doesn’t suit you, go right in and kick them out, and damn all theories about the sovereignty and independence of nations. Once upon a time this theory used to be called fascism. Now of course it would be most improper to use such an impolite name, which is today only reserved for anti-fascists and Reds. Let us accordingly always be polite and call it the Truman Doctrine or “democracy a l’Americaine,” for which the people of this country and America in accordance with the Anglo-American Arms Agreement are to be ready to shoulder arms (or, should we say, atom bombs?) in the sacred cause of the crusade against tyranny.

The Acheson Programme

In a recent important pronouncement at Cleveland on May 8, the current American policy was defined by the Under-Secretary of State. Dean Acheson, who has subsequently just resigned his office, because, as he has lucidly explained, he could make more money elsewhere. The explanation might seem a little odd in some countries, but is of course in accordance with American free institutions. The world would be slightly startled to learn that Mr. Vishinsky had deserted his post in order to pursue a more lucrative profession as a lawyer, or that Mr. Molotov had abandoned the cares of state because he had

discovered that the emoluments of an author would be higher. But in America it causes no surprise because it is well understood that in the higher ethical Western conception, so firmly wedded to the crusade against the menace of materialism, the one aim in life, the one measure of morality and the one standard of achievement is to make money. Accordingly Mr. Acheson explained with pardonable complacency how successfully America had made money, especially out of the recent war, and had reached a record national income of £52,000 million in the midst of a devastated and impoverished world, and an industrial output equal to all the rest of the world put together. But this very disparity now gives rise to a new problem in the path of the American money-makers, how to make more money, since the rest of the world is too poor to buy American goods on an adequate scale, however much it may want them, while America has no interest in buying goods from the rest of the world on a large enough scale. It is to this problem that Mr. Acheson turned his powerful intellect as a last contribution in the public service of the American money-makers as a whole, before departing to exercise his talents in other fields more directly connected with his own moneymaking.

Loans—For What?

Mr. Acheson estimated that in 1947 American exports of goods and services would amount to £4,000 million, or four times pre-war, and imports to £2,000 million. Hence an awkward gap, which the exhausted gold reserves and selling abilities of the other impoverished countries would be quite incapable of covering. In fact, as he said, “not a bright picture.” As an enlightened and far-sighted representative, he recognised that if American business men are to sell their goods to the other impoverished countries, they must first lend the money to the other countries to enable them to buy their goods. A little might be done by raising imports, though against the resistance of

American business. But he recognised that in the main the gap must be covered by American grants and loans and credits. So far is common ground. President Roosevelt had long ago recognised this, and on this basis built up his whole conception for the post-war period, that the liquidation of Lend-Lease should be followed by large-scale American lending to the impoverished war-devastated countries to enable them rapidly to build up their productive equipment and thus establish a strong foundation for international economic and political co-operation. But Roosevelt is two years dead, and all his associates and colleagues have been driven from their posts. A very different set have taken over, for whom the philanthropic savour around the Roosevelt “New Deal” conceptions, inherited by Wallace, is anathema. Hence, even while they are compelled to recognise the necessity of large-scale American lending to bridge the gap, they seek to find a way to link this to their reactionary political programme in place of the progressive democratic programme of Roosevelt. This is the problem for which the Acheson Programme seeks to offer a solution.

Heil Germany and Japan!

The Acheson Programme proposes that America should pour out grants and loans and credits on the largest scale—but on selective political grounds. In this way the loans could become an instrument to promote the new American Empire promulgated by “Life” and the prophets of the American Century. The primary direction of the loans would not be the democratic allied countries who had bled and suffered and spent their wealth to defeat fascism. The primary direction would be to build up—Germany and Japan! He spoke of

“two of the greatest workshops of Europe and Asia—Germany and Japan—upon whose production Europe and Asia were to an important degree dependent before the war... We must push ahead with the reconstruction of those

two great workshops of Europe and Asia—Germany and Japan—upon which the ultimate recovery of the two continents so largely depends.”

The conception is clear. “Before the war,” as he delicately says, i.e., in the period of Hitler-Germany and Japan of Tojo and Co., Nazi Germany in accordance with the Hitler-Schacht programme of Pan-Europe extended its economic domination over Europe, and Japan in accordance with its “Greater Asia Co-Prosperty Sphere” programme extended its economic domination over Eastern Asia. Unfortunately the war interrupted this admirable development. The peoples of Europe and Asia fought to end their servitude and build their independent existence and development. Now all this must be changed. The old order must be restored, but this time under American financial control. German economic power must be restored over Europe, and Germany must be made American Big Business’ branch agent for Europe, just as Japan must be made American Big Business’ branch agent for Asia.

Dollar Diplomacy

Once this simple and lucid programme is understood, the proceedings of Marshall at Moscow and MacArthur at Tokio will be much more easily comprehended, as also why this programme met with obstacles at Moscow when the Soviet Union stood up for all the free peoples of Europe. The subsequent proceedings in Western Germany (invasion of American big business representatives to link up or resume the links with the German monopolies for a vast trade expansion, and ruthless squeezing of the British zone by withholding of food imports to compel British capitulation to American terms for a fusion run from the American centre at Frankfurt) fit into the picture, along with the deals in relation to the other European countries. In grants and loans to countries other than Germany and Japan, Acheson explained, “top priority” must be given to

countries “fighting totalitarianism,” e.g., Greece and Turkey. The hierarchy is clear. First come the fascist countries, Germany and Japan, who must receive the main American support so as to dominate economically Europe and Asia respectively. Then come the near-fascist countries, like monarchist-quisling Greece and Von Papen’s beloved Turkey. He gives no further examples by name; but the continuation of the sequence is easy to fill in. France and Italy stand a chance of support, provided they clear out the Communists and follow De Gaulle or the Qualunquists or the Vatican. The chances of countries like Jugoslavia or Poland or Bulgaria or Czechoslovakia are somewhat slender under this dispensation. Britain will continue to receive support, provided Bevin obeys the crack of the whip and the Labour Government continues to act as “the bulwark against European Communism” in the phrase of the United States Chamber of Commerce report approving the loan. It is all a very simple and clear and logical programme, except that it forgets one detail too small to be visible to a magnate of Mr. Dean Acheson’s eminence. It forgets the peoples who fought fascism.

Where Stands Britain?

And Britain? On which side are we? Can we really be satisfied to be the junior partner of the new American Empire, the third chosen Gauleiter of Wall Street alongside Germany and Japan, in return for a stinted supply of charity rations? Or are we heart and soul with the free peoples of Europe and the world, with the peoples who fought for freedom and are determined not to lose it (including also the common people of America who four times returned Roosevelt and rejected the Deweys and the Dulles every time, as long as the choice was permitted to them)? Can anyone doubt the answer of the British people, whatever picture our rulers may give of us at this moment? Bevin represents Britain today exactly as much and as little as Chamberlain represented Britain at Munich. Today also the

awakening to our own danger is spreading, as the financial noose is drawn tighter.

“Britain’s Turn Next “?

Can we really afford the illusion that we are immune from this conflict and above the battle, able from Olympian heights of detachment in the clouds, like the old Liberal Party, to lecture both sides impartially in the dazzling light of our golden mediocrity? Are France and Italy so remote from us that the dollar assault on their democratic institutions can only elicit from us the time-worn incantation “It can’t happen here.” If we think that, we are indeed in the clouds; for it is happening here. Who doubts that docs not need to be invited to ask for the unpublished text of the Anglo-American Arms Agreement or to study the plain record of votes of Britain and the United States on every Issue at every international conference from Paris and New York to Moscow; he need only study the published terms of the Financial Agreement to learn how far national sovereignty is already impaired so that we are shackled at every turn from taking the most obvious steps required to tackle our economic problems. It may hurt our national pride; but Britain is already currently listed in the language of international diplomacy as an American satellite; and in the famous “Life” map Britain is already included in the American Empire. When the Truman Doctrine turned on Greece and Turkey, the American press proclaimed “France and Italy Next.” Now when the fire is turned on France and Italy, the same voices are proclaiming “ Britain’s Turn Next.” That decision rests with us.

Another Turn of the Screw

On July 15, sterling for current transactions has to be made convertible with dollars, according to the terms of the Financial Agreement. Whatever the dispute as to the extent of the burden,

everyone understands that this will increase Britain's difficulties in respect of dollars and the balance of payments. At the same time British Treasury officials in Ottawa are painting "the blackest possible picture of an approaching dollar crisis for the whole world" (Toronto "Financial Post"). £437 million has already been spent in less than a year from the American Loan of £937 million, which was originally estimated to last five years. This has not gone for reconstruction. When Dalton introduced the Loan Agreement in December, 1945, he said that a "considerable part" of the dollar credit "should be spent on capital goods essential to re-equipping our industry." In fact only 5 per cent, of all dollar expenditure has gone for machinery, and the obstruction has not come only from the American side. Three-quarters of the deficit on the balance of payments is due to Government overseas expenditure, mainly military. There are rumours, counter-rumours and denials of negotiations for a new loan, on unknown terms. When Bevin was winding up the debate for the first Loan Agreement, he said:

"I do not know anybody who ever came away from a moneylender's office and calculated the repayment who ever felt comfortable."

Mr. Bevin can probably now assure us that it is nothing like the feeling when the money has all gone down the drain and you have to go back to the same moneylender to plead inability of payment and ask for another loan.

Sterling Debts

Yet at the same time the restrictive conditions of the Loan Agreement are strangling essential measures for economic recovery and trade development, while the resources made available serve to finance the extravagances of Bevinism. No wonder the United States press applauds the policy which is landing us in this mess, while shedding a suitable sentimental tear over "poor noble Britain." We cannot take sensible

measures like Sweden to prohibit dollar luxury imports. We cannot make special economic arrangements with the Dominions or empire countries or European countries for mutually beneficial planned economic and trading relations, because that would be “discrimination” against the almighty dollar. Dalton roars like a bull against the sterling creditors, principally India and Egypt, whose peoples were thoroughly drained and despoiled during the war, and is immediately applauded by Churchill and the United States Secretary of the Treasury. Why? Because this supposed fighting attitude on behalf of Britain really means clearing the ground for dollar penetration of these countries, while arousing intense hostility in India and Egypt and thus hindering the development of mutually beneficial economic relations of Britain with India and Egypt.

A Worm Can Turn

At Geneva Britain is committed to support the American proposals for an “International Trade Organisation” which in the name of “freedom of trade” and “multilateral trading” and “non-discrimination” in reality means removing all obstacles to the domination of the economically stronger United States and placing obstacles in the way of state planning and state trading arrangements. The U.S. Under-Secretary for Economic Affairs, William Clayton, made perfectly clear the American aims at Geneva:

“Since the end of the war the trend in many countries is toward more extensive controls of trade by Government agencies and more actual participation in trading arrangements by Governments.

“This is not the sort of climate in which our type of foreign trade, carried on by private business men, can expand and prosper.

“Let me make it perfectly clear right at the start that one of the primary objectives in our post-war trade programme is to

create conditions under which private American traders will have maximum opportunity to expand their trade abroad with a minimum of governmental interference.

“The whole aim and purpose of the International Trade Organisation and of the suggested Charter is to reduce and minimise, not to increase, governmental interference with foreign trade carried on by private traders... That is what we are going to Geneva for to bargain for a chance for American private enterprise to continue and to benefit the American economy through expanded foreign trade.” Why should a British Labour Government be compelled to support these principles of an open offensive against state controls and state trading? Is it not time to review the whole situation, to declare that Britain, in view of its desperate economic situation, can no longer regard itself as bound by the restrictive clauses of the Loan Agreement, and to develop a planned trading programme in which we diminish dependence on the dollar and develop close relations with countries building up a planned economy?

It Can Be Done

“Impossible,” say the critics.

“We are inevitably dependent on the United States. We must dance to their tune.” The only alternative, they argue, means limitless austerity, the development of a closed economic bloc with impoverished non-dollar countries who cannot supply our needs, and the consequent division of the world into opposing economic blocs, with resulting impoverishment and political antagonism. These are not the alternatives. Our objective is international economic and political co-operation. The rest of the world needs the assistance and resources of the United States for speediest recovery, just as the United States needs no less the rest of the world if it is to grapple with the menace of its impending crisis. But such a co-operation must be a co-operation of equals for mutual benefit, not a relationship of

domination and economic and political servitude. The present bullying "big stick" methods of the Dollar Empire have to be broken, in order that such co-operation shall be possible. The only way to break a bully is not to give in to threats. This is the meaning of the firm attitude of the Soviet Union in the face of American provocative bluster. Smaller countries of Europe, like Jugoslavia and Sweden and Czechoslovakia, have shown that they can stand up to threats and face the alternative, however difficult. The Swedish-Soviet Trade Agreement or the British-Polish Trade Agreement are examples which show what can be done. The free democratic countries which are building planned economies must stand together. A new relationship must be built up between Britain and the Dominions, and with the present empire countries on the basis of freedom.

Britain Can Lead

This is not an anti-American policy. It is a policy to bring the American billionaires to reason. It is a policy to assist the progressive forces in America (who are still the majority, although their voice is drowned in the present clamour) to compel a change of course and a return to the methods of international co-operation for which Roosevelt strove. Britain in firm association with France and the Soviet Union can rally the democratic forces of the world, including in America, to end the present deadlock, return to the principles of democratic international co-operation agreed at Teheran, Crimea and Potsdam, restore the responsible joint leadership of Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union, and thus make a lasting peace, opening the way to rapid reconstruction and better conditions.

Return to Three-Power Co-operation

It is not inevitable that the present reckless disruptive and bellicose offensive of the power-drunk American imperialism,

backed by servile British reaction, should be carried through to its final conclusion. The United States also has grave problems to face. The grandiose display of strength is on the surface; the weakness is below. Every American economist has now given warning of the signs of impending economic crisis, as prices and profits continue to soar and purchasing power shrinks. Every newspaper poll has consistently revealed the majority of the American people opposed to the Truman Doctrine, little as a perusal of the millionaire-controlled American press would give any such picture of the true face of the American people.

“While the Truman proposal will be accepted by Congress, opposition to it is apparently increasing throughout the country.

“Public opinion polls indicate that a large majority is dissatisfied because the original Truman proposal by-passed the United Nations.

“Letters reaching Congressmen from their constituents are reported to be running heavily against the plan.” (New York correspondent, “Manchester Guardian,” May 8).

“Underneath a seemingly side unanimity there are palpable stirrings of uneasiness and revolt... Congress is getting an uneasy feeling that there seems no end in sight to a logical application of the Truman Doctrine.” (“Observer,” May 11).

The foreign adventures have not gone too well. In China the support poured in to Chiang and his corrupt and discredited clique is approaching fiasco, military and economic. In Greece the Quisling Government has made a rare mess of its operations, and the more funds are poured in, the more is embezzled. In the Middle East the Arab world is awake. In France and Italy the working class and national sentiment stand firm for freedom. The bankrupt situation of Western Germany since fusion gives pause to the original cocksure plans for partition. The rulers of America may yet find cause to think again, before they turn their backs on Three-Power co-operation.

Frightened Men of Wall Street

In the cheap jack spate of American anti-Soviet books turned out to order in the recent period, with the same conveyor-belt efficiency of mass production as the previous wartime pro-Soviet books, one little scribbler thought to earn his masters' favour by inventing the title "The Frightened Men of the Kremlin." To a vulgar audience the picture of Stalin as a "Frightened Man" might appear slightly comic; but the sense of the comic has temporarily disappeared from refined circles in the West, who have worked themselves up into a state of mystical exaltation about the vanishing spiritual values of their supposedly perishing Western civilisation. But there is an unconscious self-revelation in the title and its attraction for the American ruling class public today. For the truth that is revealed in that title is the truth of "The Frightened Men of Wall Street and Washington." The multimillionaire rulers of America today, at the height of their power, are panicky, bewildered and frustrated. They believe they have all the resources and power in the world at their command, and yet the world will not obey them and will not go the way they want. "Man shall shut his heart against you, and you will not find the spring." They have arsenals never before known at their command, and they are terrified of a little poverty-stricken worker reading a Marxist pamphlet in a back-room. With statistical records of unexampled efficiency they can record day by day the deepening of the economic crisis of their system, and yet they do not know what to do. They have set scientists and technicians from all over the world to construct for them the most devilish and fiendish machines of horror and mass destruction human wit can contrive, compared with which Hitler's worst was a child playing at fireworks, and yet they tremble as their finger itches to press the button and unloose them against their enemies, because they know that the outcome will shatter for ever their flimsy social structure. So they are caught in a paroxysm of

contradictory appetites and impotent rage against all freedom-loving humanity. Therefore also they are finally not strong. The peoples of the world can and will prevail. The deep progressive currents of the American people will also finally prevail. It is not too late to turn the course. We can yet see that common sense shall conquer before catastrophe. We may yet see the return to Three Power co-operation. Do not be too confident, gentlemen of the grand anti-communist crusade. Things may turn out not quite as you intend. Hitler and Mussolini tried it all before you; and, as your memories are short, ask your secretaries to tell you what happened to them.

May 18, 1947.

R. P. D.

[pp. 161-170]

**THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT AND LABOUR'S
FUTURE BY QUAESTOR, *The Labour
Monthly*, March 1951**

WHAT distinguishes the present Labour Government from a Liberal Government? Read the story, even in studiously moderate accounts like Cole's *History of the British Working Class Movement* and Brailsford's *War of Steel and Gold*, of the last Liberal Government in Great Britain, from 1906 to 1914. You will see that it is as like that of the Labour Government of 1945 to 1951 as two peas in a pod.

The Asquith-Lloyd George Government of those earlier years made social concessions to the workers to stave off the growth of Socialism, but never hesitated to use the courts, the police and firearms against Labour. By playing skilfully on their dislike of theories and their ignorance of Socialism, it kept the workers on its side, using the stick and the carrot alternately. In the meantime, its hot down colonial peoples struggling to be free in India, in Egypt and in Ireland. And by its imperialist intrigues and alliances with other Great Powers who were engaged in the same pursuits, it landed Britain in the imperialist war of 1914.

What has changed since then? Above all, this—that in place of the Russian Tsardom, most of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and part of the Prusso-German and Turkish Empires, there now exist the Socialist State of the U.S.S.R., the People's Democracies of Eastern and Central Europe, and the German Democratic Republic. None of these countries exploit subject peoples, as their predecessors did: in no part of the world are they fighting for markets, as the capitalists whom they drove out did: all of them are states in which the working people (to quote *Let us Face the Future*, with which the right-wing Labour leaders won their votes in 1945) 'have achieved a new dignity and influence through their long struggles against Nazi tyranny'.

But what of the other side of the picture?

At home, the Labour Government has made some social reforms. It improved the health service for the mass of the people, it spent more (in its first years) on education, it repealed the Tory Trade Union Act of 1927, it opened the way for rationalising the mines, railways, road and air transport by buying out the shareholders in them.

But the 'nationalised' industries are administered by the same people who did so for the capitalists: and the latter still draw their profits through State bonds. This typifies the spirit of what changes have been made by the Labour Government. And in how many spheres have no changes been made at all—except possibly for the worse, in that a Liberal or Tory Government, applying the policy of Messrs. Attlee, Morrison and Bevin, would have had to reckon at any rate with opposition from the trade unions.

Order 1305 is used freely to make strikes illegal—not lockouts, as the flagrant example of the foundrymen locked out by Cravens shows. Gasworkers and dockers are arrested for leading their fellow workers in asserting the right to strike. Troops are freely used to break strikes in the docks and elsewhere. M.I.5 is openly used to organise espionage in the trade union organisations—by a Labour Government, which would be nothing without the unions! May Day processions in London, legal for half a century under Tory and Liberal Governments, are prohibited by a Labour Government. Equal pay for working women doing the same job as men, enjoined on numerous occasions by Labour Party Conference and Trades Union Congress alike, is refused, but full compensation for capitalist shareholders is granted. Toleration of Fascist and anti-Semitic propaganda and violence is defended by Labour Ministers: but a witch hunt against Communists initiated in the public services is caught up, on the Government's blessing, by bodies like the Middlesex County Council.

What is there, in all this, that Asquith and Lloyd George would have objected to—or Balfour and Bonar Law, Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain either, for that matter?

In the colonies, British political control—greatly weakened by two world wars and by initial defeat in the Far East—was withdrawn after 1945 from India, Burma and Ceylon, for fear of a gigantic rebellion in which Britain was doomed to disaster. In this the Labour Government showed no more sagacity than the Campbell-Bannerman Government after the defeat of the Boers in 1899-1902 and the Lloyd George Government, in face of Ireland's War of Independence in 1919-1922. But look rather at the regions of the earth where the Labour Government has still the preponderance in death-dealing weapons. There the picture is different. There the shareholders in British capitalist monopolies exploiting cheap colonial labour—*the essence of imperialism, as J. A. Hobson pointed out before the Bolshevik Lenin*—can still count on their dividends.

In Malaya, armed forces directed by the leaders of British Organised Labour are still burning, shooting, bombing and 'resettling' in concentration camps—an advance on the South African technique of 1900-1902 and the Black-and-Tan technique of 1920-22—the brown and yellow *majority* in the interests of a tiny white *minority* of tin mine owners and planters. In the African colonies, the shooting up of strikers and political demonstrators, the closing down of trade unions and working class and patriotic newspapers, are just as widely practised, just as much a 'regrettable necessity' to enforce British rule, under a Labour Government, as they were before. At the very time the British authorities were introducing their much heralded 'constitution' on the Gold Coast—with its indirect franchise system copied from Tsarist Russia, its heavy load of nominated 'representatives' and its Governor's reserve powers—they showed how much it was really worth by prohibiting the importation into the 'free' Gold Coast of the British Workers

Delegation's Report on the U.S.S.R. (*Russia With Our Own Eyes*). British investments must not be endangered by Gold Coast workers learning a thing or two from Russia! In Cyprus, the Labour leaders' answer to the self-determination demand of a united people is to increase police repressions and military concentrations: in Egypt, when the people want the British occupying forces in their country (after 70 years of promises!) to clear out, they are met with flat refusal: in Ireland, when the police state of the Belfast big business men needs military backing and the Labour Government finds it awkward to send British reinforcements, the Dutch are hired.

Where, in this picture, would Asquith or Balfour find themselves bewildered? Only that British organised Labour, which used at any rate to play some part in supporting protests against bloody and rapacious colonialism, now watches its leaders enforce it!

In foreign policy, there is not even the mitigation of a 'while . . . or 'although . . .' to the stark brutal picture of betrayal of pledges and deliberate 'drift' to war.

From the moment the Labour Government was formed in 1945 unwavering and malignant hostility to the U.S.S.R. has been an outstanding plank of its policy. Atom bomb development, arranged in secret with the U.S.A. during the war but with the full knowledge of the chief Labour Party leaders, went on at full speed, and the Soviet proposals for prohibition and control were rejected and derided. The restoration of German trusts, the placing of high Nazi businessmen in official positions, resistance to moderate Soviet reparations demands lest Germany become a 'slum' (Bevin's words—it didn't matter about the awful 'slums' of destruction left behind in Russia by the Germans), and now rearmament of Western Germany under the direction of Nazi generals—this was British 'Labour' policy from the day that Bevin took office. Trade with the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies has been deliberately throttled by the

Labour Government as it never was in the worst days after the Tory raid on Arcos in 1927—true, at the behest of the United States, but what is there redeeming in that? In Greece, in Spain, in Taiwan, the official representatives of British Labour give aid and comfort to the butchers of the working class, the suppressors of trade unions, the persecutors of religion. Every Soviet proposal for a reasonable compromise—'live and let live'—on reduction of armaments by the Big Five, on unification of Germany and Austria, on German demilitarisation, on leaving Korea to the Koreans: even on such an obvious question (one would think) as admitting to the United Nations those States whom the British Government doesn't like, side by side with those whom the Soviet Government doesn't like—all these and other opportunities for reducing tension have been rejected with contumely. Attlee and Morrison and Bevin never open their mouths in public without abuse of the Soviet Union dropping out of it, like toads from the lips of the bewitched Ugly Sister.

But in return, ah, what oily praise of the U.S.A. as a 'land of Socialism', what obsequious assurances to Truman, or the American Ambassador, or the latest Wall Street gangster-politician to appear in Britain with orders for the Labour Government, what loyal readiness to put British trade, British industry, British armed forces, British strategic bases, British films under the control of Uncle Sam! Never since Charles II became a pensioner of Louis XIV, and was able to defy his own people with the help of subsidies from abroad, has there been such a spectacle as the sovereign influence of Marshall Aid, and now of 'defence' and raw material 'allocations' from Washington, upon the foreign policy of the Labour Government—in the teeth of protests from M.P.s and rank and file alike.

And what of the fruits of this policy of ignoble subservience to the United States? Have they brought at least a rising standard of living? On the contrary: and even Attlee, forced into the most

impudent falsehoods about the alleged low standard of living in the U.S.S.R.. has not been able to deny that in Britain it is falling. Rising prices at every turn, the 8d. meat ration and the harmfully low fat ration, the shortage and high cost of coal, the shortages of coarse grains for cattle and pigs (procurable from the U.S.S.R., but denied us because of the refusal to sell it machinery), the shortage of timber—these are the fruits for the people of the Marshall Aid system: with wage rates (1947 = 100) at 113 by November while the official cost of living index, notorious for its Whitehall optimism, stood at 116 (actually, food was up nearly 25 per cent., clothing 23 per cent., fuel and light 20 per cent.) Profits, on the other hand, are steadily rising—total up by 10 per cent, in 1950 compared with 1949, for 3,581 companies, or over 9 per cent, if you take 2,737 industrial companies.

The huge accumulations of raw materials in American hands, while shortages increase, have made it possible for the future to be drawn for us in the following terms, unprecedented in British history:

Washington, however, has made it clear enough that at best she will part with these commodities only if she is completely satisfied that they will be used in the manufacture of armaments which will be available for defence against Russia and her allies. If this country engages herself to an arms programme of the scale and pace which Washington considers adequate, there is little doubt but the raw materials will be forthcoming. It seems highly probable that that is what will happen. (*The Times City Notes*, Dec. 10, 1950.)

Moreover, this situation spells no relief. Britain's lopsided Budget grows still more disastrous as the arms programme increases. From 780 millions a year, the cost goes up to nearer £1,500 millions, from 7 per cent, of national income to 13.6 per cent. (*Labour Research*, February, 1951). How is this cost to be met, when nearly half British exports came from 'the very

industries which are most vulnerable to the effect of rearmament' (Mr. Gaitskell, Chancellor of the Exchequer, January 10, 1951) while the other half—from the lighter industries—are running into more and more bitter competition, particularly from Japan and Germany, America's chosen protégés? By more and more dependence on the U.S.A.—just as, in the 'good old days' before 1914, client Shahs and Sultans and Khedives used to prop their debt-ridden regimes by loans from London and Paris which left Persia, or Turkey or Egypt in a worse position than before.

Also, of course, by further attacks on living standards, of which there are plentiful prophecies on every hand, beginning with the Prime Minister himself. 'The levels of rearmament cannot be achieved without a step back in the ordinary civilian level', said the British chairman of the O.E.E.C. Executive in Washington on December 10.

But for what purpose are all these sacrifices, all this economic disequilibrium, all this rise in the level of armaments at the expense of 'civilian levels' required? Where do they lead? To the control of British forces in Korea by a MacArthur, who has proclaimed his aim the 'liberation of Asia', and in Europe by an Eisenhower, for whom the Nazi generals are brothers in arms. To the rearmament of the West German State—the State, that is, of the big militarist manufacturers and landowners, their mouthpiece the Kaiser in 1914 and Hitler in 1939—against the express wishes of the majority of the German people (Attlee himself admitted this in Parliament on February 13). To a world arms race, and particularly to still greater piles of American atom bombs on British soil—so that American lives may be economised at the expense of British towns. To the most brazen and sinister incitement to Fascist Greece and Yugoslavia to 'start something' at the expense of Albania, just as Syngman Rhee was openly incited to 'start something' in Korea. In other words, the

more dependent Britain becomes, the more catastrophic and fatal become her prospects.

It is not surprising that, as Harry Pollitt writes in his introduction to the historic new programme of the Communist Party, *The British Road to Socialism*:

The doubts and heart-searchings felt by so many people about the present situation and the future show that the British people realise that to drift along with the existing economic and social system can offer no hope. The people of Britain can look forward to a better future only if they take their country into their own hands.

There are many signs of revolt among the workers at large, and they are beginning to find an expression among the rank and file of the Labour Party and the Labour M.P.s.

Tens of thousands of engineers have shown, by their ban on overtime, that they will not accept the contrast between rising profits for the employers and falling standards for the workers. The Merseyside and Manchester dockers have done the same; and, when the Labour Attorney-General—of course, entirely without consulting his colleagues the Labour Ministers—prosecuted the London Dockers' leaders as he did the gasworkers, under Order 1305, the London dockers showed that their patience, too, is coming to an end, in spite of material benefits gained from the recent award. The successful eight weeks' strike of the Duples Coachbuilders, and numerous other smaller strikes on questions of trade union principle—particularly the defence of shop stewards and trade union freedom—have demonstrated that Messrs. Attlee and Gaitskell will 'run into stiff opposition', as the communiques from Korea say, in their effort to save enough out of the food, clothing and other living expenses of the workers' families to pay for increased armaments.

Moreover, the massive protests against the threat of atom bomb warfare and the prospect of war on China, expressed in

numerous spontaneous house-to-house collections of signatures to petitions and declarations, show that Mr. and Mrs. British Worker are thinking hard. It is sufficient to stand in the butcher's queue, or to call at the grocer's on a busy day, to hear things that spell no good at all to the Attlee Government. How this can be communicated to the organised Labour movement is well illustrated by the following case at a Scottish Coachworks, which deserves the widest publicity(*World News and Views*, February 3, 1951):

A telegram was circulated in the departments on the following proposals:(a) Cease fire, withdrawal of all foreign troops, and peaceful settlement in Korea, (b) No use of the atom bomb, (c) Admission of China to U.N.O. (d) Meeting of Four Powers on Germany.

Over 100 signatures were secured, with only two abstentions, and covering a representative section of the factory opinion. The telegrams, with names attached, were forwarded to the Prime Minister, with a covering letter to the M.P., Malcolm MacPherson. The M.P. replied, enclosing a copy of Hansard, and suggested meeting us during the recess. A room was booked in a Stirling hotel, a notice posted in the factory, the support of the Shop Committee was won and on Saturday morning twenty-six workers turned up, including Labour Party, non-Party and Communist Party.

The M.P. travelled thirty-six miles from his home in Edinburgh, and the meeting lasted two and a half hours. All aspects of the international situation were covered, and certain promises and admissions were made by the M.P. At the finish he was left in no doubt as to the attitude of everyone present to the tie-up with America, MacArthur's provocation, the Peace Congress, German remilitarisation and the Z-class call-up. The sentiments of everyone were expressed by a Labour Member who said that, while he had argued for Labour in the past, he felt they were moving away from what he wanted, becoming a

satellite of America, and being dragged into a war in which he would be cannon-fodder.

The meeting over, everyone voted it a big success, and claimed that by perseverance common ground could be found for joint action.

Labour-Communist co-operation among Middlesex teachers to fight the witch-hunt started by the Tory County Council, and among the L.C.C. staff to fight a purge started by the Labour majority, are further illustrations of how 'common ground could be found for joint action'.

This, indeed, is making itself felt in the protest movement within the Labour Party against the Government's foreign policy. From the middle of January to the middle of February, about sixty local Labour Parties—from East Edinburgh to Canterbury, from North Devon to Bradford City, from Cambridge, Horsham and Wimbledon to Penarth, Gloucester and Southport—apart from bodies like the Glasgow, Oldham and Coventry Trades Councils and the South Wales Miners' Executive, are recorded in the press as having denounced the rearmament of Germany. Many more have denounced MacArthur and the Korean war. The demand for a Four Power Conference is general in the Labour Party: that explains why Messrs. Attlee and Morrison show such venom in speaking of the U.S.S.R.

Even in the House of Commons this rising wave of protest has found some expression. On November 17 some 20 M.P.s tabled motions demanding agreement on Korea and discussions with the U.S.S.R. Later, over 40 M.P.s demanded an early meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, to promote (among other things) increased trade with all countries and gradual reduction of armaments. On January 23, large numbers of back benchers were demanding that China should not be branded as an 'aggressor' in Korea and that there should be no German rearmament. In the second week of February, 29 Labour M.P.s

tabled various motions which denounced the arming of Germany.

But at this point the movement always met the argument which hamstrung the M.P.s—though it did not similarly affect the dockers, the engineers or the local Labour Parties—and enabled Attlee and Co. to go on defying the working class and their own rank and file. ‘If you vote against us or abstain, you bring down the Government. That means an election, which the Tories may win. Anyhow, you will lose our endorsement as candidates’. To add weight to this argument, Attlee refused endorsement to the Labour candidate at Bristol West, for daring to oppose the new armaments.

It is time that men and women were found in the House of Commons with the courage—or if not the courage, then the clear light of reason firmly imposed on them by their local rank and file—to answer this specious argument. The answer is the same as the remedy for the economic consequences of dependence on America: or, if you like, for the Turkish Sultan’s and Egyptian Khedive’s financial dependence on the foreign money-lenders. *The longer the disease runs on, the worse pickle you get into.* The more you surrender to Attlee’s threats, the more shameful his surrenders to the U.S.A. will become: the more atrocious the burden of armaments, the more brutal the attack on the British people’s standards, the more violent the abuse of China and the Soviet Union—and the more headlong the rush to war, because each round leaves the right-wing leaders in a better position to point to the rising menace of the Tory come-back. With what heart can the Labour Party rank and file fight an election today, on the war-and-capitulation record of Attlee and Co.? Yes, and with what heart will they be able to fight in three months’ time? How will they be able to resist further inroads into British independence by the triumphant Wall Street gangsters? *There must be a halt somewhere and this is high time*—that is the answer.

But it would be impolitic to leave such a decision to M.P.s. In every constituency the people—whether inside or outside the Labour Party, but the trade unions, co-operatives and women's organisations should take the lead—in their own urgent self-defence should meet to demand a reversal of policy, as the coachbuilders quoted above did. They can demand that their M.P. should support such a reversal by a vote in the House, if necessary. Members of the Labour Party should insist on a special Labour Party Conference to take the necessary decisions. Enormous strengthening of the resistance to American war plans in France, Belgium, Germany, Italy, and the U.S.A. itself would be the result. Britain can yet be saved—if Labour takes its future into its own hands.

[pp. 117-127]

Notes of the Month, *The Great Contrast* by R.P.D. *The Labour Monthly*, November 1951

The first Bolshevik Revolution has wrested the first hundred million people of this earth from the clutches of imperialist war and the imperialist world. Subsequent revolutions will save the rest of mankind from such wars and from this world.

LENIN, 'The Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution', 1921.

THIRTY-FOUR years ago the first victorious socialist revolution changed the world. Since then that change has sped forward, until today one-third of humanity has chosen freedom. Lenin's 'first hundred million' have become eight hundred millions. Russia—China—Eastern Europe—soon all East Asia. And now the Middle East is in movement. The flame of popular upsurge in the Middle East has cast its warning light across the general election. In vain Tory and Labour leaders seek to cast the blame on one another. It is the cracks of the old crumbling imperialist structure that are showing through; and no party of imperialism can paper over or conceal those cracks, neither by force, nor by guile. Whatever the outcome of the election, the future in Britain does not rest with the obsolete and discredited leaders who still seek to build on the basis of imperialism, and who can only stumble from disaster to disaster. The future rests with that political leadership which can respond to the new conditions and show the way forward to Britain's future in the new world.

Two Worlds

Never was the contrast between the old world and the new so sharp as on this thirty-fourth anniversary. It is revealed above all in the supreme question of peace or war, in the contrast between the frenzied rearmament drive and the drive for peace. It is revealed with especial force today in the solution of the national question in the Soviet Union, at the same time as the revolt of subject nations is shaking the whole structure of the imperialist world. It is revealed equally in the sphere of home conditions and living standards, with the rocketing prices and lowered standards in all the countries of the American orbit, alongside

the fourfold reduction of prices and soaring standards, up to 62 per cent, above pre-war last year, and more by now with the new all-round reduction of prices, in the socialist sixth of the world—so much so that the Tory and Labour leaders are left quarrelling with one another as to which country is suffering from the worst rise in prices, and remain beautifully united in pretending that the land of socialism, whose example knocks all their statistics to blazes, does not exist. It is revealed most powerfully in the whole sphere of economic advance, with the staggering bankrupt economy in Britain, the soaring deficit in the balance of payments, and the sacrifice of plans for productive development in favour of concentrating all resources for destruction, at the same time as the Soviet Union is engaged in carrying through a giant productive advance without parallel in economic history and fulfilling audacious projects of new construction which leave the biggest previous feats of capitalist economy (Panama, Suez, Tennessee Valley, Sukkur Barrage) pigmies in comparison.

Peace or War

In the midst of the election Stalin's declaration on the atom bomb sounded the call for the banning of all atomic weapons, and for renewed negotiations to achieve this aim and establish international control 'to terminate production of the atomic weapon and to utilise already produced atom bombs solely for civilian purposes'. No country has more reason to support and press for such prohibition than Britain. No country is more vulnerable. Even *The Times* editorial, recognising the Soviet plan as 'not inherently unreasonable' and 'more easily achieved', given the will to international co-operation, than the American pseudo-plan, pleaded that the call should be heard:

No past discouragement, even now, should dissuade the Western Powers from entering into any renewed negotiations that may be proposed.

(The Times, October 8, 1951.)

Not a single party leader of the dominant parties in the election dared to respond to that call. Not one dared voice Britain's interests. Why? Because the voice of their masters across the ocean was sounding at the same moment a very different note—a note of such unbridled Hitlerite war frenzy that even the pro-American *Economist* on October

13 was constrained to speak of ‘events in Washington for which madness sometimes does not seem to be too strong a word’. In the contrast between these two outlooks is expressed the contrast between two worlds today.

Voice of Barbarism

What was the Voice of America in contrast to Stalin’s call for peace? On September 4 President Truman opened the San Francisco Conference for rearming Japan and making Japan an American military base. He chose the moment of his inaugural address to this Conference for an alleged ‘Peace Treaty’ (actual new aggressive war alliance) to vaunt before the assembled delegates from countries all over the world American possession of ‘fantastic new weapons’ capable of destroying civilisation. The very terms of the boast recalled the old familiar Hitler boasts of Nazi Germany’s possession of ‘new wonder weapons’ to crush any enemy. On September 20

President Truman told a press conference today that the United States was relying on force rather than diplomacy in its dealings with the Soviet Union. (Manchester Guardian, September 21.)

When asked by a tactful press correspondent whether he did not mean by this that ‘the other fellow has to use force first’ he snapped back that that was not what he had said.

Dropping the Mask

On October 5 the head of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Cordon Dean, announced the development of ‘new atomic weapons’ and proclaimed for the first time as official American policy that atomic warfare would be regarded as normal warfare:

Because of our great technological strides we are now entering the era when the quantities of atomic weapons available to us will be so great and types so varied that we may utilise them in many ways not heretofore possible. . .

I think that, when a situation arises where in our carefully considered judgment the use of any kind of weapon is justified, we are now at the place where we should give serious consideration to the use of an

atomic weapon provided it can be used effectively from the military standpoint. He further indicated that, while the 'concept of atomic warfare' by 'striking at great cities and industrial hearts of an enemy nation' was 'still true', it was 'no longer the whole truth', since the United States was now preparing to use many additional forms of atomic warfare. The old pretences of American representatives at the end of the war to join with the representatives of other nations in regarding the atomic weapon as a criminal, barbarous and inhuman weapon to be outlawed (with the real intention to maintain it concealed behind the delaying strategy of the Baruch Plan) are now abandoned. The mask is off.

Hell-Bent for War

The truth must be faced, and is even beginning to be realised in quarters far removed from the left. American policy is directed completely and openly for war—far more completely and openly than ever was Hitler's. All the pieces in the pattern—the arming of Western Germany and Japan, the offensive bases, the line-up with Franco, the drawing in of Turkey, Greece and Yugoslavia, the concentration on atomic weapons, the hysteria at any suggestion of peace or lessening of international tension—only fit into this strategy of a planned aggressive war. The initial pretence of 'rearmament for peace', 'rearmament only for defence against aggression'—the smokescreen still used to blind the sight of the European pawns, who are scheduled to be thrown into the cockpit—is beginning to be contemptuously thrown aside in American expression. In the frank words of the *Economist* of October 6:

In large measure, the present American programme is designed for fighting Russia, not for staying at peace by deterring a Russian aggression. With these words the whole official case for the rearmament programme is exploded. The smoke-filled eyes of the destined victims are beginning to discern dimly the outlines of the monster to whom they have sold themselves.

New ‘Mein Kampf’

All the hearings of the MacArthur Enquiry revealed inescapably, not the rejection of his aggressive aims, but the calculation of a different strategy. Not only General Bradley’s objection to ‘the wrong war at the wrong time at the wrong place against the wrong enemy’ implied the conception of ‘the *right* war at the *right* time at the right place against the right enemy’. Equally President Truman’s message to MacArthur on January 13 laid down:

Pending the build-up of our national strength, we must act with great prudence insofar as extending the area of hostilities is concerned.

Thereby President Truman made public his intention that, once ‘the build-up of our national strength’ is completed, it will not any longer be necessary ‘to act with great prudence’ ‘in extending the area of hostilities’. Hitler never declared himself more clearly. Similarly Senator MacMahon:

What I am trying to say is that now is the time, it would seem to me, to stop, look and listen and see where we are before we plunge into a course that may take us over the precipice before we are ready.

In other words, once ‘we are ready’, the time will arrive to ‘plunge into a course that may take us over the precipice’.

Warmongering in the Open

In the light of these official declarations from the highest ruling quarters in the United States, it is no matter for surprise, and no question of unrepresentative lunatic ravings, that the best-seller publicist of the third world war in the American literary market, James Burnham, should lay down brazenly the principles of American policy in his latest book, ‘The Coming Defeat of Communism’, and that this book, so far from being repudiated as an outrage, should be boosted on all the American bookstalls with all the resources of the gigantic American publicity machine:

There is only one possible objective of U.S. foreign policy: the destruction of Communist power. . . The overthrow of that (Soviet) regime is the supreme objective of United States policy. And again:

Politically we have the right and necessity of being against any regime, against it to the extent of fighting and destroying it, insofar as it endangers our own security and our basic interests.

And again:

If I want war and you want peace, what is there for us to confer about?

Here in a nutshell is the case of the champions of rearmament and opponents of negotiation. We saw in Nazi Germany what a hellbrood this kind of literature nourished.

The evil game is being repeated on a larger scale. Can any sane human being, no matter what his political outlook, who compares these outpourings with the sustained, continuous and unparalleled campaign for peace in every single publication and utterance in the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, fail to recognise the contrast between two worlds—the world of civilisation and human decency and the world of barbarism and human degeneration?

Ottawa

It is in the context of these strategic aims that the decisions of the Ottawa meeting of the Atlantic Pact Powers in September, and the immediately preceding Washington exchanges of Acheson, Morrison and Schuman on speeding German rearmament, and of Snyder and Gaitskell on financial and economic questions, need to be seen. The full purport of these decisions has been obscured from view in the smoke of the election. Yet these decisions are of staggering import for the future of Britain and the prospect of war. September, 1951, will remain a fateful landmark in the plans for war. Not only did it see the San Francisco four-day ratification (under a gagged procedure) of the American decision to make Japan a military base. Not only did it see the completion of the plan to force rearmament on Western Germany under the familiar Hitlerite disguise of a 'European Army' (the very term borrowed from Hitler). Not only did it see the decision to draw Turkey and Greece into the oddly named 'Atlantic' War Pact. Ottawa revealed the new American demand to raise still further the already crushing rearmament programmes imposed on the unhappy European satellites.

New American Orders

The extent of this demand has been concealed from the British public for the duration of the election. Even Gaitskell only made a single vague and anxious reference on his return. While the electoral controversy surged around the £4,700 million rearmament programme (itself a figure imposed by American insistence, like the previous £3,600 million figure, without participation of parliament), no mention was made of the fact that the American masters already regard this figure as obsolete and inadequate. The 'sovereign' British elector, confined for his diet of information to the strictly controlled ration of news of the British official press and radio, was not allowed to know, what has been freely printed in the American press, that General Eisenhower has demanded a 33 per cent, increase in the rearmament programmes of the European satellites by 1952.

Panic of the Satellites

No wonder that the *New York Times* correspondent on September 19 grimly commented on the results of Ottawa:

Nothing is more evident here (in Ottawa) than the general awareness that the N.A.T.O. decisions are essentially American decisions.

No wonder the same journal on September 23 reported 'consternation' in Paris over the results of Ottawa, and described how French official representatives

viewed the results of their negotiations as a prelude to new political frictions and to a desperate struggle with inflation in the months to come... (They) view their present situation with consternation and are doubtful whether France can keep her promises without additional aid.

No wonder the unhappy Gaitskell on his return from Ottawa stated on September 25 that increases in the arms expenditure were 'under consideration' (observe the stammering apologetic vagueness of the shame-faced messenger boy, and compare it with the firm, clear and precise 'American decisions' of the *New York Times* report), and went on to bleat with the pathos of a sheep under the butcher's knife:

I am bound to say that I cannot see how we in the United Kingdom can do more than we have promised and are carrying out—the £4,700 million programme—unless there were to be a radical change in the economic policies of all the members of N.A.T.O. involving something much more like a war economy, both internally in each case and in their relations with each other. No wonder even the slavish *Economist* on October 13 found itself compelled to record ‘a dangerous state of alarm and despondency’ among the American satellites in Europe over the antics of Washington, and continued:

Behaviour in Washington has been of a kind that could be expected to disillusion and repel the allies whose willing co-operation the United States needs and should be able to rely on.

Turning the Screw

Vain bleatings. Uncle Shylock Snyder, in the intervals of issuing tactful little reminders every few weeks that the first payments of interest and amortisation on the 1945 loan are due to begin at the end of this year, turned a harshly negative ear to the pleas of in solvency of the European Finance Ministers. Herbert Morrison might boast proudly to the Scarborough Labour demonstration after his return from San Francisco:

In San Francisco, although a representative of a Labour Government, I was received on absolute equality with the Foreign Ministers of other countries.

To this level has a British Foreign Minister now descended that he is grateful and even bursting with pride not to have been sent by his American masters to the servants’ hall. But our Simple Simons Herbert and Hugh, for all their kind reception, brought back no more tangible result than Moses’ horn spectacles—or the promise that a meeting of ‘Three Wise Men’ in Paris would consider the financial dilemmas of the unhappy satellites. Mr. Secretary Snyder made clear, according to the *New York Times* of September 23, that

he believes much of the trouble has stemmed from a business as usual’ attitude by most countries taking part in the rearmament effort. He has not directly mentioned welfare programmes in Britain or housing programmes in most European countries

except in talks with the U.S. delegation. What he has said to the Finance Ministers is that. . . there is room for retrenchment in most European budgets and that the lime has some to face a few politically unpopular decisions.

With this tune buzzing in their ears Herbert and Hugh had to return home to the election.

Twisting the Lion's Tail

Nor can this American attitude to Britain—with an obvious eye cast on the election—be separated from the parallel United States role in relation to the dilemmas of British imperialism in Persia. The sudden collapse of the British Government's initial high and mighty attitude to Persian aspirations, after all the parade of armed force, abrupt breaking off of negotiations, insistence on 'legal' rights, emphatic pledges never to withdraw, and contemptuous references to Moussadeq's approaching fall, to the final hasty exit was not due to a sudden conversion to the principles of pacifism and anti-imperialism, as they now seek to claim. It was due to three factors. First, the strength of Persian national feeling and the Persian mass movement, which British Intelligence had as usual underestimated with its cocksure calculations of following the customary method of buying up corrupt deputies and establishing a pliant Ministry. The second factor was the protecting role of the Soviet Persian 1921 Treaty, which stands guard over Persian independence against foreign armed aggression and thus proved a mighty shield for peace. But the third factor was undoubtedly the ambiguous (in reality, hardly even ambiguous) role of the United States, which, under cover of profound expressions of sympathy, proved itself not averse to assisting the discomfiture of British oil imperialism at the hands of Moussadeq.

A One-Way Alliance

In vain Britain's political leaders sent out their S.O.S. appeals to the sacred principles of the Anglo-American alliance for the maintenance of imperialism against anti-imperialist subversion. In vain they pointed out how Britain had faithfully backed with blood and votes American interests in Korea and now required a similar service in Persia. They failed to realise that the relationship of satellite

and overlord is not a relationship of equal allies, and that the alliance works one way only. Where American interests are involved, then the sanctity of international law, civilisation, the Charter, property-rights and what-have-you is paramount, and every satellite is expected to jump to instant obedience for action. Where: American interests point in a different direction, the picture alters.. American political leaders took a large and statesmanlike view of the problem, simultaneously advised both Britain and Moussadeq to be more moderate and less obstinate, provided free of charge some kindly avuncular lectures on the misdoings of Anglo-Iranian,, and warned against precipitate action.

Blood, Oil and Water

With ill-concealed fury British official expression swallowed the insults, kissed the boot that spurned them, and learned the lesson. But the snarls showed through the continued protestations of undying devotion to the American alliance:

The American attitude has been unhelpful. . . Some publicity has been given in Washington and elsewhere to the idea that some other oil company should be encouraged to enter Persia—talk in which it is difficult not to suspect an ulterior motive (City Editor, *The Times*, October 2). It will be galling for Britain to have to negotiate once more, after having declared that negotiations with Dr. Moussadeq were at an end. But no alternative is in sight. The American attitude has stiffened greatly in the past two weeks. It was partly the firmness of its absolute veto on the use of force which caused the British front against Moussadeq to collapse so suddenly. (*Observer*, October 7.)

Imperceptibly, the whole character of the case has changed since the British Government brought it to the Council ten days ago, to a point where Persia now tends to be in the stronger position. American efforts, concerned' for the destiny of the oilfields—with what altruism is a matter of doubt in some quarters—are concentrated far more on a negotiated settlement than on- the legal merits of the British case. (*The Times*. October 8.)

Blood may be thicker than water; but oil can be thicker than both.

Munich Memories

The old Munichite organ, the *Sunday Times*, unwisely revived memories of Munich:

Abadan is with the sole exception of Munich the worst defeat suffered by Great Britain during the present century in the sphere of foreign affairs. We have lost everything that was at stake. . . In some ways it is a lower humiliation than Munich itself; for there our discomfiture was inflicted by the then greatest Power, and we were not the only Great Power to suffer it. Here we have swallowed the cup of shame at the hands of one of the weakest nations in the world, and we have swallowed it alone. (Scrutator in the *Sunday Times*, October 7.)

Not so fast. The true analogy is closer than the writer realises. Munich was the path of appeasement of Nazi German imperialism in the name of the holy anti-Soviet cause; and Hitler took advantage of the appeasement to turn his offensive against the British Empire. The modern Munich is the path of appeasement of American imperialism in the name of the holy anti-Soviet cause; and American imperialism is taking advantage of the appeasement to press forward its interests at the expense of the British Empire, first in the Far East, and now in the Middle East. But the betrayal of Czechoslovakia was the denial of national rights. The claim of the Persian people to nationalisation of their oil industry is the vindication of national rights—even though their path of advance to full emancipation from all imperialism has still to be completed. It is piquant to see the old Munichites recall Munich with shame. But they recall it only to cling the closer to their modern Munich.

Britain's Dilemma—And the Lesson

The parties of imperialism and dependence on America have brought Britain to the extreme of weakness. Only new relations of friendship and alliance with the colonial peoples, on the basis of national independence and equal rights, and friendship and cooperation with the victorious anti-imperialist one third of the world, can ensure for Britain strength, independence and prosperity, in face of the pressure of American imperialism. Instead, they have chosen

the path of hostility and conflict with the colonial peoples, and with the anti-imperialist one third of the world, and cling to subservient dependence on the American masters. In the outcome, the American masters are using their subservience to rob them of their Empire. At the same time the pressure of American demands, the trade bans, the rearmament programme and^the new demands for still further increased rearmament, are ruining Britain's economy. The deficit on the balance of payments is reaching new record heights. Neither Tory nor Labour Imperialism can offer any solution. The time has come to advance to a new policy. The triumphant constructive advance of the countries of socialism and people's democracy provides the practical demonstration of an alternative policy and what it can achieve. Whatever the character of the Government to be formed after the election, the battle of the Labour movement and of the people of this country must go forward for a new policy which shall correspond to the aims of peace and the national independence of Britain and create the conditions for tackling the grave economic and social problems of the British people. The battle of the election is only the preparation for this fight after the election.

October 15, 1951.

R.P.D.

[pp. 497-507]

MEDITERRANEAN RIVALS. MALCOLM CARR, The Labour Monthly, November 1951

From the eighteenth century onwards, Britain, by the possession of Gibraltar and Malta, has had the dominating influence in the Mediterranean. This dominancy has in the past been contested by Italy, France and Germany and indeed, during the Second World War, Britain lost command of the Mediterranean and her supply ships had to make the 12,000 mile route round the Cape. But this lasted for less than two years. With the allied landing in North Africa she regained her position, and has subsequently held it until today. Now the threat to Britain's position in the inland sea comes from the United States. The rivalry between Britain and the U.S.A. for control of the Mediterranean has been the root cause of one of the most prolonged and bitterly fought diplomatic battles between the two 'allies' that has taken place since the war. It is still not completely settled, and the history of this conflict sheds a lurid light on the internecine struggle now convulsing the war-camp, where the U.S.A. insists on its word being law and where the suppliants of U.S. aid are forced to toe the line.

Since the end of the war, the U.S. has attempted by every means, political, economic and military, to extend its influence in the Middle East and indeed in every country upon the Mediterranean seaboard. The aim of this policy has been two-fold. Firstly there was attempt to include in the U.S. network of bases round the world, the priceless strategic oil-producing area of the Middle East. Secondly there was the attempt to oust Britain from her own previously exclusive domain and reduce the British position to that of a U.S.-paid police force. British physical occupation of the Middle East was seen as an invaluable asset to U.S. aims. It saved the U.S. keeping her own soldiers in the area, it served to maintain 'order', and most

important, it drew all the opprobrium that occupation troops suffer in the areas over which they hold sway.

As U.S. influence grew, Britain made intense efforts to salvage her reducing strength and to counter U.S. moves. The wildest schemes were tried out by both sides. The U.S. tried to rebuild taint-Soviet Saadabad Pact of 1937—this time to unite Persia, Turkey, Pakistan and Afghanistan in a bloc against the U.S.S.R. The State Department toyed with another idea—of a Pan-Islamic bloc from Morocco to Indonesia—financed by the dollar. Britain, in her turn, worked for a ‘Greater Syria’ or ‘Fertile Crescent’ plan which was to merge Jordan, Iraq, Syria and Lebanon under the late Emir Abdullah of Jordan. There was another scheme to set up a joint Jordan-Iraq-Syria Army under British control. None of these or other such ‘political’ schemes have so far reached fruition.

In the military sphere, however, the U.S. has not allowed the grass to grow under her feet. In a comparatively short time, the Mediterranean has been organised for war by the Americans. Examine the evidence. It is no longer a secret that the U.S. is negotiating with the Fascist Franco for bases in Spain—despite ‘protests’ in London and Paris. Work has already begun on vast air bases in Morocco, where some 20,000 U.S. airmen are to be stationed. The enormous African hinterland is to contain a network of bases. In Italy, Yugoslavia and Greece airfields are being built and extended to take U.S. long-range bombers. Corsica, Sardinia, Pantellaria, Malta, Crete, the Aegean islands, Rhodes and Cyprus are all the scene of feverish military activity. Airfields are being built in all those places, under the general direction of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation headquarters in France.

In the Middle East, itself an area which Britain has dominated for so long, and in which Britain has maintained bases in Egypt, Iraq and Jordan for decades, the U.S. is demanding facilities for their own aircraft and airmen, or

negotiating separate military arrangements or other aid schemes, which have the effect of undermining Britain's position as well as extending U.S. influence.

During the last few months the Americans have been trying to organise the whole of the Mediterranean area in one command or treaty organisation under a United States Commander-in-Chief. This Mediterranean bloc would in the U.S. conception be aligned with the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. The C.-in-C. would in the final resort take orders from General Eisenhower and the Atlantic Pact headquarters—S.H.A.P.E. In this bloc Turkey and Israel were to have key positions as the two countries in the area most amenable to U.S. orders and influence.

The idea of a Mediterranean bloc immediately confronted the Americans with considerable difficulties. (1) The peoples of the Middle East were by no means agreeable to aligning themselves in bloc with the new war-camp, and made their feelings known in various ways, by demonstrations, by 'neutralism' in the bourgeois parties, by signatures for the Stockholm Appeal and the Appeal for a five-power peace pact, and by other means. In Egypt and Persia, the people's desire to rid themselves of all imperialist entanglements is manifest. (2) The British imperialists took fright at the accession of so much power to the U.S. in a hitherto exclusive British preserve. Moves were made to counter the steps taken by the Americans. The Foreign Office sent Mr. Geoffrey Furlonge, the head of its Middle Eastern Department, on a tour of the Middle East to counteract the influence exerted by his U.S. opposite number George McGhee on a similar tour about the same time. When U.S. Air Secretary Finletter undertook a trip to inspect air-bases in Turkey, the British sent Sir Frank Whittle on a tour of all British Middle East air bases. Another significant move was the appointment of Sir John Troutbeck, a former head of British Intelligence in the Middle East, as Ambassador to Iraq.

At the same time there began in Washington a series of high level military and political conferences which at the present moment have still not quite succeeded in working out the chain of command and the arrangements for a Mediterranean bloc. At these talks the British have held out for the appointment of a British C.-in-C. over the Mediterranean Command. The appointment of Admiral Fechteler, they said, as Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic caused such a furore in Great Britain that the granting of another vital strategic Command to an American would not be stomached by the British people. The U.S. was prepared at one stage to accept this viewpoint, providing operational control in the area remained in their hands.

The second main difficulty in Washington was over the arrangements for the Eastern Mediterranean. This the British considered to be an exclusively Commonwealth interest, and they suggested that a separate Middle East Treaty Organisation be set up under British leadership. Geographically, of course, such an organisation must include Turkey—the only power in the Middle East with any military forces to speak of—and here the U.S. was able effectively to prevent any such organisation, with Turkish participation, from being established. Turkey refused to enter a British-led combination, and after a declaration of U.S. support, insisted on being allowed to join N.A.T.O. This, the British opposed for a long time but finally, in the course of a general compromise agreement upon the whole question, it was conceded to the U.S.

The *New York Times* military correspondent, Hanson L. Baldwin, in a widely quoted despatch obviously inspired by the Pentagon, gave details on July 21st of the terms of a 'compromise solution' to the Mediterranean command problem. This solution, combined with the other military moves discussed above, turns the Mediterranean into little less than an American lake.

The terms of this latest compromise can be summarised as follows: (1) A Near East 'theatre' including Greece and Turkey would be established under a British Commander, but it would be 'linked' with U.S.-led N.A.T.O. (2) The U.S. Mediterranean Naval Commander Admiral Cainey has his jurisdiction extended by the grant of operational authority over U.S. naval forces operating in any part of the Mediterranean, including the so-called British Near East 'theatre'. It is specifically stated that the British Near East Command will have no operational authority over U.S. forces in its own area. (3) In exchange for (2) above, the U.S. will 'permit' French, Italian and British naval vessels to 'operate' in the Western Mediterranean under their own national commanders. (4) The British will be allowed to retain command of Gibraltar.

Such is the depth to which British Imperialism has now fallen submission to the U.S. that it is apparently willing to accept a U.S. regime over what it regards as a vital strategic area, and a one-time exclusive British preserve.

But what of the peoples of the Middle East and Mediterranean? Are they prepared submissively to enter the war-camp and risk their countries being turned into battlefields without a struggle? Certainly they have not been consulted, but they are making their voices heard just the same. The Middle East is in ferment. There is no space here to give all the details of the rising tide of revolt in the whole area, but sufficient can be stated to indicate that the imperialists may prepare their cut-and-dried schemes, but whether they can put them into practice is quite another question. The Persian people have set back imperialist calculations a good long way, and may yet do much more in this direction. The Egyptian people have now entered the final stage of their struggle to free their country of foreign troops and to realise their national demands. They will surely reject, too, a strategic scheme which will merely replace British

domination by American. In Iraq the movement for peace has, according to the *New York Times*, made 'unexpected headway'.

In the Sudan railway and police strikes have frightened the government into the arrest and sentence of the Sudan Peace Committee. In Syria and Lebanon savage repression of the progressive movement has failed to damp its ardour or reduce its activity. In Cyprus, in Morocco, and in the Atlantic Pact countries themselves, the struggle against those who are trying to instigate a new war, is reaching new heights and involving larger and larger numbers of people. This movement may yet serve to remove the U.S. from *Mare Internum* and preserve it for the peaceful occupations of its peoples.

[pp. 533-537]

War Moves Over the Middle East by Clemens Dutt, *The Labour Monthly*, January 1952

THE ill-defined region which stretches from the Greek end of the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf and is now usually called the Middle East, rather than the Near East, has recently come to occupy the forefront of attention in the international situation. The Middle East, no less than the Far East, has become a key battleground in the world-wide struggle between the democratic forces of the people and the forces operating to preserve the existing system of imperialist domination and exploitation.

The present importance of this region arises, however, particularly because this struggle has flared up just at a time when the Middle East has become a vital area for the aggressive war plans of Anglo-American imperialism and the States subsidiary to it. The two phenomena are, of course, closely inter-related. The Middle East has more than half the world's oil resources. It is an area of foreign capitalist exploitation in which the American monopolies are playing an ever-increasing role. The war plans of imperialism envisage measures intended in the name of security to hold in check, and if necessary to suppress by force, the national liberation movements for the overthrow of foreign domination and exploitation. But the so-called 'global strategy' of the 'free world' goes further and comprises in essence thinly-veiled preparations for an offensive war to win back for capitalism the countries advancing to Socialism and even in some ambitions to destroy the citadel of Socialism itself, the U.S.S.R.

By naked force in the case of Greece, and by military and economic pressure in the case of Turkey, these two countries have been won for the planned ring of anti-Soviet States on the southern borders of the U.S.S.R., and accordingly have been

admitted into the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (N.A.T.O.), in open mockery of the latter's ostensible character as a defensive grouping of Atlantic countries. Turkey is strategically situated in relation to both the U.S.S.R. and the Arab States of the Middle East. Hence the endeavour to use Turkey as one of the bases in extending the Atlantic Alliance by setting up under Anglo-American leadership a regional grouping of Middle Eastern States capable of attacking the vital areas in the south of the U.S.S.R. Of course, this is being done in the name of 'defence'.

British imperialism has always justified its domination in the Middle East on the ground of the vital strategic and economic interests of the British Empire. Now U.S. imperialism has not only penetrated this former British preserve to such an extent that it can adopt the same argument of the need to safeguard its own economic interests there, but it puts forward on its own behalf the same argument of vital strategic interests. This can be seen, for example, from the U.S. State Department's Mutual Security Programme for 1952, submitted to Congress for approval. This says:

The Near Eastern area is important to the security of the United States and of the free world. It lies athwart the principal lines of sea and air communications in the eastern hemisphere. It is a land bridge between Asia and Africa, Soviet control of which would expose the African continent. It is the source of a prime strategic material, oil, the continuing supply of which is essential to friendly nations in Europe and Asia. It supplies three-fourths of the petroleum requirements of Western Europe.

Commenting on this, the *Economist* (August 4, 1951) remarked that it could be added, but is not added in the official document, that:

If Soviet expansion is to be arrested, the Middle East is important also because it is the site of bases (British in Egypt, Jordan and Iraq, and American in Saudi Arabia) which cause the Soviet Union to reflect that the Caucasus is its soft underbelly.

This is, in effect a striking admission of the considerations underlying the building up of a 'striking force' in the Middle East. Just as the favourite dream of the anti-Soviet war maniacs in 1918 and 1919, and again in the 'switch the war' propaganda of 1940-41, was to strike at the U.S.S.R. through the Baku oil-fields, so once again the thoughts of the anti-Soviet warmongers are centred on launching a blow at the Soviet Union through what they hope to be the latter's 'soft underbelly'.

Following the Ottawa Conference of the Atlantic Pact countries, the United States initiative for extending this Pact by a Middle East regional Pact came to fruition in the invitation made to Egypt on October 13 to become a partner in a joint Middle East 'defence organisation' along with the U.S.A., Britain, France and Turkey, an invitation extended jointly by these Powers. An 'Allied Middle East Command' on which these five countries would be represented was proposed, and the inducement was held out to Egypt that British troops would then be withdrawn from the Suez Canal Zone, except for those authorised by the Middle East Command to remain as part of an international garrison.

The lure was not very strong and indeed the moment chosen was hardly auspicious. The unprecedented upsurge of the Egyptian mass movement for national liberation and popular sovereignty, had just compelled the Egyptian Government to announce the abrogation of the 1936 Treaty with Britain and to demand the removal of foreign troops from the Suez Canal. To answer this demand by proposing that the British war bases should be exchanged for American-dominated ones could only be regarded as more of a threat than a promise. To the Egyptians it looked as if casting out the foreign devil by this means would only involve his return with others worse than himself. Particularly cynical was the proposal that Turkey, the historic oppressor of the Arab peoples, should be a partner in the new foreign military occupation of the Arab countries. Further, the immediate support for the plans expressed by Canada, Australia

and New Zealand, whose participation in the command has only been deferred as inexpedient at present, indicated that the term 'Middle East Defence' was as much a camouflage as the term 'Atlantic Defence'.

In vain was it stressed, as *The Times* put it, that the proposals 'express a revolution in the diplomatic and strategic thinking of many powerful States' and, in particular, that 'Britain, which has been the chief guardian of Suez and the bridge between Asia and Africa, recognises the shifts in the balance of world power and is now ready to share the guardianship with others'. The essential feature in Egyptian eyes could only be that the country would remain under foreign occupation while Egypt would be compelled to give all assistance to imperialist preparations for a future war. The annexe to the proposal put the matter bluntly:

1. Egypt will agree to furnish to A.M.E.C. (Allied Middle East Command) such facilities on her soil as are indispensable for the organisation in peacetime of Middle East defence;

2. She will undertake to grant the forces of the A.M.E.C. all necessary facilities and assistance in the event of war, imminent menace of war, or apprehend international emergency, including the use of Egyptian ports, airfields and means of communication.

Consequently it is not surprising that the proposals were indignantly rejected by the Egyptian Government. The clumsy pretence of Egyptian 'equal partnership' was too threadbare. It was too evident that military control would rest in the hands of the U.S.A. and Britain and that any Egyptian forces would play as subordinate a role as the armies of the smaller European States do in N.A.T.O.

The situation in Egypt became more and more tense, and British troops were poured into the country in an inflammable situation. A new version of the plan was worked out behind the scenes and put forward in a Four-Power statement on November 10. It contained a slight change of tone but not of substance. The effort was made to give an assurance that Egyptian internal sovereignty would not be impaired, specifying for instance:

The Middle East Command ... will not interfere in problems and disputes arising within the area. Movement of these troops placed under the Supreme Allied Commander Middle East's Command to or within the territories of the States joining in the defence of the Middle East will be made only with the agreement of the State or States concerned and in full accord with their national independence and sovereignty.

Any facilities granted to the Middle East Command by States joining in the defence of the Middle East will be the subject of specific agreements.

The explanations only confirm the essence of the plan as one for the continuation and expansion of foreign occupation. The Egyptian Prime Minister denounced the plan as 'worse than colonialism', as a plan for furthering the ambitions of 'greedy Great Powers at the expense of smaller nations'. The head of the Syrian delegation to the United Nations in Paris said that it was an interference in the sovereign rights of the Arab States.

Nevertheless, under American direction, the plan is being pushed forward and every form of pressure is being exercised to secure support from the other Arab States. Imperialism relies on its protégés among the rulers and on the corrupt bourgeois politicians who would be swept aside if the movement for national freedom triumphed. The bait is held out to the Arab States that they will receive arms from the U.S.A. and help in the development of their armed forces if they participate, which would otherwise be refused. The Arab-Israel conflict is being played upon, since Israel's support is expected owing to its being more directly under American control. *The Daily Telegraph* voices the threat that in case of refusal by Egypt the Western powers will make Israel a central part of the defence scheme and that it will thus become more powerful than the Arab states. Above all, the 'menace of Communism' is increasingly used as a means to scare the bourgeois political leaders in the Arab countries.

So far all this has had no effect. The Communist bogey is regarded in Egypt as a 'fabricated nightmare'. But whatever the outcome it is clear that a new stage has been reached in the Middle East in which the dominant role is played by the U.S.A., which is seeking not only to oust Britain as the chief exploiter of the Arab peoples, but to secure its own military and political domination in this region. As the *Observer* remarked (October 28): 'We have to accept the climate made in the U.S.A.', and Mr. Churchill has been taken to task for his unqualified admission, in his Guildhall speech, that 'the Americans have risen to leadership of the world'. The Anglo-American rivalry goes forward in the new stage although it is now recognised that the British role is subordinate to that of the U.S.A. Britain has shown a 'firm hand' in Egypt, relying on U.S. support. But the U.S.A. is not primarily interested in the protection of British interests. *The Economist* (September 1) commented 'Visiting American dignitaries in Cairo, as in Teheran, have left the impression that they will be glad to see the British removed'. In the Foreign Affairs debate in the House of Commons on November 20, Mr. S. N. Evans (Labour) pointed out that there seemed to be two American influences at work. 'One seems anxious to put us back on our feet, and the other to do just the opposite.' The enormous augmentation of British troops in Egypt must be viewed also in this light. Not only do they far exceed the limits permitted by the 1936 Treaty but they far exceed any possible requirements for suppression of civil disorder in Egypt. One reason is given by the Egyptian correspondent of the *Sunday Times* (November 18), who says that it 'constitutes an effective British claim for playing a major part in the development of plans for a joint Middle East Command'. The Anglo-American struggle for control of material resources and strategic positions extends even to the Sudan. Despite the Condominium agreement for joint British-Egyptian rule, Britain has treated the Sudan as its colony and

covers its imperialist exploitation by claiming that it must protect the Sudanese people whom it is leading towards independence. But the Sudanese are biting their protector's hand and even the pro-British party in the Sudan is now telling the British to get out. The fact that Mr. Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations, who enjoys favour with the Americans, is sponsoring the idea of a Sudan plebiscite in the near future after both Egyptian and British troops have been withdrawn, suggests that the U.S.A. sees here a method of putting pressure on Britain.

Under American leadership, the so-called Western world is rushing headlong towards war. Nor is there any doubt as to what war is intended. The Manchester Guardian, in an editorial on the revised Middle East 'defence plan' (November 12) tells the Arab States: 'The great question . . . is whether they wish, in the event of war, to be counted among the allies of the Western democracies against Russian imperialism.' No talk here even of the invasion bogey. They are to be dragged into a war which will be decided on elsewhere, in which they will have no say and in which they will be used as tools.

The Soviet Government in its Notes of November 21 and 24 gives serious warning of the consequences of the steps that are being undertaken. It makes clear that the plans for a Middle East Command have nothing in common with the interests of safeguarding peace and security in the Middle East, nor with the genuine national interests of the states in this region. Their operation would mean the loss of the independence and sovereignty of the Middle Eastern countries and would damage the relations existing between the U.S.S.R. and these countries.

The Arab peoples do not want their countries to be converted into a battlefield. The national liberation struggle is embracing ever wider sections of the people, who know from their own experience that subjection to foreign imperialism means their exploitation and impoverishment and their use as

cannon fodder. Hence the growing mass movement in Egypt, Iran and other countries of the Middle East has a significance far greater than that of a domestic movement for national liberation. A resolution of the World Peace Council has emphasised the importance to the cause of world peace of this resistance to the imposition of imperialist bases and foreign troops in the Middle East. In the present circumstances this movement takes its place as an integral part of the fight for world peace, as a contribution to the cause of the millions of ordinary people all over the world who are seeking to bridle the warmongers and prevent them from launching a third world war.

[pp. 21-28]

OLD FALLACIES FOR NEW By **ANDREW ROTHSTEIN**, *The Labour Monthly*, August 1953

..... In Britain and America, says Strachey, there is State monopoly capitalism in a democratic environment. Where is this environment? The geographical environment of American state monopoly capitalism is (i) the military dictatorships in Central and South America whom the U.S.A. openly supports because they guarantee the profits of its investor companies there—with the exception of the democratic regime in Guatemala which it hates and intrigues against (ii) the colonial dictatorships which it maintains itself, under ever so thin a veil, in the Philippines and Puerto Rico (iii) its puppet regimes in South Korea, Taiwan (Formosa) and Japan (iv) the regimes of terrorist suppression of the working-class movement which it publicly finances in Franco Spain, Greece, Turkey and Yugoslavia. Wherever else a step can be taken, with dollars or military supplies, to interfere in a country's internal affairs, even the extent of excluding the representatives of the working class from the government and altering the constitution to make this permanent, if possible, the U.S.A. does it: witness France and Italy five years ago. What a democratic environment!

Politically the environment of U.S. monopoly capitalism is (i) the unparalleled political victimisation in America of which the Mc-Carths and McCarrans are only the instruments (ii) the constant war propaganda of highly-placed generals and ministers (iii) the system of brazen judicial frame-up and terror against everything left, unequalled outside Hitler Germany, of which the Rosenberg case is but the most sickening example (iv) the armed thuggery against militant workers carried on by employers and almost irremovable trade union bureaucracies (v) the gerrymandering of the electoral system against Negroes and progressives, shown by analysis of all election figures (vi) the gross misuse of the press to silence protest and blackmail

progressives in every sphere, cultural as well as political. Very democratic: for further details see Philip Bolsovers *America Over Britain* and Derek Kartuns *U.S.A.* 53.

And what is the geographical environment of British monopoly capitalism? The colonial investors wars raging in Malaya and Kenya—a combination of the methods of butchery used to suppress the Indian Mutiny, with more modern weapons, of course, and the cynical denial that the fighting native patriots are supported by the mass of their people which was a commonplace of Britain's war on Ireland in 1919-1922, The imposition of hated settler rule by 160,000 white planters on six million Africans, without even the pretence that the latter agree, in Central Africa—with more British investments to safeguard. The maintenance of British military occupation in Egypt, after seventy years of as many hypocritical promises to withdraw it: but Suez Canal and other shares well protected. The refusal of self-determination, in spite of the clearly expressed wish of the people, to Cyprus. The regime of police rule practised by the British puppet governments in Northern Ireland and the West Indies. Oh, most democratic. Did Mr. Strachey never read Hobbes in his *Leviathan* pointing out that those provinces which are in subjection to a democracy or aristocracy of another commonwealth (are not) democratically or aristocratically governed, but monarchically i.e. despotically?

So Mr. Strachey's new, alternative, democratic form of state monopoly capitalism reduces itself, on examination, and in a very conditional form, to the *internal* situation in Britain, where a moderately democratic regime gives scope for trade union activity and working-class organisation—and to forget the bloody repressions in the colonial backyard, of which Mr. Strachey wrote himself (*Why You Should Be A Socialist*, May, 1938), that the principal circumstance making possible a certain amount of social progress in Britain is the possession by our employing class of the biggest and richest empire in the world.

True, the empire has-been somewhat modified in shape since then—but super-profits from India and Pakistan for British investors are still wrung from the working people of those countries held down in dire poverty by governments which, in this respect at least, have not changed the methods used during the British occupation.

....

[pp. 364-371]

PATIENT TEACHER. The Labour Monthly, August 1954

HISTORY is the most patient of teachers; but she keeps a rod for those who do not heed her. When Latin American countries, fired with the principles of the French Revolution and their neighbours' War of Independence, threw off the yoke of Spain, the young U.S.A. was the first Power to recognise them. And when the Bourbons planned an invasion to win back their former Empire, President Monroe gave them check. He declared that the Americas were no longer a field for European colonisation, and that an attempt to control the destiny of any American community would be an act 'of an unfriendly disposition toward the U.S.' At that time the peoples of the former colonies of Spain and of Britain alike could applaud the Monroe Doctrine, as a guard against counter-revolutionary tyrants. But that was 130 years ago. Today they see the Monroe Doctrine invoked by the tyrant to exclude the United Nations from hearing the complaint of an outraged small nation. 'Keep out of our hemisphere!' bawls the Yankee namesake of the discoverer of North America. The lesson history has yet to teach the 'new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal', who fought King George III for their independence, is that no people can win freedom who deny it to others. (If only every British housewife realised how much it costs her in rising prices to keep troops in Kenya, Malaya, Egypt, Cyprus, the Carribbean, she would support the colonial struggles for freedom and fight for her own.)

The day Guatemala was invaded, June 18, the Foreign Minister airmailed to us the article which appears on page 357. Today Guillermo Toriello shares a precarious sanctuary afforded by the Mexican Embassy in Guatemala City with 500 other refugees; others have been massacred. His message has already become an eloquent voice from the past. Yet one more

lesson history has to teach us; freedom cannot be silenced. A Latin American reader in London points out 'how the Americans have defeated themselves by showing my disillusioned friends in South America who is the real tyrant'. He explains that, having already won ten new readers this year, he intends 'to continue to do good to myself and my people of British Guiana, and all South America, by getting more still. This is how to change the outlook of the British, so that they can release themselves from American bondage too'. He claims that specimen copies did '90 per cent, of the work for me'.

....

[p. 336]

**LABOUR PARTY BOOMERANG. By E. M.
Winterton, The Labour Monthly, September
1954**

....: two of the dirtiest colonial wars in history are still raging—one in Malaya and one in Kenya—and both to our shame are being conducted by British finance-capital, anxious about its investments. Support for the strongest resolutions on this subjection the conference agendas, not the weakest, will bring the best dividends for Socialism. Again, it is the policy of servility towards America which leads to the new military commitments in Cyprus—and in turn to the bludgeoning dictatorship of British militarism and navalism over the Cypriots. To demand repudiation of the Tory Government's actions in Cyprus is bound up with the fight to free Britain from American domination, and to pursue the latter objective without the former means hamstringing the whole struggle. These are only two illustrations, although important ones, of the great fact in British politics in the autumn of 1954: that the working class militants have the ball at their feet, as never before.

[pp. 405-407]

NOTES OF THE MONTH: *New Horizons*, by R.P.D., *The Labour Monthly*, September 1954

....

Time for New Thinking

In this new world situation Britain has begun, as shown at Geneva—with whatever deficiencies, limitations and contradictions—to find the first signs of a positive and independent role, alongside India, in world politics, in place of being merely a cipher under American orders. It is the shame and disgrace of the present dominant leadership of the labour movement that this first initiative should have been left to Churchill, Eden and a Tory Government. The price of this, even measured in the narrowest electoral calculation, which Mr. Morrison should be capable of understanding, was shown in the loss of Sunderland on the day after the Churchill speech of May 11 last year—the first example for 30 years of a Government gaining a seat from the Opposition in a by-election. On a broader basis the price is shown in all the deficiencies of execution of such a policy by a Tory Government—the senseless bullying of France over E.D.C., the many continuing surrenders, the Cort case and Klimovicz case, the record in Cyprus or Kenya, etc. The situation calls aloud for Labour to stand in the forefront for peace and independent national leadership. Labour's future in the present era depends on such a new orientation.

[p. 385-398]

ENOSIS—CYPRUS' ROAD TO FREEDOM. GEORGE PEFKOS. *The Labour Monthly*, November 1954

A STRIKING photograph of a young London Cypriot carrying a poster saying 'Five years in prison for any Cypriot who dares say *Enosis*', was published recently on the front page of a British non-Communist newspaper with the following characteristic caption: 'A picture that shames every Briton.' Indeed, the grave decisions taken by the Tory Government in the recent months on the future of Cyprus—decisions taken in the name of the British people—are a menace to the British people as well.

At the end of June, the British Government, ignoring the fact that 100,000 adult inhabitants of Cyprus had signed a peace petition in 1950, and without any consultation of the people of Cyprus, declared that it had decided to transfer the Middle East Command from Egypt to Cyprus. As soon as this became known in Cyprus, the whole people protested to the Governor and Colonial Office.

What does this decision mean for Cyprus? Firstly it means complete destruction for that beautiful island in the event of a new imperialist war: secondly, perpetuation of the colonial status of the island: thirdly, still more poverty, unemployment and rising cost of living owing to the presence of yet more foreign troops there.* Cyprus, like other colonies has no effective industry: the great majority of the population are peasants and small farmers. Already 87,000 acres of fertile land have been confiscated and taken over for military purposes. Despite the

* *Since this was written, the official cost of living index has shown, in one month alone (September 1954), a rise of 4.3 points—due, of course, to the transfer of more troops from Egypt to Cyprus. This gives the lie to British official propaganda that the move of the Middle East Command will benefit financially the people of Cyprus.*

resistance of the people it is planned to take over yet more land. Whole villages, led by the village priests in the front line, are demonstrating against this confiscation of land which is forcing thousands of young Cypriot peasants to emigrate to Britain and other parts of the British Empire to seek a livelihood. In the House of Commons on July 29 Sir Winston Churchill explained that, with the development of the Hydrogen bomb, in any future war, the position of British troops in Egypt would be untenable. A day earlier, the Tory Major Legge-Bourke unwittingly underlined what the decision to transfer the Middle East Command to Cyprus may mean for the people of that island when he said:

I am quite sure that if the arguments that have been used about H-bombs for removing ourselves from Egypt are applied to Cyprus, the position of Cyprus is thoroughly terrifying.

The Cypriot people have long been aware of these dangers and that is why their demand for Enosis is coupled with the demand that no foreign power shall have the right to military bases on the island. On July 28, the Minister of State for the Colonies, H. L. d'A. Hopkinson, almost on the eve of the summer recess and without any previous notice to the House, suddenly announced further grave decisions on the future of Cyprus. These decisions shocked endangered not only the people of Cyprus and of Greece but also some of the Labour members who know something of the history and aspirations of the people of Cyprus. Mr. Hopkinson quite cynically declared that: They could not contemplate a change in the sovereignty of Cyprus' and that 'certain Commonwealth territories. . . could never expect to be fully independent'. He also announced that the government had decided, 'to introduce in the near future a modified constitution providing for a legislature containing both official and nominated members—together forming a majority—and elected members'. In other words, the Cypriot people should give up their hopes and aspirations for National

Rehabilitation and understand that their future should be based on serving imperialist aims—as long as imperialism exists. These amazing statements—contradicting all the previous assertions that Britain’s mission was to educate the colonies until the time when they could rule themselves—were made to meet the Tory caucus’ insistence on a declaration that there would be no more withdrawals from territories in the Empire or under its domination.

In the heated debate which followed, Mr. Hopkinson expressed the hope that ‘enough men of goodwill’ would come forward to operate the new constitution. He based his hopes, no doubt, on the systematic efforts of the colonial administration to create a pro-British feeling among the Cypriots by effectively controlling education, prohibiting Greek history and even the Greek national anthem in the schools, promoting teachers on the basis of their knowledge of English whilst dismissing patriotic teachers, granting scholarships to Cypriot students (incidentally forcing others to study in Britain since degrees from other universities are not recognised in Cyprus) and by high wages and salaries for government employees.

Mr. Hopkinson was ignoring the fact that British imperialism is not the first which has endeavoured to destroy the national Greek character of the Greek people of Cyprus. Neither is it the first to fail in this endeavour! For three centuries prior to the British, the Turks (and others for four centuries before them) closed down the Greek schools and suppressed the national Greek culture and did everything possible to destroy the national Greek character of the people. But on the ‘fruitful’ results of their efforts let an ex-governor of Cyprus, Sir Ronald Storrs, speak. In his book he wrote:

The Greekness of Cypriots is in my opinion indisputable. . . . No sensible person will deny that the Cypriot is Greek-speaking, Greek-thinking, Greek-feeling, Greek {*Orientalisms*, p. 550).

As for the ‘constitution’ which Mr. Hopkinson hoped might attract at any rate a section of Cypriots, the people of Cyprus as a whole learned from their own experience—even before it was confirmed by the case of British Guiana—that these ‘constitutions’ are only granted and maintained as long as they serve the interests of the imperialist power. Cyprus had a constitution from 1882 until 1931. During all those years not a single bill was passed in the Legislative Council promoting the national interest of the people. In 1931, when taxes proposed by the British Governor were defeated when (for the first time) a Turkish member of the Council voted with the Greeks, the taxation bill was made law by decree. Following the expressed indignation and opposition of the people, even the sham constitution was withdrawn. Since then Cyprus has been ruled directly from Whitehall with the British Governor as virtual dictator of the island. In 1948, a more ‘liberal’ constitution was offered with a majority of elected members in the Legislative Council but with executive and veto powers again left in the hands of the Governor. This offer was unanimously rejected by the people of Cyprus. It will not therefore be an easy task for Mr. Hopkinson to find ‘men of goodwill’ to operate the new ‘constitution’ announced on July 28, 1954, which provides for a majority of *non-elected* members.

These ‘last ditch’ measures of the Tory Government are not only an insult to the people of Cyprus but have outraged the national feelings of the whole Greek nation, which has forced the monarcho-fascist government of Greece to place the question of Cyprus before the United Nations.

Five days after the announcement by Mr. Hopkinson of the decision to impose a constitution, his representatives in Cyprus announced that the monstrous laws of 1931 which had not been enforced for some years, would be put into force. These laws, violating every human and democratic principle, were denounced by even the most reactionary press in Britain. Their

enforcement means the outlawing of every Greek political party in Cyprus whether of the right or the left because all support the Union of Cyprus with Greece (Enosis) which is, by these laws, to be treated as sedition. Leaders of political parties advocating Enosis may be imprisoned for five years and ordinary members for two. Newspapers writing about Enosis may be suppressed for three years and their editors imprisoned for five. These laws in practice forbid the circulation of British newspapers which advocate Enosis and even of reports of debates in the House of Commons taken from Hansard. The popular word 'Enosis' which has been the symbol of freedom for many centuries in Cyprus is outlawed. Any Cypriot who dare pronounce it—even in his own home—may be imprisoned for years.

But these monstrous laws, brutal as they are, have had a positive effect: they have exposed imperialism as the common enemy of all Cypriots—so that even anti-Communist Enosis supporters now recognise the correctness of the Cypriot Communists' consistent fight against British imperialism and the need for a united front against imperialism. A solid unity has been achieved embracing every political party and Greek organisation in Cyprus. For the first time, the Archbishop of Cyprus has met with the General Secretary of the People's Party of Cyprus, A.K.E.L., for discussions on the common problems and the measures to be taken to confront them.

The fortnight which followed Mr. Hopkinson's statement constitutes a landmark in the struggle of the people of Cyprus for National Rehabilitation. Nationalist and Communist editors met together and took common action: in protest against the 'anti-sedition' laws they stopped publication of their newspapers for one week. Communist and Nationalist mayors and councillors met, unanimously protested against these laws and demanded the right of the Cypriot people to self-determination.

Above all, unity in action appeared in the whole working class of Cyprus with the peasantry. This was vividly

demonstrated in the completely successful 24-hour general strike on August 12, called by trade union organisations of the right and of the left, the right and the left peasants organisations and the Shopkeepers' Association. It was one of the most outstanding political events in the history of Cyprus. This unity in action on the part of workers and peasants, and other sections of the people, coupled with the unity splendidly expressed by the workers and peasants and others in Greece itself for the cause of Enosis is the guarantee of success for the people of Cyprus and Greece in their struggles against imperialism.

The fight of the people of Cyprus for Enosis and the ceaseless struggle of the people of Greece against the Anglo-American imperialists and their monarcho-fascist agents in Greece are one and inseparable. It should never be forgotten that the present reactionary regime in Greece was imposed upon the people of Greece by the same British imperialists who today hold Cyprus in subjection. Since the present regime in Greece owes its existence to British intervention in 1944 and U.S. dollars since 1947, it can be readily understood that Premier Papagos and his government brought the question of Cyprus before U.N.O. only as the result of intense and united pressure by the Greek people. In fact, Papagos and his crew do not want Enosis. On May 19, 1954, he made this clear in an interview with an Italian journalist when he said: that Greece did not want Enosis but a constitution for Cyprus and a promise that, after a number of years a plebiscite would be held there.

This achievement of the people of Greece has already had its effect upon the aggressive alliances of the imperialists' satellites. Only a few weeks ago Greece, Turkey and Yugoslavia signed a treaty of alliance: today Turkey threatens Greece with war itself if the appeal to U.N.O. on Cyprus is proceeded with. All American subterfuge has not succeeded in concealing from the Greek people that this 'great ally' not only does not support the Greek demand for Cyprus but is working night and day to

prevent the question being discussed. When on September 23 the Steering Committee decided by nine votes to three with three abstentions to place the question on the agenda of this Ninth General Assembly, it was worthy of note that the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Burma, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Iceland, Siam and Syria voted in support, whilst imperialist France and Australia voted with Britain against; the U.S.A.—the ‘great ally’ of Greece—abstained. The other ‘great ally’ of monarch-fascist Greece, Turkey, voted against when the General Assembly endorsed the decision by 30 to 19 with 11 abstentions. Thus the whole Greek nation can see who are their friends and who are their potential enemies. The Soviet Union and the People’s Democracies are thus recognised as champions of the rights of all oppressed peoples. There are people who ask why the Cypriots want to ‘unite with a monarcho-fascist Greece’ and lose the ‘benefits’ of British colonialism. They should remember the following. Governments come and go but the People always remain. A united people of Greece and Cyprus can fight much more effectively for the fulfilment of their aspirations than when they are divided as they are at present. For the heroic people of Greece it is not the first time that they suffer under a dictatorship like the present one. Recent history shows that during the past 34 years at least eight dictatorial regimes and reactionary kings have been routed by democratic struggle.

As for the propaganda of the British Colonial Office on the ‘prosperity’ of Cyprus, let the facts speak for themselves. In 1938, an official investigation into ‘the needs of those governed’ revealed after definite minimum average of subsistence had been fixed that 25 per cent, of the people were existing below that level, 50 per cent, just at that level and only 25 per cent, above it. In 1951 alone, 3,809 people emigrated to Britain and other parts of the British Empire. After 76 years of British rule, the bulk of the peasants still use primitive wooden ploughs for tilling their land. The total sum of Cyprus’ national income is

£25,838,000. Of this profits amount to 18,428,000 (51.43 per cent.); interest to £899,000; rents to £4,892,000; wages and salaries to only £11,614,000. Profits, interest and rent take 67.59 per cent, of Cyprus' national income!

Now the question of Cyprus has been placed before U.N.O. The Cypriots have no illusions about the hazards entailed. The people of Cyprus know that the fulfilment of their aspirations depends on the united and systematic struggle of the Cypriot and Greek people, the support of the democratic forces of the whole world and not least on the solidarity of the great labour movement in Britain. Under the glorious banner of unity, inspired by the symbol of the general strike of August 12, the Cypriot people has prevented the British colonialists from, as yet, actually operating the monstrous laws announced on August 2. The Greek people have forced the monarcho-fascists to act against their will and take the question to U.N.O. Now, at this very moment, the monarcho-fascists of Greece and the U.S. imperialists are conspiring with the British to find a 'solution' and (after putting it last on the U.N. agenda) so to betray the aspirations of the Greek nation for Enosis.

Without underestimating the great difficulties which face the Cypriots in their struggle on the road ahead, they are advancing, confident that the day of national rehabilitation cannot be delayed for long. There can be no other solution of the national and economic problems of Cyprus than the one proposed by the Cypriot people. That is, Enosis—the Union of Cyprus with Greece, without conditions, and without granting military bases to any foreign power. Any other 'solution' such as 'constitution', so-called self-government, or any other compromise with imperialism is not only dangerous and harmful to the people of Cyprus and the Greek nation as a whole, but it constitutes a threat to world peace and affects the wellbeing of the British people.

TERROR IN THE MIDDLE EAST. C. ALLEN, *The Labour Monthly*, December 1954

TERROR is raging in Iran. Oil is flowing once more from its oil-fields: and blood is flowing in its prisons and concentration camps. Its rulers have betrayed their country's interests to the Anglo-American oil trusts. The price of that betrayal is the blood of innocent men. All who opposed the betrayal are being hunted down. All democratic rights are suppressed, with wholesale murder and horrible tortures. The latest victim, Hussein Fatemi, Foreign Secretary 15 months ago in the Moussadeq cabinet that nationalised the oil industry, was executed after prolonged tortures: in his dying words he declared that the British were responsible for his murder.

General Zahedi, during the war the chief Nazi agent in Iran, then coming to power with United States aid by the *coup d'état* of August 19, 1953, has sold his country to Anglo-American imperialism to be a source of their oil profits and a base for their war plans. The suppression of the Tudeh Party, which headed the national liberation movement, was the prelude to the suppression of all democratic and patriotic organisations. Over one thousand army officers have been arrested, over ten thousand political opponents of Zahedi are in prison. Hundreds have been sent to die under torture in the 'death islands' of the Persian Gulf. The one-time agent of Hitler is adept at fascist barbarities. These Iranian atrocities have shocked the world. In France, even conservative writers like Mauriac, Duhamel, Cocteau, have raised their voice to demand an end to the executions. From Britain, with greater reason, the voices of protest should be raised: *End the Iranian Atrocities*.

In Iraq terror is raging. Nuri Said in his few months as head of the government has abolished all political parties, suppressed all opposition newspapers, imprisoned opponents to the number of over two thousand. In the prisons fingers are burned, needles

stuck in heels, and there are other horrible tortures. Not only has a leading Communist been hanged but imprisonment for life is the penalty stated for those suspected of membership of the Communist Party of Iraq. For others, such as members of the peace movement, a new law prescribes that they may be deprived of their nationality. Here too the methods of the Nazis are the model followed.

Terror is raging in Egypt. The military dictatorship of Nasser has filled prisons and concentration camps with opponents, some, arrested soon after the *coup d'état* of July, 1952, some at each crisis of the regime since then and some in these last few weeks. This autumn 60 professors and lecturers suspected of a progressive outlook were dismissed from the universities, and 300 students were expelled. Academic freedom is ended. Newspapers are suppressed. The accusation of 'communism' results in long-term imprisonment. Trials are held in military 'courts', without proper defence or right of appeal.

Terror is raging in Pakistan. Ghulam Mohammed, the Governor-General, who overthrew the legally elected government of East Pakistan six months ago, imprisoned the ministers and placed the greater part of the country under military dictatorship, has now abolished the Pakistan constituent assembly and placed Pakistan as a whole under despotic rule, the finance for which is contributed by the United States Government. In these last weeks political opponents in hundreds have been cast into gaol.

Terror is raging in Turkey. Following the American-inspired Turkey-Pakistan Pact, those suspected of membership of the (already illegal) Turkish Communist Party were arrested, democratic rights were reduced and men considered by *The Times* to be amongst the leading journalists of Turkey have been cast into prison.

The iron hand is stretched out over Cyprus. No one is permitted to advocate Enosis (union with Greece) or even to

reprint speeches in the British Parliament on this subject. Cyprus is a crown colony, Pakistan a part of the British Empire. The other countries are independent sovereign states in name; but in fact are dependent on the Anglo-American imperialists, who want to use these territories as strategic bases for their war plans. For this they require ruthless dictatorship to suppress the resistance of the peoples. Hence, in the countries of the Middle East, this terror, which must be indicted by the conscience of mankind: and, at the head of the indictment stands the Iranian Atrocities.

[p. 559.560]

TURNING POINT FOR PEACE By GORDON SCHAFFER. The Labour Monthly, October 1955

THE people celebrate their rejection of the cold war and their hopes for creative co-existence. Football and athletic teams meet in Moscow. Mr. Malik switches on the lights at Blackpool. Scientists at Geneva swop atomic data, which would have given M.I.5 and F.B.I, the opportunity for unprecedented witch-hunts a few months ago. Delegates at the Trades Union Congress demand the first fruits of co-existence in the form of a cut in the call-up. They frighten the cold warriors on the platform at Southport, by giving more than three million votes to a motion urging a return to the traditions of international trade union solidarity.

The people have taken over the spirit of Geneva and left their leaders panting behind. Some of the leaders, and even more the back-room boys of the cold war try desperately to call a halt. For one thing has become absolutely clear in these months of hope since the meeting at the 'Summit'—either we go forward in the spirit of Geneva to genuine disarmament, to honest discussion on European security, to the admission of China to the United Nations, and the repudiation of those who still plan war in Asia, or we return to the tensions and the perils of cold war. But going back to the cold war is a difficult operation. The hatreds built up over the years have vanished, and it is no longer possible to put the responsibility for every breakdown on the Russians. The people can no longer be put off with stories about Molotov saying 'No'. They demand results.

The discussions in the sub-committee of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in New York crystallise the dilemma. The Soviet Union produces proposals which take over almost in their entirety, plans previously put forward by the Western Powers. She accepts stage by stage reductions in armaments, and agrees to postpone the prohibition of atomic weapons until the second stage of the plan when armed forces and conventional

weapons have been cut by 75 per cent, of the agreed reductions. The Soviet plan puts forward practical proposals for an international control agency with observation posts in all countries charged with the duty of reporting on any dangerous concentration of forces—concentrations which even in the atomic age would be a prelude to aggression. She only that during the interim period, the powers agree to prohibit the use of the atom bomb except on the decision of the Security Council. And the plea from the East is backed by practical example. The Soviet Union cuts her armed forces by 640,000 men, and her allies in Europe follow her example.

Within the Soviet plan there is plenty of room for negotiation and for accommodation of different view-points in the West, but no one can be in any doubt that agreement somewhere along these lines must change the whole international picture, and take the powers further along the road to co-existence and peace. There is no longer any possibility of deception. Disarmament along lines proclaimed by Western leaders and accepted by the Soviet Union, must mean the abandonment of strategies based on atomic weapons—strategies that have been proclaimed by the leaders of N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O., and the other U.S.-dominated military blocs as the basis of Western policy. Precisely when this situation becomes clear, the Western representatives at the New York sub-committee, including Britain's Mr. Nutting, stall on their own previous proposals for agreed reductions in armed forces, and United States Secretary for Air, Mr. Donald Quarles, repudiates any suggestion that America will agree to abolish atomic weapons, or accept a system of international inspection.

Simultaneously, President Eisenhower, who broke away from Mr. Dulles at Geneva, repeats his talk about 'liberation of the satellites', and 'unity of Germany in freedom', which is modern jargon for the restoration of capitalism in the People's Democracies, and a Germany led by Nazi generals threatening

Poland across the Oder-Neisse line. A spokesman for Chiang Kai-shek announces that Chinese Nationalists are ready to invade the Chinese mainland. Syngman Rhee receives vast new supplies of arms, and threatens to start the Korean war. This is back where we started. If these are the last words of the West, there can be no progress at the coming meeting of the Foreign Ministers. But there are other forces moving into action besides the generals, the cold war politicians, and the gentlemen from the A.F. of L. and the T.C.F.T.U. who came to Southport to try to rekindle hatreds where friendship is growing.

The whole fabric of the cold war alliance is falling apart. The supporters of the U.S.A. announced policy of 'Let Asians fight Asians' are reduced to a handful among the twelve hundred millions of Asia, who have found a new unity based on co-existence. revolt against colonial oppression in French North Africa, Malaya and Kenya grows fiercer, as it must do in a world where India, Pakistan, Indonesia and other former subject peoples have set out on the path to freedom. A Middle East strategy based on Cyprus as a military headquarters, and on a Turkey linked to N.A.T.O. in the West, to Pakistan in the East, to Greece and Yugoslavia in Europe, and to Iraq in the Middle East collapses with the demand of the people of Cyprus for freedom and the new friendship between Yugoslavia and her socialist neighbours.

Above all, the people are in action. The talks at Geneva were willed not by the politicians but by the people. The people have seen the promise of creative peace, a peace which will lift from their lives the intolerable burden of armaments, and harness the limitless possibilities of science to the well-being of a world that belongs to us all. The people who have broken away from the shackles of cold war, and who understand that the choice now is between genuine peace and a war that will destroy mankind will not allow the brave hopes of Geneva to be destroyed.

[pp. 452-453]

**THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE. 1917-1955, By
QUAESTOR, The Labour Monthly, November
1955**

.... The circumstances have changed since November, 1917—but not in some ways. The Soviet Government is no longer provisional—and has now a long record of Socialist achievement. The war raging today is not one that involves directly the peoples of Europe: but it is no less a disgrace to mankind for being waged in Malaya, Kenya, Cyprus, Algeria and Morocco. Moreover the threat hanging over Europe is of one of general destruction on a still bigger scale than in 1914-18. Above all, what Lenin said so many years ago is just as true today—that the British workers have both a vital interest in supporting the Soviet Union's fight for world peace, and the traditions and power which can help it to success.

[p. 503-511]

NOTES OF THE MONTH: After Geneva, by R.P.D, The Labour Monthly, December 1955

....

Not the Last Word

This setback at Geneva is not the last word. On the contrary, the stultifying policy pursued by the Western Ministers at Geneva will involve them in deepening dilemmas. For, despite the obstacles to peace revealed at Geneva, the currents of history are not moving in the direction desired by the Gruenthers, Montgomerys and Radfords. The German people will not indefinitely accept the refusal of unification for the sake of N.A.T.O. *Monde*, in the article to which reference has been made, on November 8, estimated that, if the British and French peoples were consulted, the majority of the British people probably, and certainly the overwhelming majority of the French people, would be opposed to the Western plan presented at Geneva. New political trends are stirring in France, and may show themselves in the prospective elections. North Africa, Cyprus, Egypt, the Middle East, no less than India, Malaya and Vietnam, all reveal that the majority of the peoples of the world are in revolt against the Atlantic Powers N.A.T.O. system of colonialism and sectional military blocs, and in favour of national independence, peaceful co-existence and collective peace. If the Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers failed to reach a fruitful result on the concrete problems set before it, then it is only all the more necessary to return to the task and make the full weight of popular opinion felt for the indispensable aims—to replace the dangerous confrontation of opposing military alliances, rearmed Nazi militarism and rival armaments by peaceful co-existence, collective security and the reduction of armaments.

[pp. 529-540]

Watch This Washington Visit, Quaestor, The Labour Monthly, January 1956

THE visit of Sir Anthony Eden and Mr. Macmillan to Washington, at the end of this month, requires the instant and vigilant attention of all sections of the Labour movement. All the official explanations of their journey given when it was announced on December 6 connect it with the failure of the Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers (October 27–November 16) to reach any positive decisions. But it would be a profound mistake to see the Washington visit only against the background of that particular conference.

Every step forward in the advance to a more peaceful world in the last two years—since the British and American Governments, at their Bermuda meeting in December, 1953, at last gave way to the combined effect of popular demand, the diplomatic initiative of the U.S.S.R. and the Soviet hydrogen bomb explosion (August, 1953), and reluctantly agreed to a Four-Power meeting at Berlin the following February—has been met with a counter-offensive by the forces of darkness.

This was why the first Geneva conference, in the summer of 1954, which ended war in Indo-China, was followed by the South-East Asia Treaty and the forcing through of the Paris Treaties, which increased the danger of general war in the Far East and in Europe. It is why the second Geneva conference (the ‘summit meeting’) in July, 1955, which finally proved to the world that peace between the Great Powers and the reduction of their armaments is a practical possibility, and led to diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and West Germany, was followed by the violent chorus of American and British warlords, repudiating any possibility of cutting armaments. This was obviously authorised by their Governments, who then ostentatiously held their preliminary meeting to work out their hard-and-fast demands for the third Geneva conference (the

Foreign Ministers). That conference, therefore, was stultified beforehand. All it could do was to draw ‘the attention of the broad public to the most urgent problems of our time—and this cannot but have a positive effect’ (Molotov’s closing speech on November 16).

The rapid call to Washington can only be intended to make the temporary success of the wreckers into a jumping-off point for further developing their counter-offensive, taking advantage of the political lull at Christmas and the New Year. They would like to weaken still further the ‘dangerous’ optimism of their peoples about the chances of peace. The problem for the broad public, on the other hand—and that implies in particular British Labour, potentially the most powerful organisation of the people in any West European or American country—is to prevent the warmongers from consolidating their temporary success. The problem is to consider afresh these ‘most urgent problems of our time’ in which all the hopes and lives of hundreds of millions are at stake.

First let us set down for the record—and the campaign—precisely what the Western Ministers rejected at Geneva. It is not necessary to take even the initial Soviet proposals in this respect: it will be sufficient to list the series of final, third-line compromise offers made by the Soviet Foreign Minister on November 15 and 16, to see the great opportunity of relieving international tension and increasing confidence which was presented, with the consequent possibility of making immediate cuts in armaments:

1. A four-Power declaration in favour of a provisional treaty between the N.A.T.O. and Warsaw Powers, providing for (i) non-use of force against one another, except in individual or collective self-defence; (ii) consultation in the event of disputes arising which would threaten peace in Europe.

2. A four-Power declaration (i) that they are determined to continue the search for an agreement on ‘a vast programme of

disarmament'; (ii) that they were closer together on certain important questions relative to reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons, including the need for effective inspection (the Anglo-French proposals of June, 1954, and April, 1955, were meant here); (iii) that they would continue their efforts to eliminate differences still existing; (iv) that in the first place they would study the Soviet proposals of May last (which Eden had welcomed as an 'important step forward'), Eisenhower's scheme of American-Soviet mutual air inspection and exchange of military information, Eden's plan for a zone of reduced armaments, under joint inspection, in Europe, and the French plan for cutting arms budgets.

3. A four-Power declaration of agreement on points for a general Security Treaty: (*a*) renunciation of the use of force; (*b*) joint action to resist aggression in Europe; (*c*) no assistance to aggressors; (*d*) a zone of limited armaments in Europe, under suitable control; (*e*) consultation with Powers involved in a European Security Treaty on their obligations; (*f*) the right of individual and collective self-defence.

4. A proposal for reduction of armed forces in Germany—foreign troops by 50 per cent., German forces in the two Republics by agreement.

5. A four-Power declaration recommending their governments to reduce restrictions on trade and communications, and to promote the exchange of broadcasts, books, papers, magazines and films, and favouring further steps to increase exchanges and visits of a cultural, scientific, technical and economic nature—including exchanging students and professors and sportsmen, and the development of both individual and collective tourism.

What would have been the cumulative effect of such a series of decisions? It would have completely altered the whole atmosphere in Europe, in favour of mutual confidence and co-operation. It would have accelerated the process of reaching

practical agreement on questions still awaiting solution—such, incidentally, as Molotov’s proposal at Geneva that all four Powers should solemnly declare that they would not be the first to use atomic or nuclear weapons: and that, as the first step in applying the programme of arms reductions by the Great Powers, they should agree to renounce A-bomb and H-bomb tests.

But these offers were rejected, as earlier more far-reaching proposals had been.

Why were they rejected? On that all more or less independent commentators—British, French, American—are agreed: it was to impress the people of West Germany with the anti-Soviet spirit of their allies—or, in the words of one cynic, ‘to protect Adenauer from slipping any further’. This was what was implied in the remark of the *Manchester Guardian* diplomatic correspondent at Geneva (November 15) that ‘this conference has largely been an exercise in propaganda directed towards the people of Germany’: and of his colleague of *The Times* (November 17) that its outcome ‘probably reflects closely the wishes of Dr. Adenauer’. For the sake of bolstering up the prestige of Adenauer (spokesman of the policy of an armed anti-Soviet bloc with West Germany as its spearhead) the three Western Ministers were prepared from the first to throw away all chances of agreement at Geneva on European security.

Ah, but that would be ‘an illusion of security’, Macmillan said in the House of Commons on December 7: ‘There can be no genuine security in Europe so long as Germany remains divided’. This was a bit of slippery sophistry of which the reader can find many examples in the Foreign Secretary’s speeches. What is ‘genuine’? Of course *in the long run* European security requires, among other things, the unification of Germany. Molotov not only endorsed this, but proposed to take practical steps to bring this about—by bringing West and East Germans into working contact.

But security means, first and foremost, certainty of not being attacked. Is anyone in Europe in danger *today* of being attacked by a divided Germany? Of course not: it is those who are putting arms into the hands of a remilitarised West Germany, under Hitler's ex-generals, who are creating such a danger—particularly as they are being backed by the anti-Soviet alliance called N.A.T.O. Security in Europe would take a big step forward if the two great blocs signed a temporary security pact, just because on this basis greater confidence and some measures of disarmament would become possible—and within that framework the reunion of Germany, *outside* all blocs and with defensive armament only. As Alfred Robens himself said in Parliament on July 27, within such a temporary pact 'arrangements could be made which would enable German unity to follow'.

The West Germans at Geneva, both journalists and numerous political representatives—from the right wing 'Refugees Party' to the Social Democratic leader Ollenhauer—understood this very well. They showed no enthusiasm at all for their Republic's membership of N.A.T.O. They admitted that—just as the U.S.S.R. had repeatedly warned everybody—it had become the principal barrier to German unity. And since Geneva signs have been increasing that the average West German realises how he has been made a tool of by the United States and British Governments. Dr. Dehler, leader of the Free Democrat party—a section of Adenauer's coalition—has publicly criticised Adenauer's failure to approach the U.S.S.R. during the Geneva meeting, and has demanded a modification of the Paris agreements (November 21). A series of German papers—while loyally continuing to blame the Russians—have begun to ask whether the Western Powers are 'wholly blameless' for failing to get an advance towards German unity (*The Times*, November 21). The Social Democrats renewed, in a Parliamentary debate on December 2, their demand that a

united Germany must be expressly excluded from N.A.T.O. in advance, and that it should form part of an agreed all-European security system. And although Adenauer secured his formal majority in Parliament, it is well known that this no longer reflects a majority of the voters—among whom, as the *Economist* sadly records (December 3), the impression is ‘that Dr. Adenauer and his foreign minister have in some way failed to do enough for reunion’.

Even as Macmillan was giving his shuffling answer in the House, a reminder came of where the real menace to European security arises. It became known that the West German Government was asking for bigger warships, and more warships, than were originally agreed by N.A.T.O. Give the militarists an inch and they take an ell. Sure enough, after several days of soothing assurances, *The Times* admitted (December 10) ‘that France and the other W.E.U. (Western European Union) countries have in fact agreed that Germany may now be allowed to build a slightly larger navy than originally stipulated’.

So it will go on—unless the British Labour movement returns to the struggle, protesting against German rearmament, demanding a European Security Treaty without delay, and thus encouraging the Social Democrats and the other opposition groups in West Germany.

The other main topic at Washington, we are told, is to be the issues arising from Soviet policy in Asia, particularly the visit of Bulganin and Khrushchov to India, Burma and Afghanistan—with what *The Times* calls (December 6) ‘its challenge and its warning to the West’. There is ‘concern’ over the offers of technical and economic aid to countries in the Middle and Far East, says the *Telegraph* (December 8). There is an ‘economic threat from Russia’ says a *Manchester Guardian* headline, the same day: she ‘intends to promote a programme of her own for aiding the underdeveloped countries’. There is a ‘diplomatic and economic battle in that part of the world’, says the *Daily Herald*

(December 7)—and that is what ‘makes the Prime Minister’s projected visit to President Eisenhower so necessary’. Complete—and shameful—unanimity!

At some other time it would be comic to record the fury of the capitalist press at the enthusiastic welcome given to the Soviet leaders in the Asiatic countries. ‘How dare they? Haven’t we offered to abolish nuclear weapons? Didn’t we wipe out illiteracy in India, and by economic and social development reduce the death-rate among Indian babies to the level of the most advanced countries in Europe? Haven’t we left Burma a flourishing industry, able to supply her population with all it needs? Didn’t we make our stay in these countries as peaceful as life in Bournemouth, as unmarked by shootings, hangings and police charges as elections to a Gloucestershire parish council?’ That is what the British press seems to have been saying.

And the retort of the Asiatic peoples has been a rude one. ‘No, you didn’t.’ It is in the Soviet Union—its Central Asian, Trans-Caucasus and smaller Republics—that former colonial peoples have raised their standards of life and education out of all knowledge, not the British Empire. Indian Conservative politicians and journalists have seen this with their own eyes. It is in Malaya and Kenya that patriots are dubbed ‘terrorists’ and villages are burned as the Black-and-Tans used to burn them in Ireland: it is in Cyprus that the methods of colonial warfare are now being used against a nation with far older culture than the British. It was Russia who ‘definitely and repeatedly asked for an agreement on the earliest date for international prohibition of nuclear weapons’, and the Western Powers who rejected it, said Rajagopalachari, the last Governor-General of India, at Delhi University on November 26. The Baghdad Pact promoted by the British and American Governments (to threaten the U.S.S.R. on its southern border) ‘is deplorable from the point of view of peace and security’, stated Prime Minister Nehru on December 5. Dulles’ support for Portugal’s grip on its Goa colony in India

will lead the latter to ‘feel more and more that the West is first and foremost colonially-minded’, admits a grotesquely anti-Soviet *Manchester Guardian* correspondent in Bombay (December 7).

As for the Middle East, ‘the Soviet Union has neither created nor intensified military tension, and disturbed conditions there are the making of the Western Powers’, said the chief Syrian delegate at the Political Committee of U.N.O. (*Manchester Guardian*, December 8). The U.S.S.R. has not ‘affronted one single citizen there. It is not the Soviet Union which is suppressing the liberation movement in North Africa. It is not the Soviet Union which has created this great tragedy of the Palestine question. It is not the Soviet Union which is bombarding the southern territories of Yemen. It is not the Soviet Union which has raided the Buraimi territory of Saudi Arabia. All this is the record of the Western Powers in the Middle East’.

What conclusion should socialists draw from this and much other evidence of what Asiatic peoples are thinking? Can one doubt that it should be to demand that Eden and Eisenhower drop trying to bully the U.S.S.R. and the Asiatic countries? Dissolve the Baghdad Pact: invite the Soviet Union to discuss economic aid, without political or military strings, to the countries of Asia: open peace negotiations in Malaya and Kenya: recognise the right of self-determination for Cyprus and North Africa: give People’s China her rightful place in the United Nations—every one of these steps, singly and collectively, would open a new page of peace in the world, and every one would add to the prospects of prosperity for the British people.

One of the worst features of the Foreign Ministers’ conference was that in practice it was a meeting of Two, not Four. Dulles gave the orders on the Western side, and Macmillan, like Pinay, was but little Sir Echo. But this should not be put down to his own pompous futility, already widely

recognised in Parliament, nor yet to his own 'energetic anti-Sovietism' (the expression of a French Conservative correspondent): it was the policy laid down by Downing Street. History shows that, whenever this has happened before—as at the beginning of the Korean War—the result has invariably been one of shame and disaster for the world; whereas when the British Government stood its ground—as when the United States was threatening to use the atom bomb in 1951, or during the Geneva conference on Indo-China in 1954—the result has been beneficial to the world.

Yet, in the face of this experience, the Labour Party leaders kept complete silence during the conference, just as at Margate they opposed the demand for a European security pact as 'prejudging Geneva'. Although hundreds of resolutions have come from local Labour Parties to Annual Conference in recent years, demanding a Socialist foreign policy, Transport House preferred to leave it to the Tories: and there is plenty of evidence from the *Daily Herald*, at the time of writing, that this is to be the policy for the Washington meeting too.

How long sincere socialists can continue to reconcile their absence from the Communist Party's ranks, in such a situation, remains to be seen. Dozens of active Labour Party people have already made their choice, in recent weeks, for the only party which consistently fights for a working class policy in foreign affairs. But whatever individuals do, trade unions and local Labour Party organisations, at the very least, owe it to the cause of peace to make their voice heard, in the demand that the British Government break loose, in European and world affairs, from the American policy which is crippling British production—and trade, wasting her most skilled labour and continuing to imperil the chances of peaceful coexistence.

[pp. 14-20]

The William Morris Society, The Labour Monthly, January 1956

....

Let us turn to greet all our overseas readers in the person of these three friends. To *the American woman* who has 'been in the fight for Socialism since 1900', and values L.M. so much that she doesn't 'want to lose a single issue': she is 90. To *the young soldier in Cyprus*, seeing for himself the ugly face of imperialism at work, finding the answers to the troubled questions he has begun to ask. To a reader in what must be an *Unnamed Country*, where repression imposes severest penalties on anyone even possessing a copy; yet somehow he gets it all the same and shares it 'with six other people'. To all, from all: Peace and Prosperity in 1956.

[pp. 48-50]

NOTES OF THE MONTH: Leadership and Policy in Britain, by R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, February 1956

....

Towards What Goals?

What is the prospect for Britain in 1956? What fruits is the visit of Sir Anthony Eden to Washington likely to bring? What new joys are the Treasury and the industrialists preparing for the working people? Is Britain to continue to be dragged behind the mad dog policies of a Dulles who boasts of his system of bringing the world to the 'brink' of a new world war twice a year as the peak and master-stroke of diplomacy? Is the highest achievement of production for 1956 to be the manufacture and testing of Britain's first hydrogen bomb, at the same time as the credit squeeze and restriction cuts down every constructive sphere of production and social expenditure? Is the best use of manpower to be the dispatch of more troops or paratroops to Cyprus or Jordan or Malaya or Kenya, in the vain effort to extinguish the flames of freedom and of the desire for peace which are sweeping through the peoples of Asia and Africa? Will the new Chancellor of the Exchequer, fresh from his laurels of obstruction at Geneva in the autumn, give the green light to the big financiers and lords of monopoly to let loose the 'showdown' economic offensive of which they dream, in order to reach the glorious Mecca of the 'pool of unemployment' and lower standards?

.....

Mr. Gaitskell's Tactics

The tactics of Mr. Gaitskell as Leader to defeat the left revolt and infiltrate Tory policy into the Labour Party have already been sufficiently demonstrated. Under cover of a loudly

proclaimed sentimental sympathy with the 'ideals' of 'social equality' specifically not social ownership—he seeks to drown socialism and slip through orthodox Tory economics in practice. Under cover of a 'vigorous' verbal criticism of Tory leadership on secondary questions he seeks to slip through acceptance of Tory policy on every major issue. He denounced Mr. Butler with unsparing invective for his autumn budget—only to slip in the almost unperceived sentence that of course he accepted the necessity for a budget of this nature along these lines. Since becoming Leader he has dramatically demanded the recall of parliament in order to protest against the supply of certain obsolete arms junk to Egypt (a country at this moment resisting the wishes of the imperialists and promoting friendship with the Soviet Union), without so much as mentioning the supply of the most modern arms to Iraq, which has broken off relations with the Soviet Union and signed the Baghdad Pact, or suggesting so far any protest against the Baghdad Military Pact or the actual military operations against the peoples of Cyprus, Jordan, Malaya or Kenya.

On all the essentials of Tory foreign policy, the hydrogen bomb, the resistance to reduction of armaments, the refusal of a European Security Treaty—silent acceptance of Tory policy. On the wage battle of eight million workers, or the rents battle of eight million tenants—silence. It is sufficiently clear that if the masses of the Labour Party are to carry forward their fight against the offensive of Big Business and Toryism, they will have to carry forward their fight, not through Mr. Gaitskell, but in spite of Mr. Gaitskell.

[pp. 49-61]

CYPRUS, GREECE AND N.A.T.O. BY THEODORE DOGANIS, *The Labour Monthly*, February 1956

TODAY we see how the subjugated peoples righting for their freedom tear to pieces the various war pacts of the imperialists. This process of upsetting the military alliances of the imperialists takes place even in countries with small populations, when the people are led by strong Communist Parties. The struggle of the 420,000 Greek-Cypriots for self-determination is a very telling example. It has already brought the Balkan alliance to ruin and it has cracked the eastern wing of N.A.T.O., of which Greece and Turkey are the main struts.

How did this happen? In these last few years, when the Greek-Cypriots intensified their struggle for self-determination, their brothers in Greece came out wholeheartedly on their side. Although the Athens Government wished to remain aloof from the question of Cyprus, the Greek people compelled it to raise the matter twice (in 1954 and 1955) before the General Assembly of the United Nations. There and then, the entire Greek nation saw that whilst the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and the anti-colonial countries supported unreservedly Greece's appeal for self-determination for Cyprus, all her N.A.T.O. 'allies' (with the exception of Iceland) 'ganged up' with Britain in opposing it. This was an eye-opener for many right-wing Greeks. Indeed, as a result very large sections of the Right now saw for the first time, that the Communist Parties of Greece and Cyprus were right when for so many years they had warned the people that Anglo-American imperialists and N.A.T.O. would undermine Greece's independence, bring economic ruin upon her and attempt to strangle the Cypriots' fight for freedom.

Today, both in Greece and Cyprus, the overwhelming majority of the people are openly demanding that Greece should leave N.A.T.O. and follow a policy of national independence and neutrality. Such a slogan six months ago would have landed

the ‘culprit’ before a court-martial on a charge of high treason! Today, not only the Left, but also political parties of the Centre and Right—the Populist Party, the Liberal Democratic Union of Mr. Venizelos, the Democratic Party, the Radical Party—publicly declare that, at the coming general election on February 19, they will put forward a policy of ‘equal friendship’ with all great powers. Indeed, it is around the question as to whether Greece should leave N.A.T.O. or not that the next general election will be fought. When, on December 18, 1955, a huge demonstration in support of Enosis(Union of Cyprus with Greece) took place in Athens, some of the main slogans were: ‘Let us get out of N.A.T.O.’, ‘Let us build the Belgrade-Athens-Cairo Axis’.

As far back as September 21, 1955, the *Daily Mail* correspondent, Mr. Noel Barber, wrote that ‘in Greece, one of our staunchest allies, there is definite and serious opinion towards withdrawing from N.A.T.O. In Athens I found a well-considered belief that the eastern wall of N.A.T.O. has cracked beyond repair’. When the Turkish Government, vehemently opposed to the Union of Cyprus with Greece, organised the pogrom against the Greek minority in Constantinople and Smyrna on September 6, 1955, the *Economist* acknowledged that ‘the Balkan alliance has been critically damaged’. And the *Observer* of October 30 lamented: ‘Cyprus has been a deadly catalyst’ . . . ‘Greece is estranged from her closest allies, Britain and the United States, and Greco-Turkish friendship. . . lies in ruins’.

There are three main reasons why the British Government refuses to grant self-determination to the Cypriots: (a) no British Conservative Government has ever conceded this right to any British colony; (b) British and other foreign capitalists are making fat profits out of the colonial exploitation of Cyprus. (In 1952 for instance foreign mine-owners exported nearly £10,400,000 worth of minerals and made £5,000,000 net profit:

but they paid less than £1,350,000 in wages and salaries to Cypriot workers); (c) Cyprus is being used as a military base for the ‘support of the Baghdad pact and the rule of law and order in the Middle East’—as the Conservative M.P., Mr. Hugh Fraser, put it in the House of Commons on December 5, 1955. The same Mr. Fraser said also that Cyprus is a sort of ‘fire brigade base’. He did not elaborate this point, but its meaning is quite clear. Now that British imperialism has lost Suez, it plans to use Cyprus as a base for an attack on the Soviet Union. From Cyprus it can also threaten or actually attack any nation in the Middle East, still under British domination, which may try to free itself. It is only a few months since British planes took off from Cyprus to bomb Arab tribes in the Aden area which had revolted against British rule. Last but not least, on January 11, two thousand British paratroopers were despatched to Cyprus to be used ‘if the need arises’ against the people of Jordan, and to protect ‘the great British capital resources in the Middle East, in particular in the oil industry’ (*The Times*, January 11, 1956).

Determined not to give up Cyprus, the British offer the Cypriote plenty of ‘solutions’, all of them aiming at perpetuating imperialist rule: a colonial constitution, self-government, transfer of Cyprus to N.A.T.O., British-Greek condominium, joint British-Greek-Turkish military occupation of Cyprus, British-Greek citizenship for all Cypriots, even a brand new Cypriot flag, a sort of colour cocktail which would include the Union Jack, the Greek flag and the Turkish Crescent! All these and many more ‘solutions’ have been thought out by the warped minds of British imperialists. Butte solution demanded by the Cypriot people, namely *immediate and unconditional self-determination*, without British bases, the Government in London refuses even to discuss.

Meanwhile, whilst British terror grows in Cyprus, efforts are being constantly made in order to enforce upon the people one or the other of the above pseudo-solutions. Already by

November 21, 1955, the British Governor in Cyprus is reported to have reached a secret agreement with the leader of the Cypriot Right, Archbishop Makarios—an agreement fully supported by the Athens Government, which is ready to go to any lengths to reach a ‘settlement’ about Cyprus in the hope of putting a stop to the wave of anti-western feeling sweeping over Greece. This agreement provided for the immediate imposition of a colonial constitution in Cyprus. The right of self-determination would be granted ‘at an unspecified date to be decided upon by the prevailing security conditions’.

Within a few hours of the British press disclosures of the main points of the agreement on December 6, 1955, the people of Nicosia came out in a heroic demonstration, led by AKEL (the Communist Party of Cyprus). Braving British tanks, the tear-gas bombs, and the machine-guns of the British Commandos, they rushed in their thousands towards the Archbishop’s palace. They invaded it, shouting: ‘Don’t sell out’. . . . ‘No colonial constitution!’ . . . ‘Self-determination NOW. The British troops attacked the people. There were serious clashes. Dozens were wounded, and many arrested. But the anger of the people was such that Makarios had to abandon his ‘agreement’. Next day he issued a statement denying that he had accepted the British proposals. However, the *Daily Mail* correspondent in Nicosia made it clear on December 12 that it was ‘the strong pressure by the Communist Party of Cyprus that had wrecked all prospects of an early settlement of the Cypriot question between Governor Harding and Archbishop Makarios’.

It was because the AKEL Party was leading the people in their struggle for freedom and against all the compromise agreements which the British and Archbishop Makarios were preparing to conclude, that Governor Harding suppressed on December 14 the Communist Party, and its press, and put its leaders in a concentration camp. The next day *The Times* wrote:

The reasons which prompted the Governor to proscribe AKEL are that it has become obvious that the party is doing its utmost to prevent the possibility of an agreement being negotiated between Britain and Greece on the future of Cyprus. It has constantly denounced Archbishop Makarios for reports that he was about to come to an agreement with Britain, and has demanded that he should refuse to negotiate on any basis other than that of immediate self-determination on terms which would exclude the use of Cyprus as a military base.

Governor Harding obviously believes that, having banned Lakeland having arrested its leaders, he has removed the main obstacle to a compromise 'solution' with the Archbishop (which would infect put off self-determination for Cyprus to the Greek calends!). He will soon discover that, even though banned, AKEL is continuing to lead the united struggle of the people for national liberation and against any sell-out however attractively presented. The people of Cyprus and Greece entered the New Year determined, once and for all, to smash their chains—British colonial chains in Cyprus, American and N.A.T.O. chains in Greece.

[pp. 63-65]

HOW TO FIGHT THE TORY OFFENSIVE By JOHN GOLLAN. *The Labour Monthly*, March 1956

FACED with ever sharpening competition from its American and German rivals in capitalist markets, and with widespread resistance from the liberation movements in colonial countries, British capitalism is trying to ease its difficulties at the expense of the working people of Britain. It thought that the return of a Tory Government in the May election last year would make this easy, and in fact the Government has brought in a series of measures intended in the first place to bring down the real value of wages and pensions, and also to bring about unemployment on a scale large enough to weaken the industrial workers and make possible a direct attack on wages.

But the public disagreements in the leading Tory and financial circles and the campaign against Eden showed that everything was not going to plan. Tory differences on home policy are not differences of aim. All want to press the offensive against the working-class. Even the second stage of the Tory attack initiated by Macmillan has not satisfied big business circles.

What the Government fears is the degree of mass action its plans can provoke in the Labour movement. *The Times*, the *Financial Times*, the bulk of the employers and the bankers, have urged the Government not 'to give way again' to the demands for wage increases. Nevertheless, wage increases have had to be conceded in a number of industries, and will have to be given in others with claims outstanding, for the very simple reason that the organised workers have made it clear that they will insist on having them. They have shown their willingness and capacity to fight.

If the Tory offensive against the working people of Britain has not so far developed to its full extent this is due in the first place to the resistance it has met from the people, and the

determination of the organised workers to maintain their position.

The projected increases in rents of Council houses are being fought all along the line. Wherever Councils raise their rents, by flat rate increases or by schemes of differential rents or rent rebates combined with higher standard rents, Labour, Communist, Liberal and Tory tenants are uniting in the fight against them. Sometimes the movement is strong enough to compel the withdrawal of increase; sometimes it succeeds in a compromise. But everywhere it is delaying the operation of increases, and leading to many Labour Councils refusing even to put forward proposals for higher rents.

In its foreign policy the Tory Government is trying to run two incompatible lines. On the one hand, it aims at strengthening and extending the British imperialist grip, especially in the Middle East against both American rivals and the peoples of that region. On the other hand, it aims to buy off American competition by continuing support for America's aggressive war plans. The net result is that British foreign policy becomes more and more bankrupt. This has been shown above all in the fiasco of the Washington Conference. None of the Anglo-American differences were resolved. It becomes more and more obvious that Britain needs a new independent foreign policy. And it is the task of all the popular forces in Britain to create such public pressure as to compel the Government to conduct real peace negotiations with Khrushchov and Bulganin when they come to London. If this were done it could well mark a turning point in the international situation.

Thus, both in its home and its foreign and colonial policy, the Tory Government, which aimed at far-reaching measures to strengthen British capitalism, is already meeting mounting difficulties.

It is clear that with correct leadership and policy, a unique opportunity opens up before the labour movement to sweep the

Tories from power. Their only hope of holding on is by the tacit support of the right wing Labour leaders. Gaitskell has developed the classic method of right wing 'opposition': denunciation of the Tory budget but acceptance in fact; a wordy fight on rents but insistence that tenants should pay up and that Labour Councils apply the Tory line; and on foreign policy fierce debates on unessentials, but complete support on the things which count.

This situation gives added importance to the Twenty-fourth National Congress of the Communist Party which meets in London at the end of this month. The resistance to the Tory plans which has already developed, especially in connection with the wages movement and the innumerable local struggles on rents, as well as on foreign and colonial issues, is in large measure the response of the workers to the call of the Communist Party for mass opposition to the Tory policies. The Communist campaign 'The People Will Decide' is bringing results.

The Communist Party Congress, on the basis of the results achieved, will aim to carry these struggles forward to the complete defeat of the Tories, the winning of a majority of Labour and Communist Members of Parliament, and the establishment of a Labour Government with a progressive policy of social and economic advance and peace. The Political Resolution which will come before the Congress sets out the political line and the organisational steps necessary to realise these objectives. Rejecting the attitude of the right wing Labour leaders that the Tories are in office for five years and that nothing can be done about it, the draft Political Resolution sets the aim of making it impossible for the Tories to carry out their plans, through the development of a united movement of the people against them, using every form of industrial and political action. The core of this movement must be the organised working class; but progressive minded people among the middle classes can be won as allies. Already not only the workers but

sections of the professional and middle classes are coming into active opposition to Tory policy.

The movement against the Tories and for a progressive policy is, however, being held back by the bans and prohibitions imposed by the right wing Labour leaders against united action with Communists. These bans against the Communists are the most potent weapon of the right wing for maintaining their control of the Labour Party, since they prevent the united strength of the Left from being brought to bear for a change of policy. The fight to end the bans is therefore vital for the future of the labour movement.

The draft Political Resolution brings out the role of the Communist Party both in the immediate fight against the Tories and in the whole struggle that leads to Socialism. It is able to fulfil this role because its policy, programme and organisation are based on the class outlook of Marxism, and it is the only Party of Socialism in Britain today.

This is why the strengthening of the Communist Party is the key to the advance of the whole working class, and why all Socialists can most effectively work for their cause as members of the Communist Party.

Attention is drawn in the resolution to the number of members of the Labour Party and active trade unionists who have joined the Communist Party in recent months. In fact, since the resolution was drafted, there have been many further recruits to the Communist Party from these sources: it is a process which must gather strength as the character and results of right wing Labour policy become more widely understood, while it also becomes clearer that many of the leaders of the Labour Left have been unable to conduct a real battle for a new policy.

There is a sharp contrast between the rising militancy of the workers and the further move to the right which the dominant clique in the Labour Party has made with the election of Gaitskell as leader of the Labour Party. Everywhere the workers

are on the alert, ready to meet each challenge from the employers and to fight to maintain and improve their conditions. Side by side with the national trade union demands for higher wages a continuous fight is being waged in the factories against employers' attacks on shop stewards and trade union rights, against threatened dismissals and cuts in piece rates. It is the same in the towns, and villages too, against rent increases. Bitter feeling is developing against the Tory Government's repeated refusals to negotiate a real peace settlement in Europe, the banning of the H-bomb and a reduction in armaments; its refusal to press openly for the admission of People's China to the United Nations or to repudiate the American-imposed bans on trade with the Socialist countries; its refusal to cut the call-up and the persistent use of conscripts against the colonial peoples, especially now in Cyprus. The April budget will mark a further desperate attempt by the Tories to attack working class standards, and will intensify working class resistance and demands for improved conditions.

Yet, in this situation, so full of opportunity for the Labour movement, the right wing leaders conduct a decorous dispute with the Tories in Parliament on the best constitutional lines, while outside Parliament they use their influence to discourage and damp down the struggle; there is no consistent challenge from the Left, no real leadership, no real attempt to gather together the forces of the Left, including the Communist Party, to strengthen the fight against the Tories and the right wing leaders.

It is becoming more and more obvious that the whole development of the movement depends on the Communist Party and the political and organisational leadership it is giving to the fight. This will be the main task of the Communist Congress. This leadership has all the greater influence because, at a time when the legend of a reformed capitalism and a Welfare State is losing its charm, and on the other hand the Socialist countries

are taking great steps forward, the Communist Party alone is holding aloft the banner of Socialism in Britain, and calling on the working people to look forward with confidence to the future. Its programme, *The British Road to Socialism*, not only puts clearly the real meaning of Socialism against all distortions, but shows the way to realise it in Britain.

The forthcoming Congress of the Communist Party is therefore of exceptional importance for the whole Labour movement. But it must also mark a decisive stage in the development of the Communist Party itself. Every Party organisation is striving to go to this Congress with more members than at our last Congress, as a prelude to a great new effort for the big expansion of the Party which the situation so urgently requires.

[pp. 111-114]

Notes of the Month, Crisis and Contrast, R. Page Arnot, The Labour Monthly, March 1956

A Crisis Bank Rate

This issue, too, dominates home affairs. For the continuance of cold war and colonialism has brought this stage of crisis in British economy. It has meant the monstrous sums expended on armaments, at the £1,500 million level demanded by the United States six years ago—not to speak of the extra £50 million or more which Germany cannot be persuaded to pay for the upkeep of the British Army on the Rhine. It has meant the military ‘commitments’ overseas, whether crack regiments sent to shoot school children in Cyprus, or to hunt resistance forces through the jungles and swamps of Malaya and Kenya. It has meant the embargo on East-West trade, the two-year conscription burden and all the other burdens of the Anglo-American alliance. It has brought not only the steep rise in prices but also loss of gold and dollar reserves resulting from the trade gap. To meet it the Tory Chancellor of the Exchequer Macmillan has raised the bank rate to 5½ per cent, using the familiar device of the City of London to restrict credit and so to squeeze the smaller capitalists as well as to create unemployment. He has followed this up by raising hire-purchase minimum deposits to as much as 50 per cent, by putting a penny on the loaf and a halfpenny on each pint of milk. This from the new Chancellor, whose first public utterance a matter of weeks only ago was to express his concern to stop prices rising! In short, the effect of Tory foreign policy is the rise in prices, the cuts in housing, schools and social services. Cold war for Britain spells the impoverishment of the people. With this issue of cold war or peaceful co-existence dominating all else, questions of foreign affairs—by no means foreign to the lives and livelihood of the people—need careful examination.

Oil in Arabia

Moreover, the Jordan fiasco had brought the countries of the Arab League closer together. Saudi Arabia, in particular, had offered several million pounds to Jordan to offset any British subsidy it might lose through its peoples' stand against the Baghdad Pact. Now, the funds of Saudi Arabia are derived almost entirely from the oil royalties paid by American oil trusts: another burning question for the British spokesmen to discuss at Washington. On the possession of the Buraimi Oasis in the south-west of the vast peninsula of Arabia, relations between Saudi Arabia and the Sultan of Muscat and Oman together with another British puppet had become embittered. British forces were in Buraimi in October. In mid-December, a British-officered force seized a key fortress in that disputed region. Strong protest was made by Saudi Arabia and repeated in very sharp terms on its wireless. In British circles the view was held that these and other forms of anti-British propaganda were being paid for by American money. Bribery too was alleged.

The Washington correspondent of *The Times* on January 22 reported that 'A selection of Saudi Arabian documents captured last October by British forces in the Buraimi Oasis' (*The Times*, January 23) had been shown to the State Department in support of British allegations of bribery. He added that 'several sacks of documents' had been 'impounded by the British authorities'. Not only were there all these difficulties arising from the Baghdad Pact, but the main military base and headquarters for the anti-Soviet Baghdad Pact, namely the British colony of Cyprus, had become the centre of a mounting movement for independence and for unity with Greece, which movement the British have been trying to crush by draconic measures under a military governor and a greatly reinforced army of occupation. This in turn had made the Greek general election (to be held on February 19) turn largely on the question of Cyprus and had embittered the relations between Britain and Greece to an extent

which put in peril the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation in the Eastern Mediterranean.

[pp. 97-110]

Notes of the Month, The Vision Splendid, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, April 1956

Time for a Change in Britain

But what of Britain? France has spoken a first word. Has not Britain also something useful to say other than prim official disapproval of M. Pineau's 'extraordinary outburst' (*The Times*, March 3)? What will come of the Eden-Mollet meeting and the reported new approach to disarmament? Nowhere is the time more ripe and urgent for a new turn of policy than for Britain. Britain has been brought to a conspicuous impasse, economic, diplomatic and military, through the policy pursued so far by the Eden-Butler-Macmillan Government. The favourable opportunities of Geneva in the summer were thrown away by Macmillan in the autumn. The Washington Conference of Eden and Eisenhower produced no fruits save a pompous and quarrelsome Declaration devoid of practical content. The high-handed action in Cyprus has won a rare unanimity of international condemnation, including from the United States. The Templer Mission to force the hated Baghdad Pact on the Arab peoples, only stimulated the national upsurge in Jordan, dramatically expressed in the dismissal of General Glubb. The Lloyd Mission to Egypt and India met with equal failure; in India the British High Commissioner has publicly warned that 'a critical period in relations between India and Britain has been reached'. Differences between Britain and the United States increase without solution. The grand official strategy of thermonuclear war has been reduced to final lunacy by the official plan to evacuate twelve million people to nobody knows where. **All** this to the accompaniment of a gravely deteriorating economic situation, whose contradictions are bound up with the foreign and military policy, and which the Government's measures only accentuates. [pp. 145-157]

N.A.T.O.—Fact and Fiction by Sancho Panza, *The Labour Monthly*, April 1956

DISQUIET ON THE WESTERN FRONT

The next few years were going to be more difficult for Nato than the past four.—
General Gruenther, *The Times*, 11.6.55.

IF Nato countries didn't contain peoples but only governments and military installations all would be well on the Western Front. Though on second thoughts, even the governments, whose existence to a certain extent depends on the people, are known to have become somewhat obstreperous, and the military installations in spite of all the planning and thinking by the commanders, generals, admirals and what not, and in spite of colossal expenditure, tend to become constantly out of date. 1955 was not a happy year for Nato. For that matter neither were the six previous years. The only things that cheered up the leaders of Nato were the accession of Western Germany to Nato with its Nazi military leaders, and a prospect of yet another reorganisation on the basis of a unified airforce and the use of tactical atomic weapons. Towards the end of 1955 a military correspondent of *The Times* wrote:

Militarily, 1955 has been an uncomfortable year for the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation with Greeks and Turks at loggerheads, the bulk of the French Army pinned down in North Africa, and the growing realisation that massive retaliation is no longer a one-sided affair. Perhaps the most serious aspect is that the N.A.T.O. ground forces between the Baltic and the Alps are at their weakest now (13.12.55).

The unity of Nato is becoming more and more precarious. The stern command of Mr. Dulles that the 'unity of Nato should be restored without delay' has not been obeyed. Apart from Greece there have been warnings from Norway, Holland,

Canada and France that the United States foreign policy and its attitude to colonial questions is endangering the unity of Nato. Then there is the mischievous Article 2 which constantly crops up at Nato deliberations and causes various difficulties and disagreements and is a source of serious embarrassment to the main partner.

1955 also brought proposals from the Soviet Union for peace and relaxation of international tension which were described by Mr. Macmillan, the then Foreign Secretary, as a possible 'sinister warning of a more subtle but just as deadly threat to the safety and unity of Nato'. Then came the summit meeting and the dangerous prospect of peace. 'Peace has captivated western Europe like an April breeze' wrote an American reporter. The *New York Times* complained that there had been a relaxation in Europe 'not only of tensions, but of vigilance'.

The prospect of peace caused a mass swooning among the generals, but they have rallied since then. The State Department, however, did not lose confidence. The officials, according to The *Times* Washington correspondent, spared no pains to tell people 'how heartened they feel by the continuing firmness of America's European allies' (29.8.55). It is also reported that the difficulties and differences leave the Shape and the Supreme Commander unperturbed because there are always the atom and hydrogen bombs and the United States strategic airforce which are outside Nato jurisdiction, or, as it is often put, which 'are held for the West by Britain and America'. There is Western Germany which is being made by the United States capable of policing Europe. This month Nato is celebrating the seventh anniversary of the signing of the Treaty. And yet, although the initials appear constantly in the press, and in spite of a well-organised information service of Nato, it is complained that very few people, and least in America, know what Nato is and what it stands for.

WHAT IS NATO?

Questions are never indiscreet. Answers sometimes are.—*Oscar Wilde.*

Lord Ismay, the Secretary General of Nato, once said that the reason why people in all the Nato countries know little or nothing about Nato is that ‘sets of initials are always lifeless and uninspiring’ and that there are so very many international organisations, in fact 957. ‘But’, said Lord Ismay, ‘Nato is not just another international organisation. It is something new, exciting and revolutionary’. But the substance behind the initials still continues to elude the 400 million inhabitants of Nato. The reason for this is simple. The leaders of Nato have not been able to make up their minds what Nato really is and what it stands for. Or, more truly said, they know what Nato is and what it stands for, but they do not know how not to convey it convincingly to the people.

What then is Nato apart from being ‘a remarkably successful experiment’ (Eden)? Some Nato leaders call it ‘An Alliance’. But as an alliance smacks of war others call it ‘More-than-an alliance’ (*The Times*) or a ‘Community’ of ‘like-minded’ peoples. (*The Times* explained that Community suits ‘the Anglo-Saxon tendency to state a general preference without bothering very much about what it means’ (16.1.52). The more warlike Nato leaders like to call it ‘The Great Deterrent’. As there is a confusion here with the H-bomb, ‘Umbrella’, ‘Shield’ or ‘Screen’ is often preferred by others. In general it is considered the ‘basic element’ of various foreign policies, a ‘trump card’ in the cold war and an instrument to put ‘teeth into diplomacy’. Mr. Dulles recently called it ‘a political warning system’. Lord Ismay, who ought to know best what Nato is, called it firmly ‘a policeman who protects all the homes of Western Europe, of the United States and Canada, Turkey and Greece’. *The Times*,

being often poetic, once called Nato ‘The Phantom Army’. But there are also some leading people in Nato countries who have no respect for deterrents, umbrellas, policemen or military teeth, and who think that Nato forces are meant to police western Europe rather than keep out an intruder. They have called Nato irreverently ‘a dumping ground for American and British obsolete arms’, ‘an instrument of American and British foreign policy’, ‘a debating society’ and so forth. But as these people belong to the small nations of western Europe, they do not count.

Nato is composed of 15 countries lapped by the waves of the Atlantic, which in 1951 was diverted to wash the coasts of Turkey and Greece. The accession to Nato of Turkey and Greece made the Atlantic ocean look ridiculous, and it was decided to abandon the geographical area as a basis for Nato in favour of certain common principles. The definitions of some words used in connection with Nato ‘have inevitably become broader. “Like-minded peoples” have been found to include recent enemies. “Principles of democracy” became synonymous with Anti-communism’ (The *Times*, 25.7.51). According to the British official publication on Nato, called *Alliance for Peace*, ‘the partners are all independent sovereign states, and there is no question of big or small countries, rich or poor countries’. ‘But’, corrects The *Times*, ‘facts of power will always give greater influence to its chief members’. The chief members make the following contributions to Nato: United States—‘vast wealth and industrial power’. Britain—‘inventive genius’ and France—‘resilient spirit’ (*Alliance for Peace*). The role of other partners is left to our imagination. The *Manchester Guardian* assures us that ‘unlike the United States Britain is not treating them as inferiors’.

If there should be any unclarity, doubt or misunderstanding left about what Nato is, let us try another angle. The favoured description of Nato as ‘a community of free nations, acting together for the welfare and happiness of all’,

etc., etc., sounds to me like the favoured description of the British Commonwealth and Empire. As Nato is under the umbrella of the United States, we may legitimately assume that Nato is one of the attempts by the rulers of the United States to build a global empire. This attempt has been assisted by Britain in the hope of some fat crumbs from the rich man's table and in the hope of being able to maintain its own Empire. All the classical methods of empire building have been applied to Nato countries. Trade, money and missionaries were followed by military consolidation with American bases and bridgeheads. The various Nato countries have been allowed to maintain sovereignty in minor matters, and some loyal natives are trusted with secondary commands. An attempt has been made to call the natives of Nato 'Europeans', but they obstinately continue to call themselves French, Italians, or Dutch as the case may be. In sorrow General Eisenhower said:

In that vital region, history, custom, language and prejudice have combined to hamper integration. . . . How tragic! (*The Times*, 4.7.51).

The soulless initials have not only worried Lord Ismay, but also other Nato leaders who would much prefer to call it 'The Atlantic Community'—'this vague but splendid title which Mr. Churchill has commended' (*The Times*, 16.1.52).

PEACEFUL INTENTIONS

There is an uneasy feeling that Nato will lose the sustained public support unless it can shed its military label, or add a new one.—
Economist, 24.12.55.

A French satirist once said: 'I can call nothing by name if that is not his name. I call a cat a cat, and Rolet a rogue'. Nato is a military organisation. It is an illegitimate offspring of the AngloAmerican Cold War policy. Nato has never wanted peace. Nato is afraid of peace, because any threat to the Cold War is a

threat to Nato. Before the summit meeting, in July, 1955, General Gruenther, for instance, declared:

It would be catastrophic if under the pressure of public opinion, the political leaders went to the conference table convinced that a settlement had to be reached this year. . . . The military realities of the situation made no requirement for an immediate solution (*The Times*, 11.6.55).

According to Lord Ismay the aim of Nato is ‘to keep the peace, not with pious hopes and appeasing gestures but with a strong military force’. For seven years now Nato has been occupied with building its military force, and, as the leaders tell us, it has still a long way to go. The complaints that Nato is considered only in its military aspect seem to me unreasonable. They arise from the various ornaments and trimmings of the Treaty which some people seem to have taken seriously. What other achievements than military has Nato to its credit? All official reports list only military achievements. Alliance for Peace tells us that ‘all the governments of the Atlantic Alliance look forward to the day when they can spend less money on armaments and more on those things which would bring greater well being and happiness to their peoples’ and holds out the hope that

when they reach the plateau of rearmament upon which real security is found they should be able to broaden out their efforts to embrace all the objectives incorporated in the Treaty.

We can only ask in the words once expressed by *The Times*: ‘at what point will the United States consider that deterrent strength has been sufficiently established?’ Judging from the deliberations of the last Atlantic Council meeting in December, the answer is never.

It makes one dizzy to recall all the varied and numerous attempts to give Nato some other plausible aim and purpose than military. ‘There is room for action in the great field of moral and intellectual leadership’ said President Eisenhower when he was the Supreme Commander in Nato. According to him Nato’s aim

is 'collective security as the product of three types of forces—spiritual, economic and military force'. The spiritual and economic forces have been duly put into the service of the military force. President Eisenhower, as most of the American statesmen, is very fond of using words like 'moral factors' and 'idealism'. Nato communiques abound with a 'rather ambiguous agglomeration of sentiments and aspirations' (*The Times*), calculated to reach the 'hearts and minds' of men. But as *The Times* said:

It is one thing for statesmen to profess high moral purposes, it is another to ensure that those purposes are kept permanently before their minds in face of all the distractions of politics (27.5.50).

The pleas for a 'fresh approach' and for 'putting life into Nato' have had no echo in the ears of the military leaders. After all Nato is a military organisation. But what about Article 2?

ARTICLE 2

About once a year the Atlantic Council and those responsible for Nato affairs within its member governments look again at the woolly but well intentioned second article of the Treaty and wonder what to do about it.—*Economist*, 24.12.55.

The Canadian Prime Minister is supposed to have been largely responsible for Article 2 which reads as follows:

The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

The last sentence is the crucial one. Surely it was a spirit of mischief which brought Article 2 into being. It has caused more trouble among the partners than anything else. It has thrown doubt and disarray into the ranks of Nato. It has been a thorn in the eyes of the commanders, generals, admirals and the State Department. The trouble has arisen because the smaller Nato nations have taken Article 2 seriously and demand its implementation.

Article 2 is the 'something else' than the purely military aim of Nato. It means many things to many people. To some it spells 'enduring material progress as the reward for moral constancy', to others it is an 'obvious means of reconciling conflicting interests'. For military leaders it has had a doubtful propaganda value.

How has Article 2 fared up to now? Two years ago Lord Ismay told us in the *Radio Times* (2.4.54):

Here we are now at the end of five years with a sound, well trained, closely integrated military force.... And now we are turning our attention to that other aspect of the Alliance which was written into the Treaty itself—Progress.

Alliance for Peace lists the achievements of Nato in relation to Article 2 as follows: (1) in the economic sphere Nato has 'a watching brief rather than an opportunity for doing a great deal', because it 'must leave many problems to be dealt with through bodies operating on a global basis'; (2) in the cultural and social sphere 'there is a somewhat similar situation; Nato's main task is to discover the gaps'; 'particular attention is being given to transatlantic relations'; the troops, one gathers, are the main cultural representatives; (3) continuous efforts are being made 'to increase public knowledge of the aims and activities of Nato'; a 'feeling of solidarity is growing', although, it is admitted, that 'nationalism is still a potent force'. On the military side 'a ready smile' has been achieved.

As a blue-print for economic, social and cultural co-operation, Article 2 has not been very successful up to now. The promised economic collaboration has not materialised. There has been no shifting of emphasis from military preoccupation to that of economic considerations. The defence burden is as heavy as ever and will be more so when the new military plans are put into operation. But the Atlantic Council has not given up hope. At its last meeting in December, 1955, the following communique was issued:

The council recognised that recent developments in the international situation made it more necessary than ever to have closer co-operation between the members of the Alliance, as envisaged in Article 2 of the Treaty. They decided to instruct the Permanent Council to examine and implement all measures conducive to this end.

THE ATLANTIC COUNCIL

There are, literally, roses round the door of General Gruenther's headquarters near Paris; but behind the door. . . .—*Radio Times*, 2.4.54. One would have thought that roses and planning for war do not go well together, but we have to assume that the roses express 'Atlantic Solidarity' and 'Idealism' and are part of the 'ready smile' policy. It is reported that there is a good understanding among the permanent representatives of the governments and the military commanders. 'There may be petty quarrels among us, these occur in the best regulated families', said Lord Ismay. At any rate the teams in the Palais de Chaillot have learned to speak the same language—the American language. But when it comes to the national governments and the ministerial meetings of the Atlantic Council the story is somewhat different.

The Atlantic Council is supposed to be the decisive leadership of Nato, that is, the political authority. But nobody

loves the Council, least of all the military leaders. Soon after Nato was established and the military planning began, voices were raised to deprive the Atlantic Council of its political authority in favour of a committee of three, composed of United States, British and French representatives. Or to invest the political authority in the Supreme Commander. The strongest vocal advocate for this change has been our Field Marshal Lord Montgomery, who not only wants a small political authority but wants to place it out of harm's way in America. The Council, backed by Article 9 of the Treaty, has become a legal nuisance. People have begun to say that at best it is window-dressing.

The effective leadership of Nato is in Washington. It is embodied in the Standing Group, composed of three members—representatives of the United States, British and French Chiefs of Staffs. The Standing Group is also called 'The Brain'. It does the thinking for Nato and directs the higher strategy. The Supreme Commander Allied Forces in Europe, General Gruenther, is the liaison officer whose task is to convey humbly to the Atlantic Council the thinking of 'The Brain'. Not that General Gruenther doesn't do a lot of thinking himself:

In our thinking we visualise the use of atomic bombs in the support of our ground troops. We also visualise the use of atomic bombs on targets in enemy territory. I recognise that creates a major political problem and I want you to realise we at Shape do not think we are all political masters. But if war does take place our minds are clear that we must and shall use every weapon in our arsenal (The Times, 9.6.54).

That is, whatever the national governments may think. Lord Montgomery's job as second in command is to echo General Gruenther's and 'The Brain's' thinking for our benefit and to plead for the co-operation of the national governments. The military leaders love to do a lot of talking as well as thinking. Not only is the Standing Group under the wing of the Pentagon, but also the Supreme Commanders who are all Americans as the result of 'delicate negotiations'. General Eisenhower's argument

that ‘command positions should not be matters of national prestige’ won the day.

As soon as the Atlantic Treaty was signed, Nato broke out, both in its military and civilian sides, into a mysterious rash of committees, working groups, plans, blue-prints, etc., and has continued to be so afflicted. So much so that it provoked the following comment from 30 American prominent men, including General Marshall:

We and our allies have pyramided committee on top of committee in an effort to reconcile the irreconcilable (The Times, 23.11.51).

These gentlemen made the first serious suggestion for measures to deprive the Atlantic Council of its political authority because, as they said ‘the Atlantic coalition disagrees on fundamental issues’ which might endanger ‘the safety of the American people’. Among the fundamental issues were listed the direction of foreign policy and the nature of trade relationships.

What then is the job of the Atlantic Council? *Alliance for Peace* tells us that ‘its most important service is to provide a forum’ for political discussion. ‘Other functions’ are—‘to give political guidance to the military authorities and to support and sustain them in every way’ and to see ‘that the morale of the civil populations is maintained at a high level’. The Council in spite of efforts to streamline its organisation is still surrounded by a staggering amount of committees, expert committees, offices, divisions, boards, working groups and ad hoc working groups, which are still trying to ‘reconcile the irreconcilable’. In addition there are the auxiliary instruments of Nato—the various ‘European’ organs.

There is a general view that as a political forum the Atlantic Council is a wash-out. A place ‘for woolly and wandering speeches’ (*Manchester Guardian*). Its main business seems to be to listen to the thinking of Nato commanders, to listen to their

reports on Soviet military progress, to listen to their latest estimate of the year of danger, which now is 1960, to receive Nato military progress reports, and to admire the military charts, diagrams, blue-prints and plans and possibly bless them. Apart from that, the Atlantic Council serves for issuing communiques where the aims, purpose and unity of Nato are restated and reaffirmed for the benefit of the public at large. These communiques have often, to put it in the words of *The Times* 'a very American ring'. How does the Council work? Nato 'democracy' seems to be a queer business. If we could listen at the keyhole of the Atlantic Council instead of reading its official communiques, we might learn something. In the official communiques 'the Atlantic Council has apparently hit on the device of a kind of mock publicity which pretends to tell everything while revealing nothing' (*The Times*, 26.2.52). The Council is supposed to be the embodiment of Nato 'democracy' and unity. It must work as a team. In the name of unity all controversial subjects are avoided and only 'agreed views' are made public. Nevertheless, Alliance for Peace tells us that 'anyone is at liberty to oppose a decision', but 'there is no imposing of the majority will upon the minority'. The minority, as I understand it, often consists of Britain and the United States. The *Economist*, having an old fashioned view of democracy, pleaded after the last Council meeting for 'an occasional glimpse of the democratic process at work' and for 'the right to differ'. But what would Nato unity look like if questions were raised 'that internally divide the Nato members' or problems discussed 'how to organise deterrence and policing more economically' as the *Observer* suggested? These problems the *Economist* tells us 'are consistently relegated to the corridors in an effort to leave the Atlantic Council itself unruffled' (24.12.55).

The Atlantic Council is not meant to be taken seriously as the leading political body, except by innocent, gullible and old-fashioned liberals. The policy for Nato is supplied by the United

States and Britain. If the Council seems to flounder it is because the leading Power, the United States, has no policy to offer or, because British and American interests and their foreign policies do not always coincide. Yet the Council can do and has done a lot of harm to the European nations by lending itself as a cover for Anglo-American policies. By sanctioning General Gruenther's proposal to use tactical nuclear weapons it has committed the European nations in Nato, without realising the full implication of this proposal, to the Anglo-American strategy of nuclear bombing. Or as the *Daily Telegraph* puts it:

Nato is concentrating the power to take life and death decision more and more in the hands of the major Powers, in particular of the United States (27.2.56).

WHAT NEXT

A sweet thick propaganda sauce has been ladled profusely on the Nato pudding. But the European peoples are learning to separate the sauce from the pudding. There is a growing anxiety among British and American statesmen that European members of Nato might refuse to accept Anglo-American leadership since it has become clear that their strategy is entirely based on the use of nuclear weapons. It seems that not only Article 2 and Article 9 have become a nuisance to Nato leaders, but that the whole Treaty clamours for revision. The *Daily Telegraph* writes:

what is needed is a re-definition of the obligations and risks implicit in the Nato alliance, in the light of the nuclear age (27.2.56).

Neither Britain nor America has much belief in Nato. Nor do they think much of their partners. Nor is there much love lost between themselves. Yet Britain and America are profoundly 'dedicated' to Nato. And Britain never ceases to declare its undying but one-sided love to America—'our life and faith' (Eden). What is one to think of it? Could it be that

Britain and America have never had ‘peaceful intentions’, that they do not intend to abandon the Cold War and the idea of a global war, when the territories, though not the people of Nato countries, become all important? What is one to make of Lord Montgomery’s warning:

Don’t let us be led astray by ‘Operation Smiles’. Don’t let the spirit of Geneva cause us to lose our perspective (*Daily Telegraph*, 22.10.55). or Mr. Dulles’ statement that

Even if the east-west tensions were totally resolved, the United States would insist on the maintenance of these two organisations (*The Times*, 3.8.55).

Meaning Nato and Seato. There may be a ‘moral’ issue involved somewhere, who knows? But the United States has another very good reason to be dedicated to Nato. Where else could it successfully hide its military alliance with Western Germany?

What about Britain? Nato was originally a British child—Mr. Bevin’s child, born of his hatred of communism, of the Soviet Union, and of the realisation of Britain’s weakened position in the world. It is difficult to abandon a child even when it has grown to be a menace. Mr. Bevin’s hopes that Britain’s problems would be solved by the Cold War and in the wider alliance of Nato have not materialised. The Soviet Union has grown in strength. Britain has lost a good many of its anchors in the world. The contradictions and conflicting interests with America and Europe remain. Britain did not achieve the coveted leadership of Europe and has lost a good deal of its own national sovereignty. The dreams and visions of Churchill, inherited by Eden, of changing Nato into a snug Atlantic Community under the protection of America remain dreams and visions. The policy of its successive governments has brought Britain into a very ‘melancholy and anxious position’, to use Sir Winston Churchill’s words. Why stick to Nato?

[pp. 178-187]

Notes of the Month, The Great Debate, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, May 1956

....

This Is All Rather Different'

Walter Lippmann has graphically described the perplexity of American policy in face of this new world situation which has begun to make its vast panoply of military alliances inherited from the previous decade look obsolete:

In the past few months Mr. Dulles has found himself entangled in an extraordinary series of dilemmas—in issues in which he is damned if he does and damned if he doesn't. He has been caught in the Goa dilemma between Portugal and India, in the Jakarta dilemma between the Netherlands and Indonesia, in the North African dilemma between France and the Algerian Arabs, in the Palestine dilemma between Israel and the Arabs, in the Baghdad dilemma between Iraq and Egypt, in the Cyprus dilemma between Britain and Greece, in the Persian Gulf dilemma between Saudi Arabia and Britain, and so on and on.

This is all rather different from what it used to be in the pre-Geneva phase of the cold war. Then the issues were between Communists and anti-Communists. The line of leadership was self-evident. But now the issues which plague Mr. Dulles are very often primarily among our allies and the peoples that we are courting . . .

The old, much simpler days are past when there was one great adversary and leadership consisted in opposing him.

(Walter Lippman, *New York Herald Tribune*, 7.4.56.)

[pp. 193-209]

Socialism and Civil Liberty, D.N. Pritt, Q.C., The Labour Monthly, July 1956

.....

To these statements of the attitudes of the two worlds, there must of course be added, for each of them, the deep and important qualification that no regime, feudal, capitalist, or socialist, or of any other existing category, can or will, ever allow any citizen or group of citizens to use their liberties for the purpose of destroying the state. Be the state liberal or reactionary, predominantly rural or highly industrialised, backward or highly-developed, capitalist, transitional, or Socialist, it will inevitably, when its existence, or even its power, is threatened, take measures to defend itself, and will suspend temporarily or permanently any civil liberty which might help subversive elements to work against it, as surely as an army in the field will blow up a building, regardless of its architectural value, if it gives cover to the enemy. One has only to recall the attitude of the British Government in Ireland, Kenya, Malaya, British Guiana, or Cyprus, of the Prussian and many other European governments in 1848, and of the Soviet government in 1918, when counter-revolution raised its ugly head against the newborn state, to realise what happens, and must happen, in such events. It is, indeed, worth noticing the significance of the history of civil liberty in Britain and its colonies, and in the U.S.A., as illustrations of the way in which civil liberty has to be won and maintained, and of the encroachments upon it made by capitalist governments in times of weakness or fear. In Britain we have the example of oppressive legislation like the Six Acts, and warlike action like the Peterloo massacre, whenever the ruling class has felt insecure; and only public opinion has restored, after a time, some measure of civil liberty.* In the Colonies, relatively unchecked by public opinion in the distant homeland, and conscious of their

minority position, British rulers have almost always done their utmost to hold civil liberty down to an irreducible minimum. And in the U.S.A. in the last decade civil liberty and the right to dissent have been largely destroyed under the neo-Fascism associated with the name of McCarthy; the situation in Britain is

[pp. 302-309]

BRITAIN'S SHAME IN CYPRUS. R. PAGE ARNOT, The Labour Monthly, July 1956

WHEN Shakespeare in one of his most famous plays told how the Cyprus situation had become so urgent that it was necessary to replace the civilian governor by the great military chief, and to send troops there in great numbers, and even stressed 'the importancy of Cyprus to the Turk', no one could have imagined that this background would be repeated three-and-a-half centuries later, with Field Marshal Sir John Harding taking the place of the civilian governor and with the Turks brought in as a threat; but that instead of a domestic tragedy there would be the drama of a national struggle, with all the apparatus of repression enforced by a Tory government whose actions have brought the name of Britain into disrepute throughout the world.

Month after month of this year and last year this has been going on, and getting from bad to worse. All the repeated claims with each new act of repression that 'law and order' would soon be established have been disproved by events. They claimed that the deportation of Archbishop Makarios would put an end to 'terrorism'. It has not had this effect. All the howling of the millionaire-owned newspapers to drown the voices of protest within Britain cannot suppress the growing demand within Britain for the ending of this sorry business.

Think what is happening. In the second week of June under the significant headline 'Big Operation in Cyprus' a despatch from the island begins:

All traffic was banned today in the west Cyprus mountains, where 5,000 British troops are searching for the terrorist leader Dighenis and his subordinates.

(The Times, June 12, 1956.)

'5,000 British troops' in part of that small island, with the islanders numbering little over half a million, or one-hundredth

part of the population of the United Kingdom. To grasp the scale of it, you must think of half-a-million troops engaged in a search operation in the Lake District or some other corner of Britain. Why, the search for ‘Bonny Prince Charlie’ two centuries ago, with a price on his head, was conducted by ‘The Butcher’, the Duke of Cumberland, with fewer troops in proportion. It was one of the charges against ‘The Butcher’ that a price was put on the head of the fugitive: for this used to be considered barbarous. It was the mark of a semi-civilised government. The despatch from Cyprus goes on:

Dighenis—believed to be George Grivas, a former officer in the Greek Army—has a price of £10,000 on his head.

If every record of these days were wiped out leaving only this single column of *The Times* newspaper, what an atrocious age this would then appear to be: and how future historians would ponder over the similarity to earlier actions in the Empires of Assyria and Rome. One sentence more, from this same despatch, runs as follows: A British service man was accidentally shot dead today when he walked into an ambush laid for terrorists in south-west Cyprus. What sort of set-up is this? It is no use telling his next-of-kin that these things are all part of the day’s work; or claiming, as they used to do in ‘colonial wars’, that such methods must be used against savages. For the people of Cyprus are far from being savages. Cyprus is one of the cradles of civilisation. They were speaking Greek in that island, aye, and writing Greek and reading Greek two thousand years before any but the merest handful of Englishmen could read or write their own language—as candidly stated by Alfred the Great about the barbarous people of whom he was king.

The Greeks of Cyprus, like so many others, have fallen often enough under alien governors: but while they have little reason to regret the Turks from whom Disraeli’s Tory Government took

over the island (together with a Turkish minority, the deposit of three centuries of Ottoman rule) as 'secret commission' for backing Abdul the Damned in a Concert of Europe conference ('Baksheesh!' it was called in the Levant, as is recorded by Scawen Blunt who felt keenly the shame of it), nevertheless they must now share the modern world outlook where one after another peoples previously subject to the Ottoman Empire have acquired and vindicated full rights of nationality, freed from both Turk and Western European.

These Cypriots have been oppressed beyond even their neighbours. British newspapers and politicians for this last quarter of a century have managed to keep an almost unbroken silence about the fact that ever since 1931 when the corrupt J. H. Thomas was Colonial Secretary, this crown colony, deprived of previously existing small rights, has been governed despotically. Cypriots in Britain, like most other 'British subjects', have full rights as citizens. Back in their own island, even before this last fifteen months, they have been for the last 25 years under an irresponsible despotism, lorded over by officials, taxed without representation and able only in the case of the large towns to elect their mayors. And these mayors, elected with the backing of AKEL and the trade unions, are now in prison, 'detained', not charged with any offence—except the offence of being almost the sole elected representatives of the townspeople. But now, after these many months—to quote the mild language of the Secretary of the Ethnarchy Council in Cyprus on his arrival in London on June 12—'collective punishments, deportations, detention camps, evictions of citizens from their shops and homes, imprisonments, executions and various other repressive measures complicate the problem instead of solving it'.

This is coming to be recognised in some of the more sober British newspapers, as witness the *Manchester Guardian's* dismay:

What will the Government do next to hurt Britain's reputation? Now it has deported a priest simply because he was chairman of a fund which, by its own account, was intended to help the families of people detained in Cyprus under the emergency regulations. . . .

The British authorities will appear—perhaps justly—as intent on suppressing a humanitarian measure. They will seem devoid of compassion and determined on vindictiveness. Is this really cause for proud cheering from the Conservative back benches? The display in the House yesterday, if reported widely abroad, will deepen the repugnance towards British conduct over Cyprus.

(June 14, 1956)

It was the *Daily Worker*, however, which so far has been the only newspaper to draw the obvious conclusion with its call 'Stop this bloodshed in Cyprus' and its Peace Plan, published on June 2, which demanded: no more hanging of Cypriots, no more collective punishment, no more use of Turkish Cypriot police against Greek Cypriots, release of Makarios and all political detainees. These were immediate measures, to be followed by

Recognition of the unconditional right of self-determination.

End to the Emergency Regulations and an amnesty for all sentenced under them.

A round-table conference of all Cypriot parties to draw up a plan for self-determination and to form a coalition Government to which Britain can transfer power.

Recall of the troops. The Cypriot Government to hold a general election for an Assembly to decide the island's future.

This peace plan is bound to find a response in the Labour movement where there is already a strong feeling against the Tory repression in Cyprus, a feeling notably voiced by Mr. Aneurin Bevan at his Newcastle meeting when he said:

The Tories suddenly became bloody-minded. Because they have just evacuated the Canal Zone and were so angry and irritable at waking up to the fact that they were in the twentieth century, they have decided to be tough in Cyprus and our boys are now paying the price for it.

(Manchester Guardian, May 28, 1956.)

This speech, when his leader Hugh Gaitskell followed him a few days later to a similar effect, means that the lead given by Mr. Kenneth Robinson in his speech in the Cyprus debate of March 14 has now been officially adopted by the Labour Party chiefs, and may now be expressed by official opposition in Parliament. But the Bevan speech, although emphatic enough in one respect (in its laying of blame upon the Tories) is still incomplete as a statement of policy so long as (in the same speech) he takes a stand for retaining British troops in Cyprus. This further stage, inevitable if the logic of opposition to Tory repression is to be followed through, has still to be reached by the official leadership of the Labour Party.

The temper of trade unionists has been rising as the millionaires through their press have been slandering trade unions both for their standpoint on Cyprus and for their resistance to the government's effort to force down the standard of living in Britain. A strong answer and a clear policy was given, ten days after Bevan's speech, by Abe Moffat at the Scottish Miners' Conference:

This union has gone on record for the withdrawal of British troops from Cyprus. . . .

We will continue to demand this in order to save the lives of British people and the lives of the people of the Colonial countries.

Between this complete policy and the as yet incomplete statements of the Labour front bench there is a clear difference. The difference can disappear if the feeling among trade unionists and the Labour movement generally is sufficiently strongly

voiced. But if the difference remains, it plays into the hands of the Tories who will take full advantage of it. On the other hand, victory for a thoroughgoing Labour policy on Cyprus would be a serious set-back for the millionaires, for their newspapers and for their Tory government.

The Combination Acts of a century and a half ago not only outlawed trade unionism but made it a crime to gather money for the defence of those accused of being trade unionists. Baldwin thirty years ago showed himself the vilest creature that was ever Prime Minister when he called to the people of North America not to send help to the starving families of the British miners. The Beaverbrook press went one worse than these, lower than Baldwin, when the millionaire newspaper the *Daily Express* launched its attack against the Electrical Trades Union's Executive for having sent £20 to the Cyprus Emergency Fund (the fund for legal aid to men kept in gaols in Cyprus with no crimes laid to their charge) and tried for a ballot of their vast readership to back up their attack. It was a challenge not so much to the E.T.U. as to the whole trade union movement; for, as was rightly said in the *Daily Herald* of June 13:

Every trade union branch, every Labour Party should send a donation to the Cyprus Emergency Fund. This loudly-trumpeted ballot brought in -05 per cent, of the *Daily Express* readers—a result which only the present Home Secretary could lap up, like a dog that eats dirty puddings. What a government! What a press! What shame they bring upon Britain.

[pp. 316-319]

Notes of the Month: *Breakers Ahead* By R. PAGE ARNOT, *The Labour Monthly*, August 1956

IT is now twenty-two months since the Chancellor of the Exchequer, then Mr. R. A. Butler, no doubt with an eye on a forthcoming general election, held out the prospect of doubling the standard of life in Britain in 25 years. It was an alluring promise. Did anyone believe it then? Does anyone believe it now?

On the contrary, the rise in prices since that smiling prophecy has been so steep that every housewife is more and more worried as each month goes by, and every father of a family is concerned lest the standard of life should go down; everyone on a fixed income such as a pension is hard hit; while as for the old age pensioners on forty shillings a week, their straitened position and meagre sustenance has become a standing reproach to the government. No matter, Mr. Butler and his Tory colleagues were successful in the general election of fifteen months ago. Once the election was over, the tune was changed: no more glowing descriptions of a radiant future but grave-warnings of harsh measures to meet financial crisis. For in fact the recurring financial crisis, which hit Britain every two years since the end of the war (but through special circumstances missing 1953) has come again. The remedy was to be the credit-squeeze (begun earlier with the first raising of the bank-rate) now to be intensified.

A high bank-rate, in the past a familiar method of making the rich richer and the poor poorer, was to be supplemented by a supplementary autumn Budget, when further taxes would be imposed, purchase taxes on consumption goods. Rising prices, said the government spokesmen, were a sign of inflation: to stop inflation they proposed to raise prices higher still. Not for a moment was there any suggestion to cut down the huge overseas military 'commitments', which in themselves were enough to

upset the balance of payments with the outside world: on the contrary the military expenditure overseas was at the same time to be stepped up by sending more troops to Cyprus. That brought us to the end of 1955, first year of Mr. Butler's quarter century that was to end in doubling our standard of living.

....

Here is what the *Daily Herald* said:

The major cause of the inflation—which, however, it seems, does not keep the smug Macmillan awake at nights—is the arms burden, our military commitments, conscription, Cyprus and the whole monstrous distortion they impose on our economy. (*July 4, 1956.*)

[pp. 337-345]

FAR-SIGHTED MILITANTS By John Baird, M.P., The Labour Monthly, September 1956

....

On colonial policy the Shadow Cabinet (whose views are voiced in the House by Mr. Bevan) recently refused to divide the House during the debate on atrocities in Kenya. The Labour Party's policy statement on Colonial Plural Societies is a compromise. It states: 'Resistance can be expected from European and Asian minorities who find their position weakened and the economic, political and administrative power of these minorities is so great that their antagonism could violently dislocate these societies'. It may, therefore, be necessary, they argue, 'to invest Governors with reserve powers for a period to protect legitimate minority interests against excessive nationalist ardour'. There is no such concern for the present ruling minorities among the resolutions to Conference. 49 are on colonial policy. Most of them indicate the great shame of the British workers at what imperialism is doing in the colonies. Coventry Borough Party presses 'for an end to the bloodshed in Malaya, Cyprus and Kenya, and demands that the next Labour Government should declare that self government and self determination will be extended to all colonies. The A.E.U. resolution calls on the Conference to 'condemn the present government policy in the colonies and supports the demand for full trade union and democratic rights for the colonial peoples'.

[pp. 399-400]

Notes of the Month: *Labour Into Battle* By R.P.D., *The Labour Monthly*, October 1956

.....

Brighton Leads the Way

This was the new situation which found its reflection at the Trades Union Congress at Brighton. During recent years each successive Congress has revealed the advancing strength of the progressive forces of trade unionism, registering a consistent average vote of over three millions on major questions against the stand-pat right wing policies of the still dominant, but decreasingly representative, majority of the General Council. But this year the balance was turned on all the main home industrial questions; and even on international relations the General Council's condemnation of union delegations to socialist countries had to be abandoned, while the proposal for closer Anglo-Soviet trade union relations won three and a half million votes. The defeat on Cyprus revealed that the movement was not yet ready to consider withdrawal of British troops.

On the key issues of home industrial policy the General Council had to abandon the battle, in face of the unity of all the major unions, and accept the militant resolutions on automation and wage policy; while, where it sought to give battle, on the 40-hour week, it was defeated in the vote. The General Council, so long as it continues to be elected in the present fashion, which leads to a result increasingly unrepresentative of the real proportions of opinion and tendency within the Congress, remains in essence the same dominantly right wing General Council. Hence it would be a misleading illusion to regard the victory of important militant resolutions at the Congress as already equivalent to a transformation of trade unionism and its central leadership. The battle is not so easily won.

But the decisions of Brighton are a significant pointer of the direction in which trade unionism is moving.

....

Theory and Practice

It may be that the last word of wisdom is not contained in the vulgar saying that an ounce of practice is worth a ton of theory: that depends upon the theory. But theory can assuredly only be of value insofar as it is linked with practice, and helps to sharpen our weapons to grapple with the real world. When we hear of a Labour Party Report on 'Personal Liberty' we naturally expect to be given the Labour view on the concentration camps in Malaya or detention without trial in Kenya or the deportation of Archbishop Makarios; we are somewhat startled to be informed at the outset, in a pamphlet of a leading party of the British imperialist system on 'Personal Liberty' that the colonies (i.e. the majority of the population ruled from London) are excluded from consideration in this report ('we do not refer to civil liberties in the colonies—a vital matter to be dealt with in a separate study'—Introductory Note). If we turn hopefully to the pamphlet entitled 'Labour's Colonial Policy', we might expect to have some definition of Labour's attitude to the colonial wars in Malaya, Kenya or Cyprus; but we find that we are fobbed off with an elaborate philosophical disquisition on the problem of 'multi-racial societies' (how to mete out equal justice to 50,000 European Kenya settlers and five million Kenya Africans) as a reason for delaying independence or even self-government.

When we turn to 'Equality' and 'A Policy for Social Justice', and find a not inexact statement of the overwhelming concentration of the class ownership of wealth in Britain (a concentration, according to their statistics, even narrower and in fewer hands than Chiozza Money found half a century ago, so that all the taxation measures have not changed the trend), we

expect to hear some proposals how to transform this class ownership into social ownership in order to end inequality; instead, we are given some proposals for fiscal reform to prevent tax evasion by the rich. So the dance goes on. Nowhere do we find any attempt to examine the problems of Britain's position in the world, of British imperialism, of Britain's economic crisis and future, or of the working class struggle against capitalism.

It must be said that these general theoretical pamphlets seem to have been written by dons for dons, and to have very little connection with the labour movement.

[pp. 433-445]

Why This Suez Madness, Ivor Montagu, The Labour Monthly, October 1956

THE Prime Minister's policy can lead only to disaster. It will bring this country, as Mr. Gaitskell rightly said, either to carrying out the threat of using armed force or to the greatest diplomatic climb-down in our history.' So the *Manchester Guardian* on the first day of debate at Parliament's return.

'Eden Gets Rough, Tells Nasser: Ike's With Us—And We're Taking Over Our Canal! . . . // *Egypt blocks the Canal or stops the user-association convoys then immediate action will be taken before the Security Council.* There, Nasser will be accused of a direct breach of the 1888 Convention which guarantees free use of the Canal—and the way will be clear for the use of force . . . let the cry babies howl! It's GREAT Britain again!' Thus, in capitals, italics and black, screamed the *Daily Sketch* upon the same event.

In these two howls, one of woe, one of joy, are expressed the situation of the day. The former describes its perils as now seen by one half of the former advocates of a contented bi-partisan policy of Empire. The latter contains the clue to the extraordinary antics of Anthony, which have astonished as much as they have alarmed the world ever since Colonel Nasser announced nationalisation of the Suez Canal Company, and which have brought us all nearer the brink of the grave.

The peculiar element in their posture has not been the Prime Minister's objections to the Egyptian action, nor even the ends he has ostensibly sought, but the manner of it, the way in which he has remorselessly and by plain proclamation of purpose, sought—as the *Sketch* puts it—to 'clear the way' to war.

Juridically, in this dispute with Nasser, the Prime Minister has not had a leg to stand on at any time. He dare not take his case to the International Court of Justice at the Hague, to the Security Council, or to the General Assembly.

At the first it would be laughed out of court. Not only is the Canal *not* British (it was built against British advice and without British skills or British labour, and such British share-interest as was purchased later, got cheap from the difficulties or corruption of the original investors), but it is likewise *not* international; and the British Government has been most insistent throughout the history of the Canal (even so recently as only a few months ago in the last Anglo-Egyptian agreement) in insisting that the company which owned and ran it *is* Egyptian. (It used to suit the British imperialist book, in accordance with the age-old buck-passing technique, to insist on this Egyptian-ness whenever *anyone else* proposed internationalisation, because, so long as the British Government controlled or predominantly influenced Egypt, this was a means of denying anyone else a share in control of the canal and not itself being juridically responsible for the denial.)

No treaty has been breached. The famous 1888 Treaty, guaranteeing passage through the canal no more makes the canal international than the Montreux Convention deprives Turkey of the Dardanelles. Indeed, it specifically treats the canal as Egyptian. Egypt is not breaching the treaty by nationalisation, either in letter or spirit; if anyone is breaching it, both in spirit and in practice, it is those who are responsible for bribing and threatening the pilots to coax them to withdraw—bribing them by promises of pensions and threatening them by means of forfeiture of rights.*

Is the canal *essential* to Britain? In the literal sense, of course not. The extreme view was put by Augustine Courtauld in a letter to the *Daily Telegraph* on September 10:

* *The hand-washing act of Eden-Mollet in pretending they are not responsible for what the Canal Company does carries small conviction to those who remember the shares they control and the role of their own functionaries on the company's board.*

What is all this fuss? Cannot our ships go round the Cape? They had to do it during the war when the canal got blocked with magnetic mines. This may sound like weakness, but is it? After all, this ditch does belong to Egypt, but the sea is free.

No one doubts that, if the canal were suddenly to be blocked by an earthquake, or disappear through some other convulsion of nature, Britain would survive.

Is passage through the canal a British interest? Certainly. As of many other maritime nations. Particularly, no doubt, to Britain. Is that grounds for war? Which Britain has renounced, as an instrument of policy. (Formally, in the Kellogg Pact, as well as in scores of other declarations and instruments.) Can Nasser be relied upon, always and in all circumstances, to respect this interest? Doubtless not. Is that any excuse for *preventive* war, before he even acts against it?

Is Nasser nasty? That is hardly the question. 'Our quarrel is not with Egypt, still less with the Arab people. It is with Nasser,' says Eden. (Exactly, as with Oom Paul Kruger, not the Boers.) Nasser is a dictator, declares Eden. Exactly, like Chiang Kai-shek, Rhee, Ngo Ninh Diem, Pibul Songgram, Nuri Said, Salazar, and a whole pack of others whom not only do we not go to war with on that account, but some of whom at least Eden cherishes as precious allies. It is scarcely dictatorship that sticks in Sir Anthony's gullet, but the fear that the dictator may not be friendly even if paid to be. Can anyone doubt that, if Nasser had joined the Baghdad Pact, he would have stayed the white-headed boy?

But one can hardly go round fighting everyone one cannot rely upon, whether because one has not succeeded in buying him or does not trust him to deliver the goods. Or can one? Surely it is preferable, at least these days, to try to keep him straight with guarantees and treaties. So one might suppose. For Nasser has repudiated no treaties or guarantees. (He has cancelled a

concession to an Egyptian company which had twelve more years to run, an act somewhere intermediate in faithlessness between Iran or Mexico nationalising an oil well and Attlee nationalising a coalmine.) Indeed, he has re-affirmed the 1888 Treaty with its guarantees. He has offered to negotiate a revision and a strengthening of it, which, since the world has changed somewhat in the last seventy years is *prima facie* not undesirable. It has been clear from the first, via Krishna Menon and others who visited him en route to London that he is entirely willing to negotiate. The final difference between Nasser's proposals made to Menzies, and the Menzies'

proposals described as Eden's irreducible minimum, as analysed by Robens, are narrow. Instead of Menzies' international board, Nasser proposes an international advisory committee, tied to the United Nations. Why not? The committee could not enforce guarantees without gathering and applying sanctions. But no more could the board. Short of permanent occupation of the canal—and that Britain had, and has already found impossible to prolong—the board's effective control would always have to depend on Egyptian tolerance, with background possibility of force as guarantee, anyway. Would not a tightened and revised new Treaty, tied to the United Nations, with the interest of Asian countries and U.S.S.R. marching jointly with that of the 'West' so far as preserving passage is concerned, be a much better instrument than that of 1888? Why not negotiate the 'narrow' ?*

* *It is sometimes urged that Egypt disregards the 1888 Treaty in its frustrations of passage of Israeli vessels or cargoes. The Egyptian argument is that the technical state of war with Israel justifies the ban and that Britain banned passage of enemy trade in exactly the same way throughout the two world wars. Eden has been perfectly content to accept this fact of ban on Israel hitherto, and only recalls it now he has his own grounds of quarrel. Further, he cheerfully accepts, without the least protestation, ban on transit not only of Israelis but of*

Why? Because the whole point of Eden's position, the aspect that he has shouted perpetually from the housetops and that has astonished and alienated the world—even those sections of it that have good reason not to admire Colonel Nasser and to welcome tightening of treaty guarantees of passage through the canal—is that he will *not* negotiate. He has gone out of his way, again and again, to manoeuvre so that any concession from Nasser, any agreement reached, would appear as having been extorted by force or threat of force.

This has been extravagantly contrived at every step. Eden's immediate answer to nationalisation was not negotiation but partial mobilisation. The conference was ostentatiously arranged *not* as a conference of *all* interested, or as *agreed* between the parties, but as one patently packed with a majority of friends and clients, and sited, not in a neutral spot, but in London, to which Nasser was summoned as a naughty boy. No attempt was made to reach an agreed plan, or place alternatives before Nasser; indeed, the plan placed before him was precisely formulated in such a way as to include terms known in advance to be unacceptable to him. The mouth piece (Menzies) sent with it was precisely and publicly instructed not to negotiate, and to make it more unacceptable still, the further massing of troops was publicised simultaneously. The latest plan, of a users' union, not in itself intrinsically exceptionable and, in other conditions, a possible convenience for negotiation, is deliberately depicted as a device to lead to 'other means' in case otherwise Nasser might think of taking it at its face value and negotiating with it.

Every step has made it plain that what Eden has required is less the fruits of victory than the act of surrender, and moreover

Jewish British citizens on B.O.A.C. planes across Iraq, his bosom ally and puppet. Obviously, re-negotiation and revision of the freedom of canal transit provided in the 1888 Treaty would afford opportunity to clarify and protect this disputed aspect of canal passage.

a surrender that must be publicly attained by the parade of force on the part of the old empires. We are in the presence of a Tory crisis, a dying convulsion of Conservatism.

From *The Times* to the *Sketch* the Empire crusaders are quite right when they see involved their mess of pottage. The gyrations of Eden are not just the hysteria of a petulant and obstinate weakling. Any illusions in that respect should have been dissipated by the hungry hyena roar from the Tory benches as he spluttered of 'other means'. Nor is it just a matter of the internal politics of the Tory party, Eden's fear at being jettisoned by the Suez cave. It is much deeper than that, it is the jeopardy of a class and its privileges. The lesser breeds must be put in their place. These sudden converts to 'internationalism of one waterway only' have not become One Worlders overnight. The sauce they offer the goose, definitely does *not* apply to ganders. Turkey may rule the Dardanelles, Adenauer Kiel, U.S.A. (cuckoo-tenant) Panama, Britain Gibraltar—but an upstart Colonel who trades with U.S.S.R. and is coloured to boot, a mere wog! The whole world must be shown that he's not fit to join our club or wear our tie. Such as he may neither own waterways, nor are guarantees from them acceptable. *He* must accept, what no one asks others to accept, and moreover, he must be evidently made to accept it by force. Of what use is force if we cannot make people bow to it? People are asking what troops and conscription are for in a nuclear age. These Labour fellows even had the impertinence to ask Parliament to shorten the period of military service. After Jordan, Suez. People will refuse to put up with military expenditure soon if we don't show we *can* do something with it. They'll ask what we are so keen on Cyprus for if we don't use it. What are sabres for if not to rattle? Are (whisper it) our Generals worth their pay?

As the quotation at the head of this article has shown, there are others, by no means revolutionary, who have less confidence in Eden's path. They are not so sure as the Templer who so often

predicted victory in Malaya, the Harding who thought the Cypriot terrorists were at their last gasp. They have noted what happened to Glubb Pasha, to MacArthur on the Yalu and at Dien Bien Phu. Things do not always go so luckily as in Guatemala. And if things turned out not to be a pushover? As was said of Churchill's great ancestor: *'Malbrouck s'en va t'en guerre, ne sait s'il reviendra'*.

'The war would unite the Arab nations against us, weaken the Atlantic alliance, and break the Commonwealth. It would open the Middle East to Communism. It would cost numbers of needless casualties; it would leave us without oil. It would be the end of Britain and France as important nations', gloomily concludes the *Manchester Guardian*.

The trouble for Empire is that they are both right. As the *Manchester Guardian* warns, force would ruin the Empire. And as the Generals fear, if they eschew force the Empire must give way. The world is moving forward. One World of co-operation is coming, and not by the path of subjection of peoples to expanding empires and exclusive clubs, but by the contrary path of liberation, the coexistence and partnership of equally sovereign states. But this is philosophy and prophecy. The actual danger is immediate. Eden and the Generals have the votes in Parliament and they mean to override the Gaitskells and the *Guardians* if our protest remains confined to words.

Here begins to become plain the enormous power of the peace idea. They cannot go to war, pouf, just like that. Already we are strong enough to prevent this. There must be a reason, nowadays. Some people, the *Sketch* for instance, require only an excuse (*'Nasser will be accused . . . and the way will be clear'*), but others need more. According to the Charter, force may be used only to repel aggression. But what is aggression? Time-serving lawyers have been found to prate that Nasser was the first aggressor because he seized the canal companies' offices. This merely defiles paper and fails to convince even pussy.

Striving to preserve peace, the Soviet Union proposed ages ago at the United Nations that aggression should be so defined as automatically to entail condemnation and international action against any state which declares war on another, invades it by armed force without a declaration of war, bombs its territory, attacks its ships or aircraft, enters its boundaries without permission or remains after permission has expired, blockades its coasts or ports, supports armed bands that invade another state. It proposed that no attack by one country on another could be justified by any political, economic or strategic ground, the exploitation of others' resources, the protection of investments on its territory; by its being backward, having a poorly-run administration, revolutionary, counter-revolutionary or civil war disorders; by its repudiation of treaties, trade agreements, economic concessions or debts; by its refusal to let armed forces cross its territory, internal religious measures or causation of frontier incidents. H.M. Government opposed this on the ground that the definition was 'insufficiently elastic'. We can now see what it meant. Or, at least, hoped to be in a position to get away with.

Nevertheless, Eden's problem remains. On Korea the people in many countries were confused because the United Nations was believed to have given a licence to repel aggression (even though, at the trial that procured the verdict, the accused was not allowed to be represented and the Court was irregularly composed). But here they will hardly stomach Britain and France arrogating the right to act as judges in their own behalf without even the semblance of a trial, and there is not the remotest possibility that, on the facts to date, Eden could receive a licence to exert force from even a majority either of the Security Council or the General Assembly. So long as Britain and France are isolated in readiness to resort to force, to that extent they are handicapped, so that Eden's whole endeavour has been to disarm opposition both at home and abroad by

pretending he has the support of other governments. That is why, instead of ordering 'Fire!' at once, he had to go through the elaborate comedy of pretending his ideas endorsed by a London conference, a 'Dulles plan,' an '18-nation mission' and the like, all totalling up to 100 per cent, failure to delude anyone into supposing for a moment that any of the 18 who endorsed the plan, endorsed the idea of enforcing it. Finally, to strip him naked, within 24 hours of his Commons 'triumph', the master-stroke of a users' union about to force the passage ('Ike's with us'), Dulles explained that, if Nasser shouldn't play Ike would indeed be with us—to the extent of selling us petrol and going round the Cape himself.

These very pretences, in the futility of their effort to justify the unjustifiable, are a tribute to the strength of the world sentiment for peace. But this sentiment must not be lulled into futility. It is strong only to the extent that those inspired by it are ready to translate it into action. Already the *Daily Herald* is seeking to represent as a success Eden's concession that, except in 'emergency', he would not use force *before consulting U.N.*, when what was being demanded by Gaitskell was a pledge not to use force *without authority of U.N.*, and the minimum necessary, in fact, is a pledge not to use force at all, but to negotiate sensibly.

The polls show that already the great majority are against force. But there are times when it is not enough just to contract out and remember to disapprove one hour a week. There are times when a whole people becomes responsible for tolerating the evil of its ministers, and history will make it suffer for its sufferance. Already Eden has, with the cost of his big stick, ruined more of the country's economic security than all Macmillan's blows at the standard of living could ever even purport to save. But much worse is the cost of his big mouth. Where is the rule of law? The obligations of the Charter? If every big nation may decide for itself what on the territory of a smaller

one is or is not necessary to its own well-being, and decide for itself when or not force may be used, what has become of the whole international system for peace and security so painfully erected after and at the cost of the Second World War? Robens rightly said the dispute is about whether we should live in the world of law and order or the world of the jungle. What use hanging Hitler, if we do not restore these protective standards by utterly discrediting and disposing of Eden and his war party now, for good and all? We have a job on hand, not only to stop the war and threats of war but to ensure a sensible negotiated settlement.

[458-464]

Sanity in Storm, R.P.D. The Labour Monthly, December 1956

.....

Anglo-French and United States Imperialism

Why did Anglo-French imperialism, which had in general previously tailed behind the United States and even at times counselled moderation against American adventurism, now spring to the forefront as the most bellicose and reckless section of the Western imperialist camp, even in defiance of the wishes of the United States? This corresponded to the position of the British and French Empires as the most heavily weakened and declining world empires, most desperate in face of the sweeping advance of antiimperialist liberation, crippled in economic and financial resources and consequently unable to compete in this sphere with the United States, and therefore resorting to the final desperate gamble of military action to reassert their mastery. France had already lost out in South-East Asia and the Middle East, and was losing in Northern Africa, with half a million troops engaged in a brutal colonial war in Algiers. British troops were already engaged in Cyprus, Kenya and Malaya. In the Middle East the former British monopoly domination had had continuously to give way to American advance. The savage Anglo-French aggression on Egypt was a characteristic last thrust of dying empires. But the disassociation of the United States created a complication for the Anglo-French imperialists. The United States could seek to reap advantage from the situation by simultaneously deploring the Anglo-French aggression, while opposing proposals for effective combined steps to bring the aggression speedily to an end. This division between the major partners of the Atlantic Alliance revealed the depth of the contradictions into which the imperialist camp has fallen in face of the world advance of socialism and of national and colonial liberation. [pp. 529-547]

The Invasion of Egypt, Quaestor, The Labour Monthly, December 1956

....

At one pole of the United Nations is the group of Socialist countries, with the U.S.S.R. in the lead—'the real enemy', as the *Daily Express*, the *Economist* and the *Daily Telegraph* have assured us in touching unison. They represent one column of the peace movement. Then there are the 26 countries of the Afro-Asian bloc—countries whose social order varies from bourgeois democracy to feudal autocracy, but which in these times are determined not to allow the heel of imperialism on their necks again, for reasons we all know. At the opposite pole is the United States, with its client dictatorships and kept men in some Latin American countries. Eden well knows that the fury of its money-kings, militarists and politicians is due, not to 'unprovoked aggression' (they committed it themselves in Guatemala only the other day) or in 'contempt for international law' (they have been breaking it every day for years in their backing of the puppet Chiang Kai-shek in Taiwan against the real government of China), but to the fact that they were outsmarted in their own ambitions to manoeuvre Egypt into becoming their loyal stooge—as they did with Iran and Turkey. Thus in the large majority of the United Nations Anglo-French imperialism sees either its direct opponents in the struggle to drive back one or other of the two victoriously advancing peace columns—or its rival. The rest are the smaller capitalist countries who, in any conflict between the Great Powers, have always suffered heavily, or know that they will do so in a third world war—or they are the other countries with colonial empires of their own, Belgium and Holland, Portugal and Spain, who alone may be expected to stand with their friends the bigger pirates at this juncture.

When British and French imperialism took up the cudgels against 'all Asia', therefore, they were bound to discount beforehand the line-up against them by Lake Success.

Regrettable though it is to admit it, the same applies, as matters stand, to the unprecedented opposition which broke loose in Great Britain itself. The rise of militant and Socialist sentiment in the trade unions and the Labour Party, which has shown itself in the mounting strike wave during 1956, at the T.U.C. and at the Labour Party Conference, was given full rein in the House of Commons debates, and responded with an avalanche of protest meetings, petitions and resolutions. It drew after it a considerable section of the bourgeoisie itself, as the quite unprecedented outbreak of political dissension in the Universities, Churches and cultural bodies revealed. The giant Labour Party demonstration in London on Sunday, November 4, for 'Law, Not War', opened the eyes of many till then unseeing: not least so, by the conduct of the mounted police in attacking the crowds—a feature which, when the militant rank-and-file had complained of it on previous occasions (for example, under the Labour Government) had only aroused disbelieving or cynical contempt among many M.P.s and good-mannered citizens. Britain, certainly, has seethed with opposition, this November, in a way not known since the years 1942-3, of the struggle for the Second Front.

Yet the opposition was hamstrung from the start. From the rank and file the demand for strike action was rising: on November 1, a feature article in the *Daily Herald* heavily underlined Robert Smillie's call when war on Republican Turkey (then not sold to the U.S.A.) was threatening—'anything that organised Labour can do by any means in its power should be done in order to stop this new war'. But then the hammer came down from the National Council of Labour: no strikes for political ends, no demand for action outside Parliament to force the Tory Government to resign. This was followed up by

Gaitskell with his memorable appeal—to the Tories: to find some other Tory Prime Minister! As though the Devil would smell sweeter were his name Beelzebub.

Why this strait-jacket on the people? Respect for the Constitution (so scantily respected by the Tories when it suits them)? Yes, but more than that. If you can promote strikes against imperialist aggression, what of Malaya, of British Guiana, of Cyprus? What of the next Labour Government's freedom to defend imperialism? The battle for a Socialist foreign policy has not yet been won in the Labour Party and the trade unions: and that showed itself in Britain in November, 1956, in spite of the wonderful and heartening protests against the attack on Egypt.

.....

The invasion of Egypt and its consequences can be turned to the advantage of the working people in this and all other countries, indeed, if the British Labour movement—with its exceptional power—recognises the crime for what it has been: the first great armed attempt of British and French finance-capital (let us hope unsuccessful) to drive back and defeat one of the two camps which, in their growth, spell humanity's advance to peace and socialism.

[p. 559-566]

**Labour Discussion Forum, A.R. Bennett, J.
Delahay and others, The Labour Monthly,
January 1957**

....

Conscription and Colonies

A distressing feature nowadays is that Tory propaganda (and indeed Right-wing Labour) has succeeded in convincing youth that it is unpatriotic to refuse to do two years military service. We must treat the working classes in our colonies as brothers and not as a breed of coloured foreigners with no connection with us whatsoever. Our mutual enemy is capitalism and the Tory government, and the best way in which we can indirectly aid our coloured brothers is to refuse to maintain the means by which the imperialists retain their hold over the colonies.

Whilst the working-class youth continues to believe Tory propaganda, and the Labour Party's policy remains little more than a compromise, eighteen-year-old lads and upwards will be faced with the corrupting influence of National Service. National Service is a fundamental problem and unless it is fairly faced up to by the labour movement as a whole, one great barrier to genuine socialism will remain, and most important of all, also a bulwark of monopoly capitalism, imperialism.

I am now a conscientious objector, awaiting prison in 1957. I based my case on an objection to being used as an imperialist stooge in our colonies. I cannot reconcile my principles with carrying through the 'dirty work' of our government in Malaya, Kenya, Cyprus, and Suez.

ALAN R. BENNETT (*aged 18*),

Poole.

[pp. 41-46]

Notes of the Month, True Blue Democracy, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, February 1957

....

General Speidel in Command

As a symbol of the New European Order Hitler's General Speidel is appointed Commander-in-Chief of the European Armies of the North Atlantic Treaty. Rommel's former aide is to give the orders to the British Army of the Rhine, and the ordinary British soldier is left wondering who won the war. The domination of West Germany in the new Western Europe is translated into the military sphere. That defence expenditure has to be cut has now become common ground, recognised also by the Macmillan Government. But they are trying to reduce the costs without changing the policy. They continue to resist the Soviet proposals for the reduction of armaments or even the banning of tests. They continue to resist the Soviet proposals for the immediate reduction of armies of occupation in Germany, with a view to advancing to a European Security Treaty replacing the North Atlantic Treaty and Warsaw Pact, the unification of Germany within such a framework, and the withdrawal of all occupying armed forces from Europe. They continue their war in Cyprus, send additional troops to Northern Ireland, and stipulate that British armed forces shall continue to operate in Malaya after the proclamation of independence of the Malayan Federation. They want to continue the commitments and reduce the costs. Under such conditions any proposals for cutting the costs can only become limited measures for economy, but not that basic change in policy which can alone lift the weight of the crippling arms burden from Britain. They are trying to square the circle.

....

From *The Labour Monthly Conference—A Review*, February, 1932. **pp. 49-59]**

Notes of the Month, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, March 1957

....

Extension of Colonial Wars

Has the Macmillan Government learned the lesson of Suez to endeavour to bring to an end the ruinous colonial wars on which Britain is engaged? On the contrary. Since Suez Britain has embarked on a new colonial war against Yemen, no doubt judging that here was an antagonist of a more suitable size for Britain's might to encounter, and that the prowess of bombing planes against the daggers and ancient carbines of the Yemeni tribesmen might recall the palmiest days of the old glories of imperial warfare. The horror of Port Said, with the wholesale bombardment and massacre of men, women and children, recalling Guernica, has been followed by the razing of the village of Danaba to the ground as a collective reprisal—a Nazi method condemned as a war crime at Nuremberg. In **Cyprus** the refusal of negotiations and reinforcement of British armed forces to 18 battalions has brought to this small island the largest concentration of British troops in any colonial dependency. In Ireland additional British troops have been dispatched to the North. In Malaya new dispositions have been announced that, also after the proclamation of independence of the Federation, British armed forces shall continue to operate under British command.

.....

[pp. 97-106]

**Outer Mongolia (Review) Andrew Rothstein,
The Labour Monthly, March 1957**

Everyone who has Cyprus, Malaya, British Guiana, Kenya, Central Africa, Egypt on his or her conscience should read this book. And it would do no harm to Britain's delegates to the United Nations to read it too.

[pp. 141]

**Labour Discussion Forum, M. Carter, R. Dixon,
A.M. Richard, A. Saunders, The Labour Monthly,
July 1957**

The Teacher from Hiroshima

As my eldest son entered his 'teens, I became rather disturbed at the approach of Call-up age. How would he like life in the Forces? Two wasted years! Away from home; and, as he has a terrific appetite, maybe not enough food to eat? So believe me, I was very much against Call-up, especially as I had seen the sorrow it caused a neighbour who lost an only son of 19 killed in Cyprus. And I still see the girl he left behind very unhappy. Now, my son was born in 1941 so he will not now be called up. But I would have him and all other lads serve their time if it *would* mean the end of H-bomb tests and threatened nuclear warfare—as Macmillan has the gall to suggest. I shall never forget the Japanese school-teacher from Hiroshima who told us that after the explosion she saw people walking around dazed, with what she thought was their clothes flowing like streamers. Taking a closer look she saw it was their skin. Am I and other mothers to live in fear of the effects this terrible thing will have on our children and their children? Every time my two youngest children have a glass of milk I think of Strontium 90. These war-crazy people who are planning nuclear warfare outdo each other with terrific skill in thinking up new horrors for us, and ways for us to be killed. We must fight to have these tests stopped at once, to ensure the future of life. We must fight in the same way that trade unionism did and from which we now reap the benefits.

MIRIAM CARTER,
Dagenham.
[pp. 328-332]

Notes on Inflation, A Student of Affairs, The Labour Monthly, September 1957

....

But it is his government that is mainly responsible for the continued inflation by the abnormal and excessive purchasing power which it exerts through its arms programme. The consumption each year of £14,000,000,000 on the arms programme is the main cause of the continued rise in prices. The bombers in Oman in July and August, the nine years war 'emergency' in Malaya, the operations in Suez, Kenya, British Guiana, Cyprus, and other overseas expenditures all go to make prices rise, as does the preparation of atomic weapons at home. There then is the main responsibility for inflation, right on the doorstep of No. 10, Downing Street.

...

[pp. 404-410]

No to the No-men, Ivor Montagu, The Labour Monthly, October 1957

....

This is the explanation of the abrupt and offensive letter from Macmillan ending the exchange of correspondence with Bulganin, with its insolent pretence that public opinion in England would not support large-scale cultural exchanges (this just a few days after the record-breaking success of the Anglo-Soviet athletic match before packed crowds at the White City). This, the decision to eschew any form of co-operative co-existence, is the reason for the bullying of Syria to the point of brinkmanship. This is the ground for the futile name-calling and exhibition of wrist-twisting over the Special U.N. Session on Hungary. No longer is there even any pretence that the failure to agree on a disarmament first step is due to the technical difficulty of control, or to fear of the numbers of 'Asiatic hordes'. Admittedly adequate policing of a first step agreement to stop tests is offered by the Soviet Union itself (Macmillan's untruth about such policing being impossible having fallen with a dull thud after arousing the contempt of every scientist in every country), and the U.S.A. is now the chief opponent of the drastic numerical cuts in armed effectives offered by the U.S.S.R. Even the policy purposes of the return to Cold War are barely concealed, in fact they have been openly proclaimed. First it is roundly asserted that the events following the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., the crises in Poland and in Hungary, the crisis his summer involving the Presidium and Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., are proof that the policy of Cold War and 'containment' can be made to pay dividends. Just a *'leettle'* more patience and pressure, just a *wee bit* more provocation by increased espionage and sabotage, obliging the Soviet bloc to enhance rather than relax security measures, just a *few* years longer of the arms race, forcing the said bloc still to divert

resources to protective armaments rather than improving the standard of living, and perhaps (the 999,999th 'perhaps' since 1917) the whole thing will collapse. Second, if, with a warmer climate between the two blocs, the peoples of the Western countries should question the necessity for 'defence' purposes of maintaining Western armed forces at their present level, // they should then desire to reduce or abandon drafts and conscription and progress to the third phase reductions of armed forces proposed by Mr. Zorin, how could the West continue its defensive battles in Malaya, Kenya, Cyprus, Algeria, Yemen, Oman or its threats to undertake such defences wherever local peoples should show signs of wishing to share with their local sheiks the bunce from local oil? The generals are quite frank about this (see MacArthur's recent statement), they rely on the legend of Soviet intractability over disarmament and threat to the 'Western way of life' to get their jungle fodder. ...

[pp. 446-457]

Rising Tide at Blackpool, E. M. Winterton, *The Labour Monthly*, October 1957

....

It would be foolish, of course, to ignore the dark spots in the picture. On Wednesday, although with obvious misgivings, the Congress passed the special proposals of the General Council to raise £500,000—6d. per head a year for three years—for an ‘International Solidarity Fund’, the purposes of which were far from clearly defined. One of its uses is to finance ‘free trade unionism’ in the British Empire —on which the General Council’s record in recent years deserves special study, since it appears to indicate that ‘free trade unions’ are only those which accept the political views of the Labour Party leaders, backed by the police rule, the military forces and the Governor’s ‘reserved powers’ of British Imperialism. This appeared very transparently in Sir Vincent Tewson’s replies on Friday, to criticisms of the General Council’s report on Cyprus and Singapore (paragraphs 179 and 238).

....

[pp. 453-455]

Where is that Defence White Paper Now, Cdr. E. Young, R.N. (Retired), *The Labour Monthly*, December 1957

....

If the Government has any sense, it should see in all this an easy way out of its difficult situation in relation to man-power for the Armed Forces. It stands committed by its White Paper on Defence to having all the 375,000 men specified for 1962 recruited as volunteers, and, in anticipation of this, to having no further call-up under the National Service Acts after the end of 1960. The Government is not getting volunteers on the scale expected, and in the present circumstances is unlikely to get them. What of trying an improvement of the pay and conditions in the Armed Forces? The controversy aroused not long ago by John Strachey, who proposed payment to men serving in accordance with industrial standards, has shown that this would prove prohibitively expensive. Moreover, would such an improvement persuade enough young men to volunteer to go out and fight 'dirty' wars, such as our National Service men are obliged to fight, in Cyprus, Kenya, Arabia and Malaya?

....

[pp. 551]

The Labour Party and the Colonies, H.B. Lim, The Labour Monthly, January 1958

DURING the past year the Labour Party has made more serious attempts to re-examine the colonial question. This has been shown by the publication of its three policy pamphlets (*Economic Aid, Plural Society and Smaller Territories*), by the increasing number of questions asked on the colonies in the House of Commons, and especially, by the continuing development of rank-and-file discussions and actions. The various shades of opinion in these discussions and actions reveal one potent fact, whatever the differences. It is, that Labour Party members are feeling and expressing growing dissatisfaction with both the Tory and right-wing Labour policies on the colonies. It is significant that the three policy pamphlets were adopted by the Labour Party at its last Conference as official policy, for they contain a number of policy statements and principles of action that have not been previously formulated and adopted. For example, the principle of the right of colonies to independence and self-determination was adopted; the exploitation of the colonial peoples and the domination of the 'White' settlers was generally admitted; and the need to assist the colonial peoples was repeatedly stated.

However, it is equally clear that neither the old guard of the right-wing Labour leadership nor the remnants of imperialist ideas among the membership have surrendered to the pressure of progressive changes within the Labour Party. The old influences can still be seen in the policy pamphlets and, for every progressive principle or statement adopted, one finds several interpretations and qualifications that hinder the application of progressive ideas and principles. Take, for instance, the principle of independence and self-determination for the colonies. What comprises independence? What must the Labour

Party *do* in order really to help the colonies win their independence?

Obviously, the first and the most important thing to do is to help the colonial peoples remove the chains of colonialism. What are those chains? They are: military, political, and economic oppression, whether these be operated solely by British imperialism or in collaboration with American imperialism. But the policy pamphlets do not relate this *main* aspect of the problem to the principle of independence and self-determination. No mention is made of the fact that in the British colonies and protectorates—and even in Ghana and the Malayan Federation, which have gained state independence—a total of some 100,000 British forces are still in occupation, and in Cyprus, Malaya, Kenya, and Aden British forces are actually in action to keep down the independence movements of the people. Then again, British imperialism has been increasingly using N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O., and the Baghdad Pact to try and save the Empire, that is, to keep the colonial peoples down. What should be the Labour Party's stand on this?

There is no doubt what the answer would have been if the right-wing elements in the Labour Party had not supervened: recall the forces, dissociate from the imperialist war pacts and let the colonial peoples be free to determine their own form of government. Instead of this, the policy statement on the right of independence and self-determination is torpedoed from behind. Pleading (in *Plural Society*) that it is 'Britain's responsibility to ensure that this process (i.e., of integration of the various nationalities) is fully carried out before British authority is withdrawn', the Labour Party policy statement is in fact pleading in favour of continued domination of the colonies by 'British authority'. What more could the Tories ask in justification of their continued military and political control over the colonies? Similarly, it could, and should be asked: If it is the intention to give the colonial peoples independence and self-determination,

should they not be given a really democratic constitution and the complete freedom of vote? Yes, says the Labour Party's statement of general principle. No, says the Plural Society—at least, not yet! The Labour Party, says the latter, cannot be expected 'to establish the common roll immediately everywhere'.

Why not? The colonial peoples are demanding 'immediately' and 'everywhere' that they are ready for democratic elections. The Labour Party right-wingers try to explain in *Smaller Territories* that you cannot apply the principle of common roll and self-determination in Pitcairn or Tristan da Cunha. Why not? At any rate, Cyprus is not Pitcairn, nor are Malaya, Kenya, etc., Tristan da Cunha. Why have these major, advanced territories not been given the elementary means to express their will *freely*? Why instead, the continued policy of suppression, of disqualification of thousands of potential voters on allegedly 'subversive' grounds? At the time the Labour Party pamphlet was being prepared, not much was heard of British North Borneo's movement for self-government. Since then, the demand for self-government has been made—and the Tory Government's answer has been, as usual, suppression of 'subversive' elements. How long is this kind of thing to continue? It is time the Labour Party realised that even with the best intention in the world, it will continue to be used to shield the Tories' imperialist policy unless it supports in present practice the colonial peoples' demand for independence and self-determination.

The Labour Party recognises that poverty, disease, economic and social backwardness in the colonies are the heritage of 'imperial rule'. One hundred years of this rule has left the problem 'still to be resolved', says the pamphlet on *Economic Aid*. The extreme poverty of the colonial peoples is something which no words and figures can adequately describe. Their suffering is there for everyone to see, and it would take a

cow-hide conscience not to be moved to shame and anger. But shame and anger are not enough. The root causes of this monumental act of imperialism's rank inhumanity have to be removed. But how? That is where the pamphlet on *Economic Aid* fails. It fails because although it assumes rightly that 'private investment. . . inevitably tends to look for high profits and quick returns', it imagines that this evil could be removed by a 'planned' and 'balanced' economy. This tendency to look on a 'planned' or 'balanced' economy as a virtue in itself without any regard as to who are to own the resources, who are to do the planning and how, is a serious weakness. Planning in itself will not exorcise the imperialist vested interests. That is why the Tories initiated and have to this day supported the Colonial Development and Welfare Plan (and its highly profitable planned projects in the colonies). Indeed, they are anxious to use it as an additional weapon of exploitation and domination. A total of 66 continuing projects were in operation in the colonies at the end of 1956 in which the Tory Government in 'planned' joint enterprise with such well-known 'private' investors as Unilever, Bookers & Greenheart (Demarara), Jardine, Matheson and Co., Ltd., Cadbury Brothers, the Anglo-American Corporation of South Africa, Ltd. (to mention only a few), made a net operating profit of £371,718— an increase of more than three times the net profit for 1955 (£113,165).

It is more than ten years now since the alleged cure (of Government-planned investments) has been applied in the colonies. The result has been: deeper imperialist penetration, more profits and privileges for the 'planned' exploiters, further extortionate draining of the colonial peoples' resources, a wage-rate of Is. 6d. to 7s. a day for the colonial workers, and the munificent sum of 1/2d. a week per person by way of welfare grant. Planning, not even the 'comprehensive local planning' as advocated by the pamphlet, cannot alter the fundamentally and predominantly imperialist character of the Colonial

Development and Welfare 'aid'. The Labour Party must, to be consistent with its general policy statement of recognising the colonial people's independence and self-determination, support their demand for the right to control, develop and distribute their own resources. Any aid that is to go to them should be free from profit or other strings. The unwillingness to expose and remove the economic machinery of exploitation in the colonies is too painfully clear in the pamphlet. Hence, there is no mention of what Labour should do to the existing British private investments— among them the giants, Unilever, Dunlop, the Rhodesian Copper trusts—which gather their harvests of multi-million-£ profits every year. Not a word is said about the demands of the colonial peoples for the return of their sterling balances (which, with those of the Commonwealth countries, stood at £3,494 million in June, 1957).

The above are some of the key questions relating to the colonial question which many in the Labour Party have demanded to be thrashed out as part of the general discussion and policy statement on independence and self-determination.

The failure of the Labour Party Conference to do this is not accidental. It is the outcome of the same right-wing influence which engineered the muddle and the retreat on the allied question of nationalisation in Britain. The old reformist plea of striking up a working understanding, even partnership, with monopoly capitalism 'at home' has once again revived illusions among the diehard right-wing section of the Labour Party that colonialism can be removed by 'improving the lot of the colonial peoples' or, to adapt the words of a well-known Indian statesman, by promising the colonial peoples that they will be fried in butter instead of margarine. A great deal more needs to be done before the healthy pressure of rank and file members of the Labour movement—not least of all of the Communist Party—brings about a decisive change in the official policy of the Labour Party on the colonial question. It is already clear to

many in the Labour movement (including the Labour Party) that this change would add a major impetus to the defeat of the Tories and to the removal of their disastrous home, foreign, and colonial policies. To do this, the brakes within the Labour movement itself (especially within the Labour Party) have to be removed and a clear, progressive policy adopted, without delay.

[pp. 28-31]

This Picture-and That, Quaestor, The Labour Monthly, February 1958

*I labour for peace, but when I
speak unto them thereof they make
them ready to battle. Psalms 120,
v. 6.*

AT no time since the second world war have the imperialist governments—British, American and French—shown themselves so determined to sacrifice the interests of their own peoples and of world peace to their cold, malignant and implacable enmity to the U.S.S.R. At no time has the stubborn determination of the Soviet Union to go on with its efforts for peace, whatever the odds, been so apparent.

The NATO governments met in conference in Paris from December 16 to 19. Right up to the conference opening, the official press here and elsewhere tried to leave no doubt about its purpose. This had been well summed up by one of our most orthodox and most pro-American daily newspapers:

What is needed from the Paris meeting, therefore, is not some new declaration of the rights of man or new slogans about peace and freedom, which its composition and purpose make it unsuited to supply. . . . What is needed first and foremost is a new military structure which will restore to the West, and particularly to the United States, an adequate overall strength. . . . The NATO Council's main task therefore must be to restore the deterrent. . . . There is only one possible way of meeting this vital requirement. America's allies must allow her to station on their territory intermediate-range missiles.

(Daily Telegraph, December 13, 1957.)

But things did not go quite that way. A number of smaller countries were already nervous about what the *Daily Telegraph*

thought was a ‘must’. Moreover, on the very eve of the conference Soviet Premier Bulganin had sent messages to the heads of the NATO governments—and also that of Spain with whom the U.S.S.R. has no diplomatic relations—proposing top level discussions on the following immediate proposals for improving mutual confidence:

1. A joint pledge by the Powers not to use atomic or hydrogen weapons.

2. The ending of nuclear tests for two or three years, as from January 1, 1958.

3. Agreement of the Great Powers not to place nuclear weapons in East or West Germany: and of the two German governments, with those of Poland and Czechoslovakia, not to manufacture or themselves instal such weapons.

4. A non-aggression agreement ‘in one form or another’ between the NATO and Warsaw Pact states.

5. Britain, France, U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. to renounce force in settling Middle East questions, and any other steps infringing the independence of Middle Eastern states.

6. The ending of all forms of war propaganda.

In addition, the U.S.S.R. declared itself ready to reduce armed forces and armaments on a basis acceptable to all concerned; to take part in a complete ban on nuclear weapons, cessation of their manufacture and destruction of stocks: and to join any plan for withdrawing foreign armed forces from *all* countries, including those of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The U.S.S.R. would reduce its forces in Germany, or withdraw them altogether—as well as from other countries where they are stationed under the Warsaw Treaty—‘provided that the armed forces of the United States, Great Britain and France are withdrawn from the territories of the Federal Republic of Germany and from other NATO member-countries’.

These proposals caused consternation in the NATO camp, just because they appeared so reasonable to the man in the street.

The Foreign Office sneered as usual that there was ‘nothing new’ in them: the *Daily Telegraph* actually published a list of eight previous letters from Bulganin making disarmament offers, between September 19, 1955, and April 20, 1957. But what the man in the street noted was that such reasonable offers had been available for over two years—and had all been rejected. Finally, the correspondents at Paris began openly referring to the growing demand for negotiations. Norway and Denmark flatly opposed any creation of rocket bases on their territory. Even Adenauer asked for negotiations. Something had to be done.

The conference communique published on December 19 repeated earlier barefaced lies about the alleged plans of the Soviet Union for ‘domination over the entire world, if possible by subversion, if necessary by violence’. It contained a mass of those very pious declarations and slogans about freedom against which the *Daily Telegraph* had warned—knowing that they were all the more sickening because of British, French and American repressions in Cyprus, Malaya and Arabia, Algeria, Formosa (Taiwan), South Korea and Vietnam. It announced agreement in principle that stocks of rocket missiles should be established in Europe (where exactly, to be determined later). But the communique, while ignoring all the Soviet offers, did agree ‘to examine any proposal, from whatever source, for general or partial disarmament, any proposal for enabling agreement to be reached on the controlled reduction of armaments of all types’.

This was a very small and grudging concession to the immense demand of the nations for new talks. It made even these concessions dependent on a meeting of Foreign Ministers—i.e., one in which the U.S.S.R. would be safely outnumbered by three or four to one—or of the new United Nations ‘Disarmament Commission’, in which the U.S.A. and its satellites had ensured that 16 out of the 25 members should come from anti-Soviet governments. Yet, miserly and hedged-round with reservations

as the communique was, it did show that the pressure for a peaceful settlement of international problems was making headway. Even the sabre-rattling *Economist* admitted that ‘some kind of thinning-out process among the armies in the two halves of Germany’ and ‘some working arrangement about the suspension of nuclear tests’ were now possible.

The response from the Soviet side was immediate. On December 21, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. adopted a resolution on foreign policy, solemnly endorsing the six main points of the Bulganin letters together with a seventh—substantial reduction of armed forces and armaments all round, of the Great Powers first of all. The resolution authorised the Soviet Government to consider further reductions in the armed forces of the U.S.S.R.; and it urged ‘a personal meeting between the leaders of states and discussion by them of urgent international problems’.

The Foreign Office, true to its tradition of immediately sabotaging anything that seems to promise even the beginnings of agreement with the U.S.S.R., at once issued a grossly distorted and hostile ‘analysis’ of the Soviet offer (it appeared in the *Sunday Times* and *Observer* of December 22 and the *Daily Telegraph* next day). Almost immediately it became quite obvious that the dominant group at Washington represented by Dulles was also moving heaven and earth to secure rejection. Yet, as one Washington correspondent put it: ‘Whatever may be Mr. Dulles’ beliefs about the value of negotiating with Russia, it would seem that at the moment he has no choice but to appear to be conciliatory’ (*The Times*, December 28). This was the more necessary because angry feelings were rapidly rising in Britain about the revelation (December 18) that Macmillan had agreed in Paris to let the Americans build four rocket missile bases in Northern Scotland.

Reports of a ‘crisis’ in the U.S.A. government began to be carefully spread to the press—a dodge so often used before to

lull the public into inactivity. The *Daily Express* began to criticise Dulles and urge negotiations. The Queen, who alone among heads of states had conspicuously failed to extend to the Soviet Union the common courtesy of congratulations on its 40th Anniversary, was induced to squeeze out of herself a few perfunctory words of polite acknowledgement in reply to a warm New Year message of goodwill and peace hopes from the Soviet leaders. Even *The Times*, on New Year's day, wrote that Britain ought to make 1958 'a year of disengagement'—earning a hostile broadside next day from the *Daily Telegraph*. On January 5 the *Observer* printed an article by Bertrand Russell advocating 'disengagement' of the two sides in Europe with an atom-free zone between them, and the *Sunday Times* published a long interview by its diplomatic correspondent with the Polish Foreign Minister Rapacki, who had first put forward this plan. Things seemed to be moving.

The previous evening, however, the Prime Minister had made a party broadcast in which—amid a murky torrent of untruths, slanders and misrepresentations of Soviet policy—there had suddenly emerged the suggestion: 'We could start by a solemn pact of non-aggression'—a proposal which the Soviet Union had already made at the Summit Conference in July, 1955, and often since.

Immediately the fat was in the fire. The 'crisis' in the U.S.A. disappeared overnight. Messages stressing 'surprise' and disapproval poured from Washington and from its faithful henchmen in Western Germany. The diehard press in Britain attacked the proposal, and on January 6 the Foreign Office issued an interpretation, explaining it away. Macmillan did not mean a pact 'signed in isolation': it should 'complement' an agreement on other matters: words must be accompanied by deeds—and so on, *ad nauseam*.

Yet the same day the Soviet Union gave an example of how deeds do follow its words. It announced a cut of 300,000 in its

armed forces in accordance with the Supreme Soviet's decision of December 21, 1957—this in addition to the cut of 1,840,000 made in 1955 and 1956. The funds thus economised, said the official statement, would be diverted 'to peaceful construction and further improving the people's material and cultural standards'. The usual attempts were made by some British commentators to write down this decision; but *The Times* was forced to admit (January 8) that it met the stock argument used by the advocates of hydrogen bombs about the need to compensate for Russia's vast manpower.

It was obviously time for the enemies of peace to press on with their offensive, and they did so. On January 8 it was announced that Dulles, at a secret meeting of the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, had 'very strongly' opposed any immediate Summit conference. On January 9 Eisenhower sent a message to Congress, once again loaded with provocative falsehoods about the U.S.S.R., calling for a huge increase in armaments and armed forces and offering to the Soviet government co-operation in . . . malaria and cancer research, a proposal which, in the words of *The Times*, sounded 'something of an anti-climax' to a listening world. On January 12, after nearly five weeks delay, Eisenhower sent a reply to Bulganin's letter of December 10, making it quite clear that the Soviet proposal for heads-of-government discussions was being rejected. He made the meeting dependent on preliminary discussions, first by diplomats and then by Foreign Ministers, in which the following items must also be included:

1. Abandonment of the unanimity rule in the Security Council, i.e., granting the capitalist Powers full majority rights in this body.

2. Unification of Germany by 'free elections' now, i.e., with foreign troops in occupation of German territory, and Nazi-minded big business in the saddle, armed, in Western Germany.

3. Discussion of the situation in the countries of Eastern Europe, i.e., where the U.S.A. and British governments failed to secure restoration of capitalism after the war.

If the U.S.S.R. agreed to these utterly irrelevant crowbars being dropped into the discussions of disarmament and peace, Eisenhower would be ready to talk about all kinds of things—stopping of nuclear tests and nuclear weapon production (but not banning the weapons themselves), reduction of armies and armaments, etc. But as clearly the U.S.S.R. would refuse to consider Eisenhower's sabotage proposals from the very first, the negotiations would get stuck among the diplomats, and would never reach the Summit level. Q.E.D. Unctuous hypocrisy could go no further. No wonder the *Daily Herald* (January 13) headed its report: 'Ike Spikes Top Talks'—and the *Daily Mail*, *Evening Standard* and *News Chronicle*, a wide range of political shades, wrote in the same strain. Moreover the same day Eisenhower rounded off the picture by proposing to Congress the biggest expenditure on war preparations ever made in peace-time, absorbing two-thirds of the U.S. Budget.

Eisenhower's letter, although drafted earlier, was delivered three days after a second message from Bulganin had reached him, Macmillan and seventeen other heads of government. In this new letter of January 8 (which not a single British capitalist newspaper ventured to print) the Soviet government replied point by point to various sophistical arguments put up against its proposals of December 10. These it repeated, with some significant additions:

1. It pointed out that stopping nuclear tests for two or three years 'would not require any measures of control that are complicated and hard to achieve', i.e., that supervision could be easily arranged, if desired.

2. Foreign military forces stationed in Germany and in the territories of both NATO and the Warsaw Treaty countries could

be reduced by agreement, 'or on the territory of Germany, as a beginning'.

3. Land control posts and a 500-mile zone for air photography (on either side of the line dividing East and West) could be established to supervise arrangements under points 1 and 2, i.e., the atom-free zone as well as that of reduced armaments.

4. A Summit conference, primarily to discuss 'the most urgent questions, whose settlement would lay the basis for an improvement in the whole international situation', should be held within the next two or three months, preferably at Geneva.

5. The Conference ought to consist of the member-states of NATO and of the Warsaw Treaty: also of uncommitted countries. But the U.S.S.R. would not object, at the initial stage, to only two or three from each group, or even one from each.

Comparing the Soviet proposals with those of the U.S.A. has already induced one well-known Conservative M.P. to write—and the most viciously anti-Soviet newspaper in Britain to print—the following lines:

Mr. Khrushchov is an optimist. He believes, or says he believes, that the prospects for peace are brighter. He gives the impression of being tough, but gay and full of hope. By comparison Mr. Dulles is a Dismal Jimmy. He gives the impression that he doesn't really want to negotiate about anything ever, and that the only thing he believes in is arms'. (Sir Robert Boothby in the Daily Telegraph, January 10, 1958.)

The British working class however is also tough, it believes in peace and in negotiations, and it hates arms. Presented with these parallel pictures—the steady Soviet pressure for immediate steps to peace, the sullen and vindictive efforts of Downing Street and the White House to keep open the door to war—it will not hesitate. And all the more because Macmillan's reply to Bulganin (January 16) obediently backed the American

demand for low-level talks, and ran away from any idea of an immediate non-aggression pact.

The problem is to get the information to the people. Here is a job for all of us. It will be of crucial importance to the world in the next few weeks.

[pp. 64-69]

Notes of the Month, 1. Strike Strategy, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, June 1958

Class Confrontation

Everyone recognises that the present attack on the busmen is the signal, the spearhead, the try-out for a general attack on the workers' standards and against the trade unions. There is no mystery about this. The Cohen Report proclaimed the aim aloud.

Every speech of every Minister proclaims it. Every newspaper article proclaims it. The battle is not about the fractional financial difference between the award and the busmen's final claim (indeed,

Mr. Cousins' last minute offer to reduce the award of 8s. 6d. to 6s. 6d. in order to spread the thin margarine all round removed any financial difference). The financial difference between the award and the claim would not be comparable for a moment with sums the Government is prepared to throw away any day without a ripple on a rejected missile or aircraft design or re-equipping the Royal Yacht or a vast military installation in Cyprus due soon to be abandoned. No. The battle, as every Minister's speech and kept press editorial insists, is about 'a principle'. The 'principle' is that wage increases must not be granted to meet increases in the cost of living, *i.e.*, that real wages must come down. The 'firm stand' against the busmen is demanded in order to give notice to all other sections and to the whole trade union movement.

[pp. 241-250]

Cyprus: Tory Colonialism Exposed, Clive Evatt, Q.C., *President Australian Committee for Cyprian Self-determination*, *The Labour Monthly*, August 1958

MY recent visit to Cyprus confirmed all that I had heard and read concerning the Cypriots and their beautiful island. They are essentially a peace-loving, friendly, industrious and clever people, obviously quite able to manage their own affairs and naturally determined, like all true patriots, to liberate their island from foreign domination. Their courage and devotion are such that they will never abandon their legitimate aspirations for self-determination.

The visit also confirmed my belief that the so-called ‘Turkish problem’ was a myth—artificially created and fostered by provocateurs. By and large the Turkish-speaking Cypriots, who number less than one-fifth of the population, are not interested in ‘partition’. Basically and fundamentally they regard themselves as ‘Cypriots’. So, too, do the Greek-speaking islanders—whose Greek, incidentally, is purer than that spoken anywhere else. The culture and traditions of Cyprus are essentially Greek, as history establishes.

I am often asked: ‘What is the solution of the Cyprus problem?’ There is only one possible reply: ‘Self-determination’.

The case for self-determination is overwhelming and unanswerable. Self-determination is expressly or impliedly guaranteed to peoples such as the Cypriots, by the Atlantic Charter, by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and by resolutions carried by the United Nations Assembly. Self-determination has been expressly or impliedly promised by every British Prime Minister of note since and including Gladstone. The British and the Australian Labour Parties have in unmistakeable terms declared in favour of Cyprian self-

determination. At Dorking last year twenty-six British Commonwealth Labour Parties emphatically resolved that peoples such as the Cypriots were entitled to and should be granted the right to determine their own destinies.

But the Macmillan Government does not intend to grant Cyprus this right and in an attempt to justify their stand, the Tories have converted the island into a Police State as bad as anything seen under totalitarian rule. The 'rule of law' no longer exists: civil liberties have been abridged to vanishing point: imprisonment without trial is the lot of Cypriots imprisoned in the infamous concentration camp at Kokkinotrimitheia: 'British justice' has become a mockery. As dissension on Cyprus provides the Tories with an excuse for denying the Cypriots self-determination, so Tory policy involves provocation of the most disgraceful kind. All sections of the British public should demand immediately a Royal Commission or other impartial inquiry to expose exactly what is occurring on Cyprus.

Here are some examples of Tory mis-rule. Although the vast majority of Cypriots are of Greek extraction (over 80 per cent.), an exclusively Turkish auxiliary police force exists on the island. Could there be anything more provocative than the creation of such an organisation? According to reputable citizens on the island this force contains criminals and others with most questionable antecedents.

On Friday, June 6, 1958, Raouf Denktash (described as the No. 2 Turkish-Cypriot) returned to Cyprus after a fortnight in Turkey. Denktash enjoys remarkable immunity including—one gathers—freedom from arrest. On his arrival he addressed a public gathering in Nicosia without the slightest interference from the forces or from the Turkish police. Some of his remarks as reported in the Cyprus Mail of June 7, 1958, are indeed interesting:

We shall not accept self-government for Cyprus or any form of constitution. We want partition. Thousands of Turkish

youths are ready to rush to our aid if necessary. The Turkish nation and the Cypriot Turks are determined for partition. We may have to undergo some difficult days but be sure that our goal will be achieved at the end.

Mr. Denktash said he was convinced from his talks that partition was a just cause which could not be abandoned by the Turkish Government or Turks in Cyprus, he told his cheering audience:

Everybody in Turkey strongly believes that either today or tomorrow or some day in the future, 'taksim' will be granted unconditionally.

Any Greek-Cypriot who ventured to address a public meeting or speak in such terms would be unceremoniously thrown into the concentration camp at Kokkinotrimithia to join the other Greek-Cypriot political prisoners held there without trial. But not so with Denktash, who after his inflammatory speech was cordially received at the British Secretariat by the Administrative Secretary. Events soon took a startling turn. The following night (June 7, 1958) from 10 o'clock till after midnight a section of Nicosia was attacked by a Turkish mob. Greek-Cypriot buildings were burnt and their occupants were brutally attacked—some fatally. The Turkish police and the British authorities allowed these outrages to continue without interruption for over two hours. The sky was aglow and church bells rang out their grim warning before any real attempt was made to stop these atrocities against innocent Greek-Cypriots. When the latter attempted to retaliate the authorities took action; not, however, against those responsible for the initial lawlessness but against innocent Greek-Cypriots who were endeavouring to defend their families and their homes.

Outraged by these occurrences the Mayor of Nicosia, Dr. Dervis, telephoned Governor Foot and complained that the security forces had arrived too late. The Mayor said:

Slackness by police in taking action gave the Turks time to complete their orgy. The criminal acts of 1955 in Istanbul

have now been repeated in Nicosia. What measures did the government take after Mr. Denktash's 'rabble-rousing' speeches to the Turks? The atrocities committed tonight are the result of Denktash's speech. If I were to make that kind of speech I'd have been put in prison or sent into exile. Why has the Government permitted this gentleman to provoke the crowds. The Greek people believe that the Government were the Turks' accomplices in their atrocities—otherwise it would have taken immediate and stronger measures to protect the public. The police and the army always arrive too late and show unwillingness and apathy to act when the Turks are committing murders and firing Greek property. I want to know why the Turks are armed and why the authorities fail to search Turkish houses as they search Greek houses. The people have no more confidence in the Government in view of its scandalous partiality to the Turks. Evidence is mounting daily of a Tory-Turkish conspiracy to stage a reign of terror on the island, the aggressors consisting of gangs of Turkish criminals. The Turkish police close their eyes to their atrocities. Day after day Greek-Cypriots are being slaughtered. Governor Foot's refrain 'I shall restore order' has a hollow ring to those who know the truth. The fact is there is no order on the island would baulk the Macmillan Government's plans. It would bring nearer the realisation of self-determination. And that is exactly what the Tories want to prevent. In requesting the urgent despatch of a United Nations observer team to Cyprus, Bishop Anthimos of Kitium stated:

Greeks are being murdered in broad daylight, houses and shops burned and Greeks forcibly evicted from their homes under the very eyes of the British authorities who do nothing to protect the Greek-Cypriot population which has lost the last dregs of confidence in security authorities.

[pp. 347-351]

GREEK TEACHERS EXCLUDED

I found that the Greek schools on Cyprus were hopelessly understaffed. This was again the fault of the British authorities who refuse entry permits for teachers from Greece whence hitherto teachers freely came. On the other hand, no restriction is placed on the entry of Turkish teachers from Turkey.

I sought from the Governor an explanation of this cruel discrimination which so unjustly penalised Greek-Cypriot school children. 'Why do you exclude Greek teachers?' I asked. 'They are all murderers', replied the Governor, who, however, was unable to supply any valid evidence to support his sweeping charge. In Foot's favour it might be explained that he did not always display such anti-Greek bias. On his arrival in Cyprus he gave the impression of making some attempt to act impartially. But following the Turkish-Tory rapprochement early this year, Foot's attitude seemed to undergo a remarkable change: this no doubt would be due to instructions from the Colonial Office. Certain it is that the administration is now as completely pro-Turk as it is anti-Greek. It was rather pathetic to hear Governor Foot plead the Turkish case as though it were some reality and not the bogey manufactured at the Ankara talks.

Since I left Cyprus there has been further evidence of provocative conduct by the British.

The troops have a general order to leave Greek and Turkish flags alone, since their removal usually causes further incidents but the Greeks still living at Omorfita (a suburb of Nicosia) today were resentful at seeing Turkish flags planted on their homes under the eyes of the authorities. (Manchester Guardian, July 3, 1958.)

To keep Cyprus in a state of tension is an essential part of the Macmillan Government's programme. Turkish-Greek enmity is fostered; thus thrives the policy of 'Divide-and-Rule', the centuries-old weapon of the colonialists.

The Macmillan Government has produced a plan—an ‘adventure in partnership’, the Prime Minister called it when introducing it in the House of Commons. The Plan of course cannot succeed. It is not intended to succeed. It is fraudulent and hypocritical. Its smugness nauseates. It has been widely condemned. The Cypriots themselves will have none of it. Self-determination is their due. Why should they take less and so much less?

It was a bitter disappointment that the Labour opposition in replying to the Tory plan failed so ignominiously. Here was an historic opportunity for greatness, an opportunity to capture public imagination by courageously upholding the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, decisions of the United Nations Assembly, the Labour Party’s own decision at Brighton, the twenty-six Commonwealth Labour Parties’ resolution at Dorking. Why did Labour retreat in the House of Commons on Thursday, June 26, 1958, in the Cyprus debate? This question must be answered at the next conference of the British Labour Party. Upon that answer may hinge the success or failure of Labour in the General Election.

To those who sincerely support the principles of Labour, colonialism is abhorrent. It denies fundamental justice and basic civil liberties. It is the antithesis of democracy. Colonialism must perish! Let it perish on Cyprus and let it be replaced by long-promised but long-delayed self-determination. In that way will peace, justice and liberty be restored to the long-suffering Cypriot people.

[pp. 347-351]

Gunboats off the Lebanon, A. Masri, The Labour Monthly, August 1958

Here is a picture of the first country to be invaded.

ONCE more in the last few weeks there has been a shameful spectacle—colonialism in action against the Arab liberation movement. Like the Bourbons in their decay, the Tories can neither forget their past nor learn from it. Less than two years after the Suez crisis, British warships and troops were again poised for action in the Eastern Mediterranean, ready to bomb and fight an Arab nation in rebellion against foreign domination.

Lebanon, a small nation with a population of 1½ million, is up in arms against the regime of Camille Chamoun who was brought to the office of President six years ago at the time when British influence was still paramount in the country after a discreet takeover from the French at the end of the Second World War. Times have changed, and the Americans in their turn have stepped in since the British fiasco of 1956 in Egypt. At the outset of the Lebanese crisis last May, it looked as if this might be Dulles' own exclusive adventure, and indeed, the haste with which British warships were dispatched to the Lebanese coast and paratroops flown to nearby Cyprus was a measure of Macmillan's anxiety to share the honour and profits of finally teaching Arab nationalism a lesson. The stage was set, and the pretext not difficult to fabricate. From the moment that it became evident that Chamoun and his armed supporters of the neo-fascist Phalangist party were unable to put down the rebellion, the cry went out that there had been 'massive intervention' by the United Arab Republic of Egypt and Syria to justify the real intervention and save Chamoun.

The fallacy of this accusation was thoroughly exposed by the United Nations observers investigating on the spot, and

Macmillan has had to share with Dulles the disgrace of being pointed at as the real menace to Lebanon. Despite Chamoun's best efforts. Dag Hammarskjöld and a hundred observers could find no proof that the Lebanese crisis was not a purely domestic affair, and the obvious conclusion was drawn that the only foreign interference was that of American arms in the hands of Chamoun's gangs and of American and British warships ready for action a few miles from the shore.

From the first it was overwhelmingly clear that the stake was Lebanon's independence and the immediate demand Chamoun's resignation and the abolition of the Eisenhower Doctrine imposed by him a year ago.

There was never any doubt as to the unpopularity of this American military alliance which was offered to the Middle East immediately after the aggression on Egypt in 1956 and rejected by all Arab countries except Lebanon and Libya. The Parliamentary opposition to Chamoun, grouped into a National Union Front, rejected it from the start despite persecution, assassinations and terror. By the beginning of this year, when it became clear that the American promises to help Lebanon's economic development had remained empty words and that the Eisenhower Doctrine was only a means of military domination, even some of the Government supporters came out against it. Since then, all the nationalist sections of the population—Moslems and Christians, religious leaders, traders, dockers, industrial workers, peasants and intellectuals—joined forces for the one purpose of achieving national independence.

The only way to ensure Lebanon's continued acceptance of the American alliance was to keep in power the men who put their signature to it last year and whose interests remain linked with it: President Chamoun and his Foreign Minister Charles Malik. Chamoun's announcement that he would ask for a revision of the Constitution to enable him to stand again as a candidate in the Presidential elections was the starting point of

the civil war. His accusations of interference against the United Arab Republic completely unmasked him in the eyes of the Lebanese and other Arab peoples who know that the aim of these accusations is to split the Arab peoples and weaken their common struggle for independence.

Right along the southern and eastern shores of the Mediterranean as well as further inland the struggle of the Arab peoples goes on. It is reaching in North Africa a present climax in Algeria; and in West Asia a present climax in several other countries beset by the imperialists, as well as in the Lebanon, where two of the oil monopolies' pipelines sweep down to the sea.

So the Lebanese crisis is not an isolated event in the Arab world, it is part of the fight of the Arab peoples for their national independence. Why, it is often asked, is 'national independence' a cause for which men suffer, fight and die in countries which achieved independence years ago? Lebanon became independent in 1946, Syria in 1945, Iraq in 1927, Egypt in 1922.

The short answer is that the forces of colonialism do not easily abdicate, they only let go when they are forced to; and independence remains an empty word if it is not accompanied by real self-determination and economic freedom. So long as the Arab peoples are split and weakened, their freedom is not secure. The fear of an aggressive return of colonial domination is ever present and indeed well-based. Exactly two years ago this month Egypt nationalised the Suez Canal Company, until then in the hands of foreign shareholders. Then came the Suez crisis: it sharpened the vigilance of the Arab peoples to the utmost. The aggression against Egypt made the generation-old movement for Arab unity a burning reality.

But even while the foreign troops were still in Port Said new methods to destroy this unity were being devised, this time in Washington. A week only after their withdrawal, the Eisenhower Doctrine was announced promising 200 million

dollars—to be shared by 12 Middle-East countries—in return for acceptance of the use of American forces ‘in case of Communist-dominated aggression’, or in clearer language, in case of determined attempts at independence in which the State Department, with its well-known impartiality in these matters, could discern Communist inspiration.

It is true that of the seven Arab Governments to whom the deal was proposed—Egypt and Syria were not even approached—only two dared to accept openly. Yet the plan achieved one of its principal aims: even without the formality of subscribing to the Eisenhower Doctrine, unpopular Governments such as those of Iraq and Jordan, were propped up by the promise of American intervention in case of need, and the way was open for the suppression of nationalist elements.

Today the dividing line is clear. In the United Arab Republic of Egypt and Syria, without military alliances of any sort, an independent policy is followed, steel mills, oil refineries and factories of all kinds are being built, and the Syrian and Egyptian peoples are pushing ahead towards a better future. In the Arab Federal Union of Iraq and Jordan unpopular Governments are struggling against the pressure of their peoples for a nationalist policy. In Iraq a new Parliament has just come into being: in the ‘free elections’ staged by Nuri es Said, 125 seats out of 145 were returned unopposed, over half the new deputies are semi-feudal landowners. Jordan, seething with insurrection, is ruled by martial law, American dollars have replaced the British subsidy to maintain overworked police forces, and bankruptcy is ever round the corner.

[pp. 357-359]

Notes of the Month, Hands off the Middle East, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, August 1958

Since these Notes were written the news has come of the American-British armed aggression in the Middle East against Arab national liberation in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq. Reference is made to this at the end of these Notes. The highest point in the fight for peace and freedom of nations since Korea and Suez is now here.

IRAQ has risen. The revolution in Iraq opens a new world situation with incalculable consequences. No final judgement of the further outcome would be appropriate at the moment of writing, when only the first fragmentary news of the uprising and the proclamation of the Republic has become available. By the time these Notes are read the further development of the national revolution and the reactions of the powers will have revealed themselves. But this much must be said.

Iraq was the pivot and base of British power in the Middle East, of the already dwindling and shrinking Middle Eastern Empire of Britain created after the First World War. Iraq was the pivot and base, alongside Aden and the American air bases in Arabia, of Western military power and strategy in the Middle East. Iraq was the pivot and base, the nominal originator and the centre, of the Baghdad Pact, the instrument of Western counterrevolutionary intervention to seek to dominate all the peoples of the vast area from the Eastern borders of the Mediterranean to the borders of Assam and Burma. Iraq 383 was the chosen instrument to be used to seek to counter the inspiring call of united Arab liberation represented by the United Arab Republic, and to set up as the alternative the mockery of the federation of the two puppet regimes maintained by imperialist support in Iraq and Jordan under the aegis of petty royalties invented and created by British military commanders.

National Revolution

How has Iraq been thus held back for so long in the midst of the advancing tide of Arab liberation? There is no mystery about the answer. It was not backwardness or lack of national feeling of the Iraqi people. Again and again through all these years the Iraqi people have demonstrated their thirst for national freedom in heroic struggles and revolutionary risings, notably in that uprising which smashed Bevin's Portsmouth Treaty. Nor was it the mythical 'prosperity' which the imperialist exploiters and profiteers from Iraq's oil resources claimed that their exploitation had spread. That 'prosperity' went to the handful of ruling families and satellites of the regime; the mass of the people were held down in poverty and illiteracy. The long out-dated and universally execrated grip of imperialism on the Iraqi people was maintained by one of the most ruthless regimes of military and police terror even in the modern array of imperialist puppet states of the type of the regime of a Chiang Kai-shek or a Syngman Rhee.

Labour Party and Iraq

It is significant that the otherwise so eloquent Western apostles of 'humanism' and 'individual liberty' and crusaders against 'authoritarianism' and the 'police state', always ready to launch the most vociferous campaigns when it is a question of attacking a socialist regime and its measures of self-defence against imperialist intervention and counter-revolution, were strangely silent about Iraq. The terror in Iraq was maintained under the auspices of British military occupation and the Anglo-Iraqi Treaty with bipartisan support. Was there a squeak from Mr. Gaitskell? We do not recall Mr. Gaitskell and his fellow lovers of liberty organising any demonstration of protest in London against the terror in Iraq. Perhaps they were too conscious that it was the first Labour Government under

MacDonald and General Thomson which began the system of air-bombing in Iraq, and the third Labour Government under Earl Attlee, Bevin and Mr. Gaitskell which sought to impose the Portsmouth Treaty against the universal resistance of the Iraqi people. Now Iraq has risen. When Iraq has risen, can the full summer of united Arab liberation throughout the Middle East be far behind?

What Will the West Attempt?

How will the Western powers react? Already before the revolution in Iraq they were engaged in massing their forces for their counter-offensive in the Middle East, specifically with relation to Lebanon and Jordan. The massive British airlift to Cyprus had already stationed there the great part of Britain's mobile strategic reserve in readiness for action. The American Sixth Fleet had been moved into position; the marines had been dispatched. The unstable puppet rulers in Lebanon and Jordan, faced with the implacable hostility of their own peoples, will only too eagerly, if occasion arises, offer the Western powers the pretext for intervention. Already Britain has entered on armed action in Southern Yemen, in the region of Aden, with the lawless deposition of the Sultan of Lahej, following on the armed aggression against the people of Lahej.

Threats of Intervention

Thus all the pieces are mounted for massive intervention by the West, if such were decided, at any rate in the preliminary form of occupation of Lebanon and Jordan, with a view to feeling out the possibilities for fomenting division in order to overthrow the patriotic regime in Iraq. Nor would the lack of any formal diplomatic pretext for such intervention present in itself an insuperable obstacle any more than in all the previous cases of Western lawless armed aggression in the Middle East and elsewhere. Suez has sufficiently illustrated this. It is true that the

formal cover of a ‘United Nations’ sanction would be considered highly desirable by the Western aggressors if they decided on action. It is also true that the Charter of the United Nations specifically forbids such action unless authorised by the Security Council with the concurrence of the five permanent members or leading Powers, including the Soviet Union. But the illegality of the Korean War under the Charter did not prevent very extensive military invasion of Korea. Since then the further illegal formula has been devised of resort to a vote of the Assembly, which is specifically excluded by the Charter from war-making powers. If in the new balance the necessary two-thirds majority vote of the Assembly could not be rigged, the official representatives of the United States and Britain have publicly indicated their readiness to take independent military action, if they thought fit, either under an extended interpretation of the Eisenhower Doctrine or the Baghdad Pact or even the Anglo-Iraqi Treaty, although all these only cover aid against external attack.

Article 51

Finally, if all these fail, the official representatives of the United States and Britain have indicated, already with reference to Lebanon, their readiness to take independent military action, if they thought fit, under their famous ultimate ‘catch-all’ clause, their interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter as justifying any military action taken in ‘self-defence’. It is obvious that if Britain, for example, is at this moment engaged in invading Lahej, arresting its citizens, deposing its lawfully elected Sultan in order to impose a puppet, and conducting armed aggression against its people, this military action, although not sanctioned by any vote or decision of the United Nations, is fully in accord with the new fashionable imperialist interpretation of the Charter of the United Nations, since it represents in accordance with Article 51 indispensable ‘self-defence’ of the British people against the menace of the people of Lahej, or ‘collective self-

defence' together with the puppet they have installed. Indeed, in the whole long history of imperialist aggression and invasion of other people's countries all over the world, it would be difficult to discover an example of what used to be crudely called aggression which would not now be adequately covered by the new elastic interpretation of Article 51. No, it is not the absence of formal diplomatic pretext or justification that creates the special difficulties in the path of extended imperialist military intervention in the Middle East under present conditions.

Dilemma of the Western Powers

The present problem of the Western imperialist powers in relation to Iraq and the advance of Arab liberation in the Middle East lies deeper. It has long been clear to them, since the Second World War, that the old methods of military domination and direct or thinly veiled colonial rule, as established in the 'New Middle Eastern Empire' built up by Britain out of the ruins of the Turkish Empire after the First World War, could no longer be maintained. Not merely the advance of the Arab liberation movement, but also the increasing American penetration, eager to take advantage of the consequent contradictions facing Britain in order to weaken Britain's hold and extend its own; emphasized the untenability of the old position. The independence of Syria and Lebanon after the Second World War, the loss of Palestine, the Iraq rising of 1948, the enforced evacuation of Egypt, first to the Canal Zone, and then from the Canal Zone, the Iran oil nationalisation crisis and the fiasco of Morrison's military bombastic threats over Abadan, the expulsion of Glubb from Jordan, and finally the fiasco of the Eden-Macmillan assault on Suez, have all reinforced this lesson. On the other hand, the Western powers are still unable to reconcile themselves to the new conditions, to the recognition of independence and non-intervention, as urged by the Soviet Union. Their hatred and abuse of Nasser during recent years has

almost equalled their hatred and abuse of Communism. They still regard, and in every speech openly proclaim, the continuance of their effective domination and military occupation of the Middle East as ‘a vital interest of the West’, that is, as essential for the strategic interests and economic exploitation interests of Western imperialism.

Oil

These special and very powerful economic interests of the Western imperialists in the Middle East, it should be explained, do not mean the question of the supply of Middle Eastern oil to Britain and Western Europe. There is no problem here. This is only the highly mythical picture (‘Britain’s life-line in danger’; ‘the life-line of Britain’s industry’; ‘our livelihood and employment depend on Middle Eastern oil; it is as simple as that’, etc.) presented in the vulgar propaganda of the Macmillans and Edens to the trustful British public in order to reconcile them to the supposed necessity of the endless and costly military measures and operations and adventures in the Middle East. All the oil required would be abundantly available from a free Middle East on a basis of equal exchange. The only interruption of the flow came through the action of Sir Anthony Eden, when he deprived British industry of Middle Eastern oil in order to save it from such a deprivation.

Not Supply, But Exploitation

It would obviously be in the interest of a free Middle East to sell as much oil as possible to the West, on a normal commercial basis in exchange for goods, without the need of any special military apparatus. In addition, the price would probably be cheaper; since the present Anglo-American oil monopolies which control the supply and distribution, and most of the refining, while obtaining their crude supplies at low costs on the basis of very low production costs through low wages, sell at the

world market price maintained at the highest level of American or Venezuelan oil, with higher production costs, and are able to extract gigantic profits from the difference. It is these colonial super profits of the oil monopolies which represent the 'vital economic interest' of the Western powers in the Middle East, and are seen as justifying all the political and military intervention, since it is not incorrectly assumed that a free Middle East would rapidly seek to nationalise these resources in order to use the revenue for the development needs of the people. It has been calculated that, on the basis of these profits of the oil monopolies, British capitalism at present in effect receives its Middle Eastern oil without paying for it {i.e., the payment is covered by the oil profits and thus balances in the balance of payments), and still has a surplus profit.

Peaceful Alternative

Certainly, on the basis of peaceful commercial exchange with a free Middle East, the British people would have to pay for their Middle Eastern oil with goods. From the standpoint of the British monopoly capitalists this would represent ruin and the collapse of their present structure of the balance of payments. From the standpoint of the British people it would represent unmitigated benefit. On the one hand, it would remove all the exaggerated military costs derived from the Middle Eastern strategic policy, garrisons, occupation, bases and ceaseless wars. On the other hand, the export of goods to the free Middle East in exchange for the oil, would stimulate production and employment in Britain, at the same time as it would help development in the Middle East and thus promote prosperity. That is why the repeated Soviet proposals for a peaceful policy and settlement in relation to the Middle East, on the basis of recognition of national independence, withdrawal of all bases and foreign military occupation, and non-supply of arms and non-intervention by all the powers, corresponds not only to the

interests of the Middle Eastern peoples, but equally to the interests of the British and other Western peoples. But the Western powers have consistently rejected every such peaceful proposal. To maintain their domination in the Middle East they are still ready to commit ceaseless aggression, to invade, to occupy with military forces, to instal and maintain corrupt reactionary regimes and conduct unending wars.

New Colonialism

Hence the Western powers, in place of recognising the new conditions and reconciling themselves to Arab liberation, have sought to continue their old domination by new methods, by special military treaties, dispatch of troops of occupation, maintenance of military and air bases, and all other forms of intervention short of the old colonial rule. These are the methods which have been described as the 'New Colonialism'. The classic ground of the 'New Colonialism' has been the Middle East. Typical of these methods of special military treaties have been the Baghdad Pact, the Anglo-Iraqi Treaty, the U.S.-Arabian Military Agreement and the Eisenhower Doctrine.

Crumbling Structure

But the weakness of this new structure to hold back the advance of Arab national liberation has been abundantly shown in the outcome. Despite every form of pressure—and indeed the original break with Egypt arose over this issue—not a single Arab state except the discredited regime of Nuri would accept the Baghdad Pact. Only Lebanon and Libya accepted the Eisenhower Doctrine, and the acceptance by President Chamoun met with universal opposition from all political sections. Further, the professed theory underlying these military pacts was to offer 'military protection' (like the gangster imposing 'protection' on the unhappy shopkeeper) against an imaginary hypothetical menace of Soviet military aggression. But every

child could see that there was no Soviet military aggression, no Soviet occupation, no Soviet bases, nor any prospect of any; all the aggression and invasion came from the Western powers. It was against their self-styled 'protectors' that the people needed protection.

'Protection'—Against Whom?

So the formula was extended to cover aggression by 'international communism' in the hope of lumping anything under that heading. Again in vain. Certainly there are communists in the Middle East, fighting bravely in the common national liberation struggle. But it was obvious to every observer that the national liberation movement comprised all patriots, like the old resistance movements in Occupied Europe; and that the dominant leadership is at present opposed to communism. Indeed, when the leadership of the United Arab Republic proclaimed communism illegal, it became difficult for the most zealous American or British propagandist to describe this leadership as part of an 'international communist conspiracy'. So the formula had to be extended again to include the menace of aggression by the 'octopus tentacles of Nasser and the United Arab Republic'—i.e., to 'protect' the Arab people against the menace of the Arab liberation movement. But even this final absurdity has broken down. In the case of the popular uprising against the stooges in Lebanon the attempt was made to create a myth of 'massive infiltration' from the United Arab Republic. The report of the United Nations Observers smashed that myth. In the case of Iraq even that myth could not be attempted. What remains for the Western powers? Only the bare choice remains. Either to accept the victory of Arab liberation. Or to enter on the desperate course of open, brutal, lawless aggression and military intervention.

Let the Imperialists Beware

Iraq is a little country of five millions. Lebanon and Jordan are little countries of one and a half millions each. No wonder the Western imperialist rulers, drunk with past power, may still imagine that it is only a matter of dispatching their warships and jet planes and commandos and marines to overawe and terrify and bully into submission. Have they learned nothing yet? Have they learned nothing from Suez? Egypt was also a small country in terms of material and armed power. But it was the mighty British and French Empires, once lords of the world, which bit the dust when they turned their guns on Egypt. Iraq and Lebanon and Jordan and Egypt do not stand alone. They are united in the unity of the Arab nation, forty millions strong, and with the Arabs of North Africa, eighty millions. They are united with all the Afro-Asian nations of Bandung, the majority of mankind. Alongside them in the cause of national independence and peace stand all the socialist peoples, one-third of the world, firm and true friends, and not without strength. The balance, of the world is no longer on the side of the imperialist powers. They attacked Egypt and failed. They organised counter-revolution in Indonesia and Hungary and failed. They mounted their offensive against Syria and drew back. Admittedly they are now desperate; and a desperate beast can be dangerous. But if they start making trouble now, they may find they are starting more than they anticipate.

Hands Off the Middle East!

At the moment of writing, since the beginning of these Notes, Lebanon and preparation for a parallel British landing in Jordan. So they have chosen this path. Characteristically they have not even waited for the presence of United Nations sanction. As in Korea, so here the United States rulers prefer the path of independent military action and presentation only of the accomplished fact to the United Nations. Britain has hastened to

approve the United States action and to declare that British armed forces stand ready. The puppet ruler of Jordan has offered the same invitation to the foreign invaders as in the case of Lebanon. The match has been applied by the incendiaries to the whole explosive region of the Middle East. The flames will need to be put out quickly if they are not to lead to a wider conflagration.

Peace in the Balance

The present crisis is even graver than that of Suez; for it is taking place at a more advanced stage in the development of the Middle East, and also at a more advanced stage in the development of the world situation, armaments relations and international tension. Peace is in the balance. The mobilisation of all the peoples of the world for peace is today even more urgent than at the time of Suez. The call 'Hands Off the Middle East!' needs to be sounded from every side, from every section of the labour movement and all supporters of peace. The dangerous relative lull in broad peace activity, apart from a zealous minority, during the recent period, which has made it possible for the Western powers to block summit talks and even resist responding to the Soviet unilateral suspension of nuclear tests, needs now to be reversed. The divisions in the peace movement need to be overcome. Unity for peace is the supreme need, if peace is to be saved. The testing time is here.

July 15, 1958.

R.P.D

[pp. 337-349]

Notes of the Month, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, February 1959

1. Election Prospects

....

Britain on the Eve of the Election And in Britain? What is the picture in Britain, now fifth in the order of industrial powers (soon to be sixth, when China fulfils its short-term aim) on the eve of the election? In Britain unemployment has reached the highest level since the war. The economic prospect is insecure and fills all with anxiety. New plans are announced for further cutting down the already fallen production in the main spheres of industry, in coal and steel. Arms expenditure in the United States rises to a new record height, at the same time as it decreases in the Soviet Union. The Sandys programme for Britain offers a corresponding prospect of increasing burdens in the mad drive to pose as a nuclear power. The war and repression in Cyprus drags on. Every constructive proposal of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for a peaceful solution, whether over Berlin and Germany, disengagement in Europe, the Middle East, or the Far East, has been met with a Western: No! The lords of the old dying social order, conscious of their inferiority and approaching defeat in peaceful economic competition, still feverishly brandish the threat (although they now know that they are outclassed in this field also) to unleash the catastrophe of nuclear war. The hands of these madmen, centred in the United States, but with their main allies and accomplices still ruling Britain, have not yet been tied by the peoples. Such is the situation of Britain on the eve of the election. Can there be any doubt what are the great questions before the British people in the coming election?

....

2. Black Record

....

What did the Conservative Government offer in its election manifesto of 1955, four years ago? 'The British Empire and Commonwealth is the greatest force for peace in the world today.' Within the next year the same Government had launched the criminal aggression of the Suez war, condemned by opinion throughout the world and ending in ignominious fiasco. In swift succession followed wars in Oman, Aden, Cyprus and the invasion of Jordan. 'During the coming 25 years to double the standard of living' (a cheap promise, since they knew that in 25 years none of them would be there to answer for it). The Cohen Austerity Report to stiffen the fight against wage increases has provided the answer of practice to that profession.

.....

Awakening Hanover

Now they have discovered that their nuclear armament (estimated at five H-bombs) is strategically insignificant save as a starting point for the destruction of Britain; further nuclear development is swelling the costs to such fantastic heights as to raise the proposal, already recommended in an expert Anglo-American official report, of voluntary retirement of Britain from the race; and that the type of colonial wars Britain normally wages (Suez, Cyprus, Oman, Aden, Jordan, Malaya) requires the old armed services and equipment more than ever. Hence they have successfully secured the worst of all possible worlds: to incur the cost and odium of the H-bomb without even a theoretical strategic advantage from it; to disorganise the existing armed services and then to require to rebuild them; and to incur in consequence such simultaneous mounting commitments in all directions as to raise the menace of an increase rather than any significant decrease in arms expenditure.

[pp. 49-57]

Notes of the Month, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, March 1959

....

Logic of Peace

Thus the two main pillars of the entire Atlantic strategy have now collapsed. The first was the assumption of western nuclear monopoly or superiority enabling the Anglo-American Alliance to dictate terms to the Soviet Union and the rest of the world. That is finished. The second was the assumption of the threatening Soviet armed attack on the West, in the name of which all the vast structure of rearmament and NATO was built. Now that also is finished. What remains? The supposed basis for NATO has gone. When The Times on February 2 announced the Cyprus Plan, its political commentator explained that any base on the island must be a British and not a NATO base, because 'NATO might be wound up at some future date'. An interesting incidental remark. Coming events cast their shadows. But the time for winding up, and advancing to real European co-operation is now. It is time to banish the unseemly nightmares and enter the far more interesting world of living reality. There is no Western superiority. There is no threat of Soviet attack. What remains? Nothing but the only path forward—the path of peaceful co-operation and peaceful coexistence.

[pp. 97-112]

Mcmillan's Visit by Quaestor, The Labour Monthly, April 1959

....

Needless to say, the same attitude was taken up by Adenauer's government. Moreover, both directly in Macmillan's talks at Paris after Adenauer had met de Gaulle, and indirectly through inspired statements in the American press, the British Premier was given to understand that it was not enough for him to repudiate (as he did in Paris) the idea of military disengagement in Europe—withdrawal of foreign troops from Germany, or from a wider area. It was 'dangerous and misleading' even 'to talk of a thinning of military forces in Germany without raising the question of German unification', the U.S.A., French, and West German Governments had told Macmillan (message in *The Times*, March 11, from its Washington correspondent quoting the *New York Times* as authority). By the time these lines appear in print, no doubt the Prime Minister will have been told the same in Washington. These statements—echoed during the second week of March in numerous press messages from Paris and Bonn—not only show who is responsible for maintaining international tension in Europe by insisting on keeping foreign troops on German territory and maintaining them in the heart of the German Democratic Republic. They also throw an interesting light on the real—as distinct from the pretended—attitude of the Western Powers on the question of German unification. If there is one thing they know, it is that the Soviet Union will not (i) allow them to overrun the G.D.R. peacefully; (ii) abandon it to its fate if they attack it; (iii) withdraw from its obligations to the G.D.R. under the Warsaw Pact if NATO remains in existence with West Germany part of it; (iv) take decisions with them about unifying Germany over the heads of the Germans, as Hitler and Chamberlain dismembered Czechoslovakia over the heads of its

people in 1938, and the British, Greek and Turkish Governments robbed Cyprus of the independence its people demanded in 1959. That being so, what is the point of their insisting on, or threatening, any or all of these things?

....

[pp. 157-161]

Drawing & Message for May Day, The Labour Monthly, May 1959

LABOUR MONTHLY TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO THE INTERNAL SITUATION

Fifty-six years of Imperialist domination have reduced the workers and peasants of Cyprus to abject poverty and slavery. More than two-sevenths of the entire cultivated land belongs to the Church and the Monasteries. More than three-fourteenths are expropriated or mortgaged and only seven-fourteenths are owned by the peasants. Cyprus is predominantly a peasant land. 75 per cent, of the entire population are peasants—small owners or renter (i.e., peasants who rent land from the big kulak farmers or from the Church and cultivate it). The Church, the biggest feudal landlord, along with a dark phalanx of usurers and moneylenders, have crushed and ruined the peasants.

(From Terror in Cyprus by Evdoros Joannides,
May, 1934.)

[pp. 216-18]

1959 Trade Unions Under Fire, O.H. Parsons, The Labour Monthly, May 1959

....

On the other hand, it seems to be agreed by these gentlemen that what they call 'increased competition' amongst unions would be a good thing. Quite how they think that this will reduce demarcation and inter-union trouble they do not make clear. Perhaps they do not care; divide and rule failed in Ireland, India and Cyprus, but never mind, perhaps they think it will work at home.

....

[pp. 233-236]

1959 The Intelligent Voter's Guide, County Councillor Renee Short, The Labour Monthly, September 1959

County Councillor Renee Short, Watford, prospective Labour candidate:

How would I refute the Tories' claim that they are promoting peace abroad and prosperity at home ? The squalid record of this Tory government must make all decent people flinch at the thought that there could possibly be another vote of confidence given to such a gang. Abroad, the crimes of Suez, Cyprus and Africa brought the risk of world war very close and made Britain's name stand for repression, gun-boat politics and the police state. At home, we have had a demonstration of the real meaning of the Tory poster : ' Life's Better with the Conservatives '. So it is—for a few. Certainly the take-over merchants who operate on the stock exchange have never had it so good. The Clores, the Frasers, the Josephs and the rest can make millions of profit almost overnight. Big Business has much to be grateful for to this government which believes that private profit should take precedence over the good of the nation. The rest, however, saw the meaning of Tory prosperity earlier this year when unemployment figures were higher than for twenty years. Young people leaving school had a taste of what a Tory government will offer them—dole queue and months of unemployment before they find a job. Print-workers and engineers know now what it means to fight for a decent wage and a reasonable working week ; old age pensioners know a decent pension has been refused them year after year. Ask them if living is better under the Conservatives ! Behind this facade of sham prosperity, rising share prices and carefully generated psychosis of well-being, industry stagnates and production falls

in mines, railways, shipping, steel, cotton and building, with injustice and cynicism abounding.

[pp. 441]

**Document of the Month, The Labour Monthly,
June 1960**

BOOKLETS

Cyprus: The Solution. Movement for Colonial Freedom. 16
pp. 6d.

[pp. 286]

The Market Alternative, Quasestor, The Labour Monthly, October 1962

It is now perfectly clear that the three pledges given by the Government to get parliamentary approval for its application to join the Common Market have not been fulfilled. The National Fanners' Union has rejected the terms for Britain's entry accepted so far by the Government in its negotiations with the Six. The neutral members of the European Free Trade Association—Sweden, Switzerland and Austria—have not been offered those 'fair' terms which the Government promised. And practically all the Commonwealth countries, at the London Conference in September, showed their distrust, fear or downright rejection of the ambiguous and dangerous phrases offered them in place of the guarantees which Macmillan promised. In order to deepen the impression that there is and should be no way out for Britain but to enter the Common Market, the Tory and pro-Tory press began saying that there is no alternative. 'What could the Commonwealth give us in compensation' asked the *Daily Telegraph* editorial (September 10). 'It is hard to see exactly what would be Britain's future environment if she were outside the Six', said *The Times* leading article the same day. But this is as grossly misleading as all the rest of the arguments—and *The Times* itself tacitly admitted this, in a characteristic piece of understatement, in its leader on September 11:

On the evidence so far, it is not yet proven that the communist bloc would deliberately try to sabotage an agreement which gave them what they regarded as reasonable access to western markets.

'On the evidence so far. . . .' Let us look at the evidence then—that evidence about which there is plenty of evidence, overwhelming in fact, that the capitalist press and politicians

have deliberately prevented the British public from knowing anything about it.

In May of this year, as was noted in the July issue of *Labour Monthly*, the Soviet Union and the other Socialist States proposed to the Economic Commission for Europe in Geneva that it should promote an international conference on expansion of trade between all countries, without discrimination. The western powers rejected the proposal—and the British press kept quiet about it.

On May 30, at a Soviet-Mali friendship meeting in the Kremlin, Khrushchov took the question up again, after showing the dangers of the Common Market. He said:

The Soviet Government believes that the United Nations cannot remain aloof from this question, which is of vital importance for hundreds of millions of people. It considers desirable to convene an international conference on problems of trade, which would discuss the question of setting up an international trade organisation to embrace all regions and countries of the world without any discrimination. The calling of such a conference would undoubtedly be supported by many countries which are opposing the policy of building up closed economic groupings of the western powers.

And Khrushchov was right. Just over a week later, a 'Conference on the Economic Problems of Developing Countries' opened at Cairo. It had been called on the initiative of a group of neutral and uncommitted countries—the United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, India, Indonesia, Ceylon and others. Thirty-four nations of Africa, Asia and Latin-America were represented, with Cyprus and Yugoslavia: the latter and Cuba were the only socialist countries present—not the Soviet Union, not People's China, not the other socialist countries of Europe and Asia. The Acting Secretary-General of the United Nations, its various Economic Commissions for different regions of the world, even the International Monetary Fund, were all

represented by observers. It was what Transport House and the General Council love to call 'an official conference'. But could you read about its proceedings in any of the papers campaigning for the Common Market? Not on your life.

Why? Because most of the papers submitted denounced the disastrous effects of economic 'blocs' and trade discrimination, and many speeches exposed the threat of the Common Market to underdeveloped countries. Because the final resolution, *unanimously* adopted on June 18, declared wholeheartedly in favour of an international conference to promote trade (including trade in raw materials) between all countries without any discrimination. Because it attacked economic groupings using discriminatory methods. Because it declared that increased economic aid to developing countries was necessary on the basis of mutual benefit and respect, without any political and economic strings. And because the signatories agreed that they would take the same attitude at other international meetings—and that the resolution should be sent to the Acting Secretary-General of the United Nations with the request that it be put down on the agenda of the coming seventeenth General Assembly.

Here was a facer—but more was to follow. Before going further, however, one ought to point out the great importance of such a line-up of the countries which for centuries have had to depend only on their production of raw materials and provision of cheap labour to maintain the miserably low standard of living of the vast mass of their people. It was a dramatic reminder of the reality of the worldwide *colonial revolution* now far advanced. It was a message to the monopolies of finance-capital now dominating Great Britain, the United States and the European 'Six', that the recently liberated peoples will not put their heads in any neo-colonialist noose again. It was a great demonstration in practice that the policies of the Soviet Union and its socialist associates do in fact respond to the needs of the

vast majority of mankind, in problems of economic development and relations just as they do on the linked problems of disarmament. And it was an encouraging call to the British people to remember that, in opposing entry into the iniquitous Common Market, they have allies—and they have an infinitely better path to follow.

That was why practically nothing was said about the Conference in the capitalist press.* And the same applies to the thirty-fourth session in Geneva of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. In this body sixty States-members of the U.N. were represented. It had on its agenda a resolution calling emphatically for an international conference on trade and economic development, brought forward by a group of States broadly representative of those present at Cairo—India, Brazil, Senegal, Ethiopia and Yugoslavia. The resolution recognised the harmful effects of ‘closed groupings’ on the economies of the under-developed countries, and if discriminatory trade barriers on world trade generally. Speaker after speaker from raw-material-producing countries showed how adverse ‘terms of trade’ imposed on them by the highly industrialised States would get worse by the operation of the Common Market. Every possible device was used by the Western Powers to throw cold water on the proposal. In the first phase of the debate, while the Socialist and the under-developed countries were pressing the case for an international conference, Britain, France, Italy and the U.S.A. avoided mentioning it, evidently trying to cook up a common opposition. Then they went into action. Italy complained that the opening paragraphs of the draft resolution smacked of ‘prejudice against the European Economic Community’ because it spoke of ‘obstacles and restrictions’ hampering the under-developed countries.

* An excellent survey, by a Cypriot journalist who was there, K. L. Tsioupras, appeared in *World News* of September 15, 1962.

France not only supported Italy, but wanted to water down the wording so as to avoid any obligation to hold the conference at all. But the richest demonstration was given by Miss Salt (Great Britain). In language long familiar to all trade unionists, she piled up cliché upon cliché. 'No simple solution was possible. . . . It requires a flexible approach. . . . Visible trade was only one aspect of economic relationships. . . . It hardly needed a conference to convince governments. . . . A new organisation could only retard action. . . . Problems should be identified as they arise.... Inquiries are most valuable when they are specific and local.'

But it was all to no avail. The majority against them was too large. Some slight verbal changes were made to save their face; the Italians withdrew their objection; the French amendment was heavily voted down; and the resolution to convene 'a United Nations Conference on Trade and Development' was carried unanimously. Experts must be appointed to a Preparatory Committee by November, and they are to meet by the early spring of 1963 to consider the agenda and documentation for the Conference, 'with particular reference to the problems of the developing countries'.

Here too was a great lesson. If Macmillan & Co. can be defeated over world trade versus the Common Market in an international conference by the combined forces of socialism and national liberation, why cannot the British people, led by the working class, defeat them on the same question at home?

The reservation, 'for the time being', is appropriate. No-one can doubt that slippery Macmillan, diamond-hard only in his defence of the moneybags of his class, has other tricks up his sleeve. As the president of the Economic and Social Council, Jerzy Michalowski (well known for his term as Polish Ambassador in London, some years ago) said in his closing speech, 'obviously all problems are not going to be solved overnight. None of us have any illusions about that'.

But while the international trade conference was not a panacea, ‘a breakthrough could be made on some of the key issues of the day’. He appealed to all governments to ‘give the deepest consideration *to their role in, and attitude towards the conference* during the coming weeks and months, so that we may strengthen the forces of world economic co-operation and bring the post-war trend to disintegration to a halt’.

The Soviet delegates at the Council had already moved for the inclusion in the conference agenda of three items—the setting up of an International Trade Organisation, the harmful effect of closed Western economic groupings on international trade, and the elimination of trade discrimination. If there were really any sincerity in Macmillan’s talk of ‘reconciliation in Europe’, here would be his chance to promote it on an historic scale, in what Michalowski rightly called ‘a great step forward in the promotion of the idea of co-existence and co-operation of all countries, and indeed all groups of countries’. And if expecting sincerity from our present Prime Minister is like expecting kindly consideration from a crocodile, it has been shown more than once that, if the labour movement really makes up its mind and acts together, it is strong enough to dispose of all the Tory menagerie. The Cairo and Geneva meetings have pointed the way.

[pp. 445-448]

The Notes of the Month, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, November 1964

....

George Brown's Call for the Dunkirk Spirit

Already before the election campaign was over the dawning recognition of this grim prospect began to change the previously complacent tone of some of the more realist leading Labour spokesmen. In his speech at Doncaster on October 5 George Brown was reported to have said:

In light of the fact that Britain is spending £500 million a year more than it is earning, the days of Santa Claus for grown-ups have to come to an end. We have to decide on October 15 whether we are going to opt for pretence or whether we are going to opt, as Britain did after Dunkirk, for tough policies, tough Ministers and long-term strategy to see us through.

Dunkirk? Is it to be 'blood, tears and sweat' again? A new call to tighten belts and for sacrifices? For the defence of Britain? Not at all. To pay for sending bombers against the Yemenis, tanks to Cyprus, helicopters and troops to Malaysia, or maintaining armed bases in Aden, Akrotiri and Singapore. Lest the innocent should be in any doubt against whom he proposes to be 'tough', he clarified his intention further in his speech on the same day at Leeds:

If you ask me what I would want to achieve after October 15, it would be to be a member of a Government which, at whatever risk to achievement, and at whatever cost to immediate raising of standards, would again raise the flag of unselfishness.

'At whatever cost to immediate raising of standards'. Once again we hear the authentic notes of Bevin addressing the American Legion at the Savoy Hotel on September 10, 1947:

My dear Americans, we may be short of dollars, but we are not short of will.... We won't let you down... Standards of life may go back. We may have to say to our miners and to our steel workers: 'We can't give you all we hoped for. We cant give you the houses we want you to live in. We can't give you the amenities we desire to give you.' But we won't fail.

But even Bevin did not offer these slogans for his election campaign. This time these menaces of 'toughness' in respect of 'standards' have appeared even before the election was over. 'If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in a dry?' You have been warned.

....

[pp. 481-494]

The Peace Movement Today, Andrew Walker, The Labour Monthly, April 1965

There were various trends. Those, probably a majority, who thought that a Labour Government with Harold Wilson at its head was all that mattered. Those who, while not sharing the anarchistic, a-plague-on-all-parties attitude, were nevertheless disgruntled by Harold Wilson's calls for tanks in Cyprus, helicopters in Malaysia and aircraft to support our boys in South Arabia, and by the lack of any sustained activity. Then there were the various groups of sea-green incorruptibles: those who, in reaction against the first group, wanted to march out into the wilderness by transforming the organised peace movement as a separate organisation into a political party by including such things as housing, opposition to racism, local government and whatnot in its programme, or by putting up candidates at elections; the opponents of all political action; and the diehard universal unilateralists who seemed impervious to the changes in the domestic and international political scene.

[pp. 158-161]

The Notes of the Month, After Washington, R.P.D., The Labour Monthly, January 1965

.....

Washington and Britain

It is obvious that the outcome of the Washington talks has the most profound effect on the internal situation in Britain. If Britain is to fulfil the initially proclaimed Wilson-Healey-Walker programme to strengthen Nato, build the Polaris submarines, participate in the multilateral Atlantic Nuclear Force, increase the occupation troops in West Germany to 55,000, maintain the bases in Cyprus and Aden and Singapore and elsewhere, recruit Gurkhas and continue the war for the maintenance of the neo-colonialist satellite Malaysia, this can only be at the expense of urgent social and economic needs at home. The consequent burdens of overseas expenditure can only hamper essential home productive development, increase the costs of British manufacturers in contrast with other industrial countries less heavily burdened, and thereby cripple the exports drive and render precarious the position of sterling, however desperate the efforts of the people to produce more and export more in order to meet the crisis. The experience of the first two months of the Labour Government has abundantly shown the truth of this.

.....

[pp. 1-15]

Crisis in Greece, A Struggle for Democracy, Betty Ambatielos, The Labour Monthly, October 1965

GREECE is in the throes of the most acute crisis of the past fifteen years. This crisis was deliberately provoked and is being artificially prolonged by the Palace, supported by the military junta and the neo-fascist Right. It is facilitated by renegades from the Centre Union and is inspired and financed by U.S. imperialism. The bringing down of the legal government and attempts to impose a docile government obedient to U.S. commands, is the Johnson Doctrine in operation in Greece: 'This Doctrine', said Mr. I. Iliou, leader of the Union of the Democratic Left (E.D.A.), 'is operated in Vietnam, the Congo and the Dominican Republic through fire, mercenaries and marines; in Greece, through conspiracy, provocation, U.S. dollars and corruption'. While the crisis could be solved immediately by the formation of a caretaker government charged with the holding of free elections within 45 days of the dissolution of Parliament (according to the Constitution) the Palace and its supporters are as determined to avoid elections as the devil Holy Water! There is nothing they fear more than the freely expressed will of the people.

As a result of the refusal to proceed to elections following the dismissal by the King of the legal Premier, Papandreou, the country has been virtually governed by the Palace (and the army) through its own appointed premiers who, even when overwhelmingly defeated in Parliament, continue to function as if they were normal governments. In particular, they have effected changes in the army (200 army officers removed in one night!) and security police— against the interests of the democratic people and in preparation for more serious violations of the people's will.

Behind the King's action lies the determination of all the powers of reaction, backed by the imperialists, to wipe out the democratic gains resulting from the people's defeat of Karamanlis in 1963, and restore the policies of the National Radical Union (E.R.E.) through whatever government possible. The defeat of Karamanlis was a major breakthrough. For almost thirty years there had been dictatorship or reactionary governments (with which the Throne was always associated). Even so-called liberal governments in the post-war period had continued policies of national betrayal and the suppression of liberty at home.

The electoral victory of the democratic forces in February 1964 presented for the first time the opportunity for a decisive turn towards the democratic road (and for the monarch to restrict himself exclusively to 'reigning not governing'). The Centre Union (Papandreou) polled 53 per cent of the poll and had an absolute majority in Parliament. E.DA's 22 deputies supported its declared policy for the restoration of democracy. There was nothing to stop the programme being carried out immediately and to the last letter. It is now past history that Papandreou failed to lift the Special Emergency Measures dating from the Civil War (1946-49), did not legalise the Greek Communist Party (K.E.E.), release the remaining political prisoners or root out the fascist elements from their key positions in the army, police, etc., and that he too banned meetings and, among other things, discussed with the King the latter's proposal for the banning of the Democratic Lambrakis Youth. Why then did the U.S., the Palace and the Right conspire against him? It was not so much Papandreou they feared as the unity of the democratic forces, forged in the struggle against Karamanlis. The conspiracy aimed at reversing the drive forward to democracy, peace and progress being pressed for by the united democratic forces.

It was against these forces that the unconstitutional action of the Palace was directed. The outlawed K.K.E. and the legal

E.D.A. had repeatedly warned against a coup; it was carried out and was a coup despite the effort made to pass it off as a commonplace government change. On July 15 the King refused Papandreou's request that he replace Garoufalias as Minister of Defence. (He was the Palace nominee for the post whom Papandreou had originally accepted but now, under popular pressure, wanted to remove.) Papandreou was dismissed and another Centre Union figure, Novas, installed as Premier. The dismissal of the legal Premier, who beyond doubt represented the majority, was unconstitutional and was flying in the face of the sovereign people. The appointment of Novas by the King was a further violation of the constitution. Thus the crisis arose and the only way out constitutionally and democratically was for the mandate to be returned immediately to Papandreou or for recourse to elections for the people to decide.

Simultaneously with these astounding developments came the views and attitudes of the Palace clique (Frederika, the King's advisers Hoidas and Arnaoutis, etc.) in the King's letters to Papandreou published on the initiative of the Palace! These revealed the demand that the King decides on the person of the Prime Minister, ministers, army leaders etc., and that the monarch's views (his concern for a return to the state of 'stability and sense of security' which, it was alleged, had disappeared after the defeat of Karamanlis) take precedence over the expressed will of the people. In other words, that Absolute Monarchy replace the Parliamentary Democracy in which the monarch derives what powers he has from the people and does not interfere in the affairs of government. The content and language (e.g., 'This is my last warning') exposed the Palace once again as identifying itself, not with the people as a whole, but with a section of it only, and that the most reactionary.

With amazing clarity the people saw that it was not simply a question of Papandreou (who had come in for sharp criticism from the Left and other democrats) but popular sovereignty that

was at stake. The removal of Papandreou was a direct attack on the legal representative of the will of the people (for the restoration of democracy) as expressed in the elections of February 1964. The struggle, therefore, for the restoration of the legal Premier or immediate free elections was a struggle to save the new forward position won for democracy in 1963-4.

The first Palace government (Novas) was defeated in Parliament after only fifteen days; the 'ace' Palace card was now brought out in the shape of one-time socialist Tsirimokos. But that was trumped by the people in only five days! Desertions from the Centre Union to these Palace-appointed Premiers reduced its Parliamentary strength to 134, but with E.D.A's 22 deputies, the Parliamentary majority still remained with the forces supporting the restoration of democracy. This great fight involved hundreds of thousands of democrats, workers, youths and students demonstrating night after night for two months. In Athens, in addition to the usual police attacks, thousands of tear-gas cylinders were thrown against the people injuring many and killing 23-year-old Sotiris Petroulas. Stoppages of work are frequent, general strikes in particular towns and, on July 27, a 24-hour general strike in all the industrial centres. Slogans for the return to Constitutional and Democratic Order and the solution of the crisis through free elections are the demands.

But 'elections' is a word which haunts U.S. backed reaction like a nightmare. *They are determined at all costs to avoid them.* Election now, they say, would be 'dangerous'—presumably because, since the whole of Greece is echoing to the demand for a return to constitutional and democratic order, it is clear the majority would vote for a programme of democracy! In any case, they would not be elections, they add, they would be a plebiscite on the question of the monarchy. In fact, this issue, which no party has raised, was raised by the King himself by his deviation from the Constitution. If the King desires to win respect, the

speediest way of doing this, says the Left, is to respect the Constitution and proceed to elections.

However, at the time of writing, intense activity continues behind the scenes to effect a 're-deployment' of the Centre Union Parliamentary forces. In other words, through 'inducements', persuading more Centre deputies to desert to the renegade Novas-Tsirimokas group to produce a viable Centre Union government, and through it make greater progress towards restoring the policies of the Karamanlis era. The crisis and the continued efforts to ignore the people's will are pregnant with dangers. The only way to avert them and secure democratic normality, says E.D.A., is for the people to express its will in free elections. A caretaker government, enjoying the confidence of the political parties, must be formed to carry out the elections; steps must be taken to guarantee free elections for all; the elections should be held within the constitutional time limits.

The dangers are acute. The military junta and its dream of dictatorship are threatening in the background. The Americans are pressing. They were behind the whole conspiracy, the Greek press reveals. Tangible results are expected in return for the many millions of U.S. dollars expended on the operation against the legal government—Greek troops for their war in Vietnam, agreement to partition of Cyprus to placate Turkey and secure Cyprus as the Nato centre for aggressive aims against the peoples of the Middle East and the defence of the oil interests of the imperialists; more concessions allowing even more intense exploitation in the interests of the monopolies.

But the Greek people, whose modern Marathon—the March for Peace last May—heartened the peace forces everywhere, are not interested in war, but in peace, in independence, in self-determination for Cyprus. They want friendship with all peoples, especially the non-aligned peoples of Africa and the Middle East, their Balkan neighbours and the socialist countries. They are interested in progress, in going forward not back. The bitter

struggles they are waging unitedly now, supported by international solidarity, will ultimately impose their will, secure conditions for free elections and enable them to plant their feet again even more firmly on the road to national independence, progress and democracy.

[pp. 454-457]

Cyprus in the Grip of Crisis, Minos Perdios, The Labour Monthly, September 1971

CYPRUS is in the grip of a serious crisis—the most serious crisis since the emergence of the Cyprus Republic. Intercommunal talks between Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots have moved slowly and have now reached a crucial point in the final stage. If the talks meet an impasse, threats against Cyprus will become imminent and serious. Any unfortunate or unwise move may result in a most grave situation, not excluding clashes along the military confrontation lines. And such a development will certainly have disastrous consequences for the Cypriot people.

The Cyprus Government, aware of this situation, is doing everything possible to pursue its policy of a peaceful solution to the Cyprus problem and keep peace among the people of the island. In line with this policy the Government is planning to appeal to the UN Secretary General and, if necessary, to have recourse to the UN Security Council.

A major factor in this development is the pressure applied to the Government of Cyprus by Nato countries—Turkey and Greece—to give in and accept US-inspired plans. The imperialist powers, and especially the US, have, from the very birth of the Cyprus Republic, pursued a policy of pressures upon the Government of Cyprus, with the basic aim of turning the island into a military air and naval base for Nato in the Mediterranean and the Middle East. But this pressure has now been intensified and has taken the form of a concrete formula at a recent meeting in Lisbon of the Foreign Ministers of Nato countries. The basis for this latest plan was laid during recent exchanges between the Greek and Turkish Prime Ministers (Papadopoulos and Erim); they undertook to impose the plan, possibly even by force. The solution proposed aims at

partitioning Cyprus between Turkey and Greece, and creating conditions for Nato to set foot in Cyprus.

The letter sent to the President of Cyprus by the Greek Prime Minister, which was published in the columns of the West German paper, *Der Spiegel*, left no doubts as far as the Greek junta's intentions towards Cyprus were concerned. In his letter, Mr Papadopoulos threatened that, unless President Makarios was willing to accept the Lisbon plan, he would be obliged to take 'strict measures, however bitter they may be'. And these 'bitter' measures menace the very existence of the Cypriot President.

Properly interpreting and expressing the Cypriot people's feelings in the matter, the President turned down the Lisbon plan and Mr Papadopoulos's proposals, and underlined the determination of Cyprus to resist any attempt to impose the plan upon the Cypriot people, whenever this attempt might come.

September is considered to be a crucial month for Cyprus, because, in the event of the intercommunal talks breaking down, Greece and Turkey are to consult each other as to the way to enforce the Lisbon plan for partition, with the aim of strengthening Nato's south-eastern wing. In this way, the problem facing Cyprus today is not so much the constitutional differences between Greek and Turkish Cypriots, but the threat against the independence and the very existence of the Republic of Cyprus.

Cyprus is a small country, an island of 600,000 people, but, against this background of imperialist intrigue, all her people and her President are determined to defend the sovereignty and unity of the island. In this struggle Cyprus is not alone. At her side stand ready to help the socialist and non-aligned countries, the democratic and progressive forces throughout the world.

The recent visit of President Makarios to Moscow and the joint Soviet-Cypriot communique, issued on the talks of the two parties, radically changed the situation in favour of Cyprus. The

Soviet Union clearly stated in the communique not only support for full independence, integrity, sovereignty and unity of the Cyprus Republic, as well as the withdrawal of all foreign troops stationed on the territory of Cyprus, but she reaffirmed her constant, active opposition to any intervention in the internal affairs of Cyprus, to any use of force or threat of force against Cyprus. The presence of the Soviet Red Fleet in the Mediterranean has radically changed the balance and position of forces in this uneasy area.

The imperialist powers have been forced to think again, and this is why, alongside intrigues in the international field, they have intensified their subversive activities internally within the island. They have incited anti-communism and chauvinistic feeling in particular. Under these circumstances, threats against the life of President Makarios and party leaders of the left and other patriotic organisations are becoming more and more real and dangerous. The Cypriot people as a whole are forced to be on the alert, ready to deal with any suspicious move in this direction.

AKEL, the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus, faces heavy responsibilities as a leading force in the defence of the Republic. It has denounced the Lisbon formula and the proposals and threats contained in the Greek Premier's letter to the President of Cyprus, both being unacceptable to the Cypriot people. It gave its full support to President Makarios in his determination—as on similar occasions in the past—to resist pressures, and to give a clear and definite No to the Nato plans. AKEL believes that the unity of all patriotic forces, and their mobilisation around President Makarios, is the most effective weapon in the struggle against the enemies of Cyprus. At this crucial moment its appeal has gone to all political parties and other organisations to build up a powerful 'Front for Salvation' of Cyprus.

The initiative for a peaceful solution to the Cyprus problem should be kept steadily in the hands of the Government of Cyprus. The intercommunal consultations must be carried forward in an atmosphere of mutual trust and goodwill. If these talks collapse, we must take the way to the UN. But if the enemies of Cyprus leave no alternative to the people and force them to fight, it becomes a matter of life and death, and AKEL has declared that it will place all its forces at the disposal of such a struggle, ready to fight for Cyprus to the end.

[p. 421-422]

Cyprus, Dina Machallepies, United Popular Support for Makarios Government, The Labour Monthly, April 1972

We all know that the Cyprus problem is now passing through its most critical stage since the proclamation of the Cyprus Republic. We know that the imperialist factor, with American imperialism as the spearhead, plots, conspires, undermines and, in general, plans to impose its own solution.... We also know that dates have been fixed for the enforcement of this imperialist solution on the people of Cyprus. And these dates are placed in the coming two-to-three months at the utmost.'

This prediction was made by Mr E. Papaioannou, the Secretary of the Progressive Party of the Working People (AKEL) in one of his speeches on August 29, 1971. Unfortunately for Cyprus the events of the last few weeks have proved Mr Papaioannou right. The Greek military regime, in a desperate effort to present Cyprus on a plate to its Nato allies, has sent an ultimatum to the President of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios, demanding, if not his actual resignation, that he obeys Athens, allegedly the centre of Hellenism.

However, this was not plain guessing on the part of Mr Papaioannou, but a realistic analysis of the situation. As far back as 1959, AKEL, evaluating the positive and negative elements of the Zurich-London agreement which declared Cyprus an independent republic, stressed the dangers emanating from the provisions of the agreement, the preservation of the British military bases, the presence of foreign armies (950 Greek and 650 Turkish soldiers) and the right of intervention by the three self-appointed guarantors (Britain, Greece, Turkey) in the internal affairs of Cyprus.

On the basis of this evaluation, AKEL characterised as antiimperialist and national-liberation in character the new

phase of struggle faced by Cyprus, and stated that the main object of its policy was the completion of Cyprus independence. 'To achieve this goal,' says the Party programme formulated in the early sixties, 'it is necessary to follow an anti-imperialist policy at home and abroad, rid Cyprus of economic and political dependence and imperialist influence, eliminate military bases, democratise the country's political and social life and rehabilitate its economy.'

Towards this end AKEL fought for parliamentary representation. Since, in 1960, the Party could not count on more than 35 per cent of the votes in any one of the island's six constituencies, AKEL came to an agreement with the Patriotic Front of Cyprus, a coalition of several groups and associations which recognised President Makarios as its leader. Under this agreement all five AKEL candidates were elected. During the decade that followed, AKEL, despite its few seats, made itself heard in parliament, at the same time gaining considerable experience. By 1963, however, due to the unworkable constitution of Cyprus which stipulated a Greek President and a Turkish Vice-President, each having the right to veto the other—which they did frequently—antagonism and mutual distrust between the two communities grew immensely and finally culminated in the atrocities of Christmas 1963: these events marked the beginning of a new phase of the Cypriot struggle for freedom. This phase was characterised by the aggressive insistence of the imperialist alliance of Nato to impose on the Cypriots a solution that would serve its strategic interests in the region of the Middle East. This was expressed in the cynical interference of the US leaders Ball, Acheson, Lemnitzer and Cyrus Vance, who had all appeared with plans to settle the Cyprus question. But all those plans came up against a resolute 'No' from a united people.

Due to a tense domestic situation, the first Cyprus parliament was in office for ten years instead of five as stipulated

by the constitution. The island's second general elections took place in 1970. This time AKEL decided to campaign on its own and put forward nine candidates. All nine won: AKEL polled 40 per cent of the votes.

AKEL in parliament always supported the Makarios Government's measures to restore peace, and welcomed the intercommunal talks as the only way to solve the problem of the two communities by peaceful means. These talks, however, came to a deadlock late last year. This as well as the present Cyprus crisis can be traced to a Nato conference held in Lisbon in June 1971. At this conference, a meeting between the Greek and Turkish delegations took place. Both sides admitted that Cyprus remained a source of friction between them and consequently a weakness in the southern flank of the Nato alliance. It was also common ground that this state of affairs was likely to endure as long as Makarios remained in power. They therefore agreed upon a formula which envisaged separate administration for the Turkish community, constituting 18 per cent of the population only, thus creating a state within a state, or a double union by dividing Cyprus between Greece and Turkey.

Once again Cyprus's answer was a negative one. This provoked the Greek junta leader, Papadopoulos, to send a letter to Makarios warning him that, if he did not give in, 'the Greek Government would feel the severe necessity of taking those measures which the national interest dictated....'

In September 1971, General George Grivas was sent to Cyprus in a bid to intimidate Makarios and stir up old feuds and antagonisms. Grivas, who is still on the island, living without pretence of concealment in the headquarters of the regular Greek Army battalion, just outside Nicosia, set about forming terrorist groups. Makarios wisely avoided a confrontation with the General, and instead tried to reinforce the National Guard by importing 15,000 Czechoslovak small arms. This made the

Greek military regime realise Makarios was not prepared to betray his people, and forced them to show their true colours, thus disillusioning their few remaining fans in Cyprus who clamoured for Enosis, still believing in the grandeur of mother Greece. The Greek regime sent an ultimatum to Makarios demanding that he surrender the arms to the United Nations' peace keeping unit in Cyprus and form a government of 'national unity' including pro-Grivas elements and excluding the Communists. Makarios, at the time of writing, has not conceded to either demand. More pressure is being put on Makarios by three of his church colleagues, the bishops of Kyrenia, Paphos and Kitium, who at a recent Holy Synod meeting called on him to resign his temporal post.

The fourth Regular Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Committee of AKEL was convened on February 14 and declared that the Party of the Working People condemned the Athens ultimatum and believed that interference by Athens in the internal affairs of Cyprus encourages foreign intervention and pressures on the Cypriot people, thus damaging their own interests as well as those of Cyprus. A resolution adopted by the Plenum states clearly the AKEL policy on this issue: (1) AKEL unconditionally supports the Makarios Government for a decisive confrontation of conspiracies, prevention of coup d'etat plans and the achievement of an acceptable solution; (2) AKEL makes all the support it can command available to the legal state, which is the only one entitled to keep armed forces for the defence and security of Cyprus; (3) it condemns any attempt to incite the National Guard and the police force against the Government; (4) AKEL believes that the Cypriots themselves are the only ones capable of finding a just and peaceful solution: in order to safeguard her rights, Cyprus should develop friendly relations with other countries, especially the non-aligned and socialist ones; (5) finally, AKEL

appeals to all parties and organisations to unite and co-operate with President Makarios for the rescue of Cyprus.

[pp. 165-167]

Honour to D.N. Pritt by Jacques Duclos, The Labour Monthly, August 1972

EZEKIAS PAPAIOANNOU General Secretary of AKEL (Progressive Party of Working People), Nicosia, Cyprus

D. N. Pritt was a great friend of the Cypriot people. As Labour Member of Parliament, he frequently raised his voice both inside and outside the House of Commons against the British colonial regime in Cyprus and in support of the liberation struggle of the Cypriot people. As honorary member of the Committee for Cyprus Affairs in London, D. N. Pritt developed, along with other progressive MPs, systematic activity championing the right of the people of Cyprus to decide their future free from British or any other foreign interference. Pritt was also a fervent supporter of the abolition of British bases in Cyprus and for a peaceful, democratic solution of the Cyprus problem. As a legal defender of all fighters for freedom D. N. Pritt rightly earned the name of 'lawyer of the victims of imperialism'. The Cypriot people remember Pritt when he visited Cyprus in 1956 to defend the leadership of AKEL, some 135 leaders, whom the oppressive colonial regime of Field-Marshal Harding arrested one night and detained in concentration camps and prisons. D. N. Pritt made a brilliant case of habeas corpus before the colonial Court but justice meted out by the colonial regime ran contrary to elementary human rights, and the AKEL leadership was kept in jail for over a year without any trial. D. N. Pritt has earned a place in the hearts of the progressive people of Cyprus and will always be remembered as a great friend, as a staunch, consistent supporter of their struggle for liberation.

[pp. 366]

Bereaved-Rejected-Deprived Emotional and educational experience of West Indian adolescent immigrants by Jane King, The Labour Monthly, October 1972

....

According to the Inner London Education Authority Report 657, in 1966 the proportion of immigrant children in the Authority's area in ordinary schools was 13.2 per cent. In educationally subnormal schools it was 23.3 per cent. In 1967 the proportions had risen to 15 per cent and 28.4 per cent respectively. Of these 28.4 per cent (about 1,166 children in ESN schools), 75 per cent were West Indian, 4 per cent Indian and Pakistani, 13 per cent Cypriot, and 8 per cent 'other'. Only the West Indian children were more highly represented as a percentage of the whole immigrant population in ESN schools than in ordinary schools. And this was by the staggering figure of 21 percent....

....

[pp. 474-478]

Sad Cyprus, British Government Responsibility One Year After the Turkish Invasion by Lena Jeger MP, The Labour Monthly, July 1975

Cyprus is a sore place on the conscience of the world. For many people in Britain it may be a far away island of which they know little or nothing. In fact, Cyprus is at present the symbolic touchstone of international affairs: it is in Cyprus that the credibility of the United Nations is on trial together with the meaningfulness of the Commonwealth, the honour of treaties, the assertion of human rights. For all these reasons it is as important in modern international politics as was Czechoslovakia in 1938.

Cyprus is a small island, about half the size of Wales, at the eastern end of the Mediterranean. It has always been an orphan ruled by whatever power happened to be in the ascendant in the area. During the Crusades, Richard Coeur de Lion took possession for a time and gave it to his wife for a wedding present. When Venice was Queen of the Mediterranean she ruled Cyprus, and the walls built by the Venetians can still be seen in Famagusta and Nicosia. In 1571, when the Turks were invading Europe, they occupied Cyprus with terrible brutality. They settled about 20,000 Turks there and these are the ancestors of the Turkish Cypriots. In 1878, after the Treaty of Berlin, Cyprus was ceded to Britain in some complicated horse-dealing.

And there we stayed, the imperial power, until the so-called independence of 1960. And during these years, although language and religion kept the two communities apart in many ways, there was a rubbing along, the sort of *modus vivendi* which any neighbours living in a small place together have to manage. I say 'so-called' independence because of what has happened.

I was in Cyprus and present when the treaties were signed. For the UK the ex-Governor, Hugh Foot (Lord Caradon), signed,

together with ministers from Greece and Turkey, a guarantee of the integrity and independence of the new country. With hindsight one can say that this treaty was doomed. But on that hot, happy morning in beautiful Cyprus the bells rang and hands were shaken and the Union Jack on Government House was run down to make way for the unlovely flag of independent Cyprus on what was to be called the Presidential Palace—alas now a shattered ruin.

What went wrong? Everything that went wrong came from outside Cyprus. Left to themselves, the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots could have carried on, growing their melons, tending their flocks, running their hotels. They worked together in the docks, in the hospitals, in the courts. I remember vividly going to a hospital in Paphos some years ago and, because I certainly can't tell a Greek Cypriot from a Turkish Cypriot, I asked the ward Sister whether she was Greek or Turkish. 'Why do you ask?' she said. 'It doesn't matter here. But if you really want to know I am Turkish. My staff nurse is Greek. The anaesthetist is Armenian. The surgeon is Greek and the physician is Turkish. The cook is a Turk and the caretaker is Greek. The patients are about half and half, but apart from the language it never registers with us.'

Of course there were tensions. But I insist that they came from outside. There is no space here for long history, but it is absolutely clear that the fascist colonels in Athens organised the Samson coup in 1974. The non-democratic Turkish government was alert to exploit any trouble. The pity and the misery of Cyprus is that her people have always been used to exploit the internal troubles of other countries.

Under the Treaty of Guarantee of course the British government should have intervened against Samson. I think there would have been little or no struggle. A few old tanks rolling down the road from Akritiri would have been effective. If not, what is the use of British sovereign bases in Cyprus? If

our expensive troops cannot even protect local undertakings, how on earth are they going to be any use elsewhere ?

So the Turks flew in with their bombs and bombardment. I have read many Turkish accounts about how they had to come to protect the Turkish minority in Cyprus. In fact, the Turkish Cypriots had never been safer. It was the Greek Cypriots who were killing each other in those few mad days. Will we ever know what the CIA and Nato were working out with the Greek colonels? We only know that, for the hundredth time in history, the Cypriot people were sacrificed.

And now we have a situation where the UN, supported by Greece, Turkey and the UK and US, has passed a resolution asking that all foreign troops should leave the island and all the refugees should go home. That resolution was passed in November 1974. No action has been taken to implement it. I know because I was in Cyprus in April and I saw the thousands of refugees in their tents, deprived of their homes. I talked to UK citizens who had made their homes in Cyprus and had been evicted, their homes looted, their property destroyed. The Turkish Cypriots who have been moved to the north to occupy the homes of banished Greek Cypriots are not happy. These are a peasant people. They are married to their land, the land where their ancestors have planted trees and tended flocks. A strange, new piece of land, albeit bigger, means less. People, like trees, have roots.

So I was not surprised to get messages from Turkish Cypriots transferred to the north. 'I don't like it here,' one man in Famagusta told me. 'I have a bigger home, but it is not my home. Anyhow, the Turkish soldiers stole everything and it is just four walls. I have no animals, no crops. I am out of work. I dare not let my daughters go out because of the Turkish soldiers. They are not like us. When I see how they behave I do not feel that I am a Turk.' So what do we do ? I believe that we have got to defuse Cyprus. Everything that has gone wrong in the island

is because of its use by outside powers in their own interests. At present it is a Nato toy. I do not know why the British Foreign Office is in love with Turkey: when, in the history of any fight for freedom, has Turkey been on our side Or on the right side? But now there is an official view that the Turks might be splendid fighters against the Russians—look how good they were in Korea, I am told. But surely we are working for a detente, and the idea of our support for Turkey to fight Russia is a nonsense and a contradiction. It is also a nonsense for the poor people of Turkey. Here is a country of miserable living standards, spending a stupid amount of GNP on military purposes, while the children are uneducated, the women are enslaved and poverty is a disgrace. Only the arms dealers and the opium growers in Turkey are rich.

So we have to press our government to implement the UN resolution. We have to refuse to sell arms to Turkey. On May 10-11 in London an international conference on Cyprus was held and representatives from twenty-four countries attended. We asked, as a priority, that the UN conference resolution on Cyprus should be implemented. We are planning to set up a standing committee to implement this purpose. What stands in our way, in the way of a UN resolution? The answer is Nato. At present the British government is putting its fantasies about pro-Turkish anti-Russian confrontations (in harmony with Kissinger and his totally discredited foreign policies) ahead of its simpler obligations to a Commonwealth country, which has signed guarantees written on its books.

If we fail Cyprus, we fail the whole concept of UN international responsibility. We then concede that people and their lives matter less than the theories of Nato and the policies of the CIA. If the UN resolution on Cyprus is ignored, why should anything else from the UN be respected? I come back to where I began: Cyprus is a symbol. And if we get it wrong, there will be a lot more wrong in the future. **[pp. 302-304]**

Partition of Cyprus! George Pefkos, The Labour Monthly, November 1975

ABOUT a year ago the General Assembly of the United Nations, after a most revealing discussion of the brutal aggression against the Republic of Cyprus by the Turkish army and its terrible consequences, unanimously decided in favour of the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Cyprus, the return of all refugees to their homes, and respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus. Since then, after initiatives taken by the government of the Republic of Cyprus and the UN Secretary General the resolution was reiterated, but no action whatever was undertaken by the Turkish government for its implementation.

In fact, provocative steps have been taken by the Turkish government and its occupation forces, blatantly violating the decisions of the UN, such as the extension of the occupation of Cypriot territories, the repeated violation of the air space of the Republic of Cyprus and the ‘decision’ for a ‘unilateral declaration of independence’ (UDI) for the Turkish-occupied north.

The arrogance of the Turkish militarists, despite the almost complete isolation of Turkey inside and outside the UN, is the result of the support they receive from Nato, the CIA, the Pentagon and the American monopolists—the real power behind the US President—who have opposed the attempt by US Congressmen and Senators to maintain an arms embargo on Turkey.

Another factor here is the terrible economic conditions of the Turkish working people and the need, on the part of the Turkish militarists, to divert the attention of the mass of the Turkish people to ‘nationalist aspirations’. The Turkish chauvinists are also worrying about the constant growth in the strength of a healthy progressive movement inside Turkey.

The Turkish government, Mr Denktash and their 'sponsors' do not at all like the situation in Cyprus being discussed at the UN. Every time the government of the Republic of Cyprus raises the problems of the island arising out of the Turkish aggression or out of more recent provocative actions, the Turkish chauvinists react violently. When Cyprus recently appealed to the UN, they threatened to occupy the whole of Cyprus. Their latest move is to discuss 'instant UDI' and force the inter-communal talks to breaking point by refusing to present, at the September meeting in New York, a detailed programme for discussion of their territorial 'claims' as Mr Denktash had promised.

The Turkish chauvinists and their supporters in Nato do not want any serious discussion or any 'noise' about Cyprus. They want to be left alone to implement their long-held aims for the partition of Cyprus and its transformation into a 'reliable and safe' Nato base. New steps in this direction were revealed by Miss Cherry Windridge, writing in the *Times* on September 9:

I have recently returned from Cyprus researching for a group of Conservative members of parliament. ... I managed to get into the occupied Turkish zone illegally, and it is true that the Turks are using the Clerides-Denktash talks as delaying tactics to consolidate their hold over the conquered territory by importing Turks from the mainland.... The Turkish Cypriots themselves are appalled at the nature of this new influx which consists of uneducated, illiterate shepherds and gypsies from Anatolia....

The official Tory policy towards Cyprus was, however, best expressed by Sir Frederic Bennett, Tory MP for Torbay, who, replying recently to an appeal signed by Cypriot constituents in Torquay asking him to do something about the tens of thousands of refugees in Cyprus, wrote in a letter:

I do beg you if you really have, as I am sure you do, the best interests of your kith and kin in Cyprus uppermost in your minds, to realise that today's tragedies of Cyprus did not

begin with the Turkish invasion but rather with a total failure of President Makarios, immediately following on independence, to implement an agreed constitution which safeguarded the rights of both the majority and minority inhabitants. This is not a matter of argument. It is a sad fact of history.

The really sad fact of history is that the Tories in 1959 imposed on the Cypriot people a diabolical constitution typical of the old rotten colonial era. Quite deliberately and in accord with the imperialist design of divide and rule, the 1959 constitution provided for a Turkish vice-president elected separately by the Turks—18 per cent of the population. Both president and vice-president were to have a right of veto over foreign affairs, defence and internal security. In the Council of Ministers and the House of Representatives, the Turks were granted 30 per cent of the seats as well as 30 per cent of the posts in the civil service and security forces, and 40 per cent in the army! It was these deliberate provisions in a typical colonial constitution which brought about the present tragedies of Cyprus, and *not* President Makarios.

The fundamental rights and freedoms of the minorities in Cyprus must be guaranteed in every possible way. That is why, as long ago as 1965, President Makarios sent to the Secretary General of the UN, U Thant, an official document in connection with the rights of the minorities. The document, in the form of a Declaration signed by President Makarios and handed to all delegates at the UN, guaranteed ‘the fundamental rights and freedoms to be enjoyed by every person irrespective of origin, religion, language or sex’ in Cyprus. The Declaration of the Cypriot President contained 32 detailed points covering all aspects of political, social and religious life, and stated finally that ‘the government of Cyprus is prepared to accept the presence of a UN commissioner with an adequate staff of

observers and advisers to observe' the 'adherence to all' the foregoing rights and freedoms of all Cypriot citizens.

Czechoslovakia could have been 'a long way from Britain' as Mr Chamberlain pretended in 1938 when Hitler invaded that country, but Cyprus, a member of the Commonwealth, was a 'next door neighbour' to the ninety-nine square miles of 'sovereign' British military base when, in July 1974, tens of thousands of Turkish troops, armed with Nato weapons, marched into that island in broad daylight, so to speak. And let it be remembered that the London-Zurich Agreement, imposed on the Cypriot people in 1959 by Nato, did not only grant a huge military base to a Nato ally with many other 'facilities' to the British forces in regard to the Cypriot ports, roads, airfield, etc, but alongside it a 'Treaty of Guarantee' was signed and 'offered' to Cyprus by three 'guarantor' powers, one of them Britain, aiming to safeguard the whole imperialist set-up.

Yet a Labour government, elected mainly by a labour movement with such a rich tradition of international solidarity actions, did not lift a finger to help a member of the Commonwealth and to discharge its obligations under the 'Treaty of Guarantee' for Cyprus.

The results of the Turkish invasion—known the world over—are indeed terrible. About 200,000 people, refugees in their own small country, facing a second winter in inhuman conditions; thousands killed, missing and wounded; 40 per cent of the Republic's land, and that the most fertile, under foreign occupation. Why? Certainly not because the Greeks and the Turks of Cyprus could not live together in peace and harmony, but because Nato had designs on the strategic position of the island.

The Greeks and the Turks of Cyprus have lived in friendship for centuries, and they will do so again when they are left alone. Today, it must be quite obvious to all political observers interested in developments in the Middle East that the traitors,

who carried out the coup against President Makarios, and the military organisers in Turkey, who followed it up with the invasion of Cyprus, were acting on behalf of the same patrons—namely, the leadership of Nato under US military and political personnel.

Since 1963, the CIA and the whole machine of Nato have been mobilised against the Republic of Cyprus and against the Cypriot President. The half-a-dozen or so plans prepared by Nato and its associates for a so-called solution for Cyprus, aiming actually for the partition of the island, have all been rejected by President Makarios and the Cypriot people, with the clear understanding that partition of the island and division into two communities will be catastrophic for the whole people of Cyprus, Greeks as well as Turks. Partition of Cyprus will not only create constant friction and difficulties between the two communities, but it will also provoke conflicts between Greece and Turkey with even broader implications. That is why today, when the Turkish Cypriots live under the most humiliating conditions of the double oppression of the Turkish occupation troops and the chauvinist elements of Rauf Denktash, they object to the final partition of their island as has been very recently witnessed. In the Daily Telegraph on September 24, the following was reported from Nicosia:

The 120,000-strong Turkish-Cypriot community was bitterly divided last night over new powers given to Mr Rauf Denktash, their leader, to declare an independent Turkish-Cypriot state.

In fact, Mr Denktash was not given any such powers because he did not get the two-thirds majority needed for that purpose in accord with his own 'constitution'. Seven Turkish MPs walked out of the chamber, protesting angrily, while others deliberately did not attend the meeting. Those MPs who dared demonstrate publicly their opposition to Denktash expressed the genuine desire of the Turkish Cypriot peasants and workers, who do not

want partition of the island and separation from their Greek neighbours and friends.

It is a pity that Fleet Street's newspapers did not a few weeks ago publish some of the most moving photographs of the Turks in Paphos, when, under the orders of Mr Denktash, they left their houses and villages, embracing and kissing their Greek friends and crying as if they were going to a mass Cypriot funeral.

While President Makarios was in New York at the beginning of October preparing for the battle of Cyprus in the United Nations, a lot of talk and newspaper reports were circulating about so-called 'mediations' by the Nato powers, the EEC countries and even Dr Kissinger for a 'just solution' of the Cyprus problem. However, the Cypriot people have no illusions about this kind of 'mediator' because they are quite clear that those who are responsible for the present tragedy of Cyprus can never really help to bring about a just solution to the Cypriot problem. A real solution for Cyprus can only be found within the context of the UN: by implementing the UN resolution of November 1974, calling for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Cyprus, the return of all refugees to their homes, and respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus, with the two communities living together in harmony, solving their own common problems.

The proposal put by the USSR, the most sincere and consistent friend and supporter of Cyprus and the Cypriot people, for a conference on Cyprus by all members of the UN Security Council and other interested countries from the non-aligned world, is a most positive step, and as such is supported by President Makarios and the Cypriot people, the Greek government and people, and by many other interested countries.

Here, in Britain, there is also wide support for the Cypriot people and the justice of their case. The Labour and Communist Parties, the TUC and many other organisations of the labour movement have called for the immediate implementation of the

UN resolutions on Cyprus. The common interests of the British and Cypriot peoples demand that more should be done for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Cyprus, the return of the tens of thousands of refugees to their homes and for the independence, unity and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus.

[pp. 512-516]