

THE LIMITS OF ANTICOLONIALISM: THE BRITISH LABOUR MOVEMENT AND THE END OF EMPIRE IN GUIANA

The Labour MP, Tom Driberg, was not noted for his circumspection but when he composed the introduction to Cheddi Jagan's indictment of British colonial policy in Guiana, *Forbidden Freedom*, he chose his words very carefully. For Labour politicians, who were ostensibly committed to anticolonialism, it ought to have been a straightforward matter to condemn the Conservative Colonial Secretary, Oliver Lyttelton, who had ordered the dismissal of Jagan 133 days after he had been elected Chief Minister by the Guianese people on 27 April 1953. The case against Lyttelton gathered additional force when it transpired that the pretext he had offered, that Jagan's supporters were planning to burn down the capital, Georgetown, rested on the flimsiest evidence. Yet these circumstances did not alter the belief of many key figures in the British labour movement that Jagan was a pro-Soviet stooge who was responsible for his own downfall. With an eye to these controversies, Driberg thought it prudent to suggest that the previous Attlee government had 'shown the sincerity of its anti-imperialism by its actions in India and Burma and the Gold Coast', while also acknowledging that Labour's response to the crisis in Guiana had been 'qualified and cautious'. Of the text and author he was introducing, Driberg noted: 'I cannot myself endorse every word of Cheddi Jagan's book; but I met him more than once in London and learned to respect and like him for his obvious sincerity, his modesty and his quiet unembittered wit.'¹ The explanation for Driberg's unexpected ambivalence can be found in divisions within the wider Labour movement between Bevanites and Gaitskellites and these disagreements necessitate reconsideration of the forces which shaped Labour's colonial policy. The reason the radical critique of imperialism offered by the Labour left in the post-war years never became official policy was because the revisionist right prioritised Atlanticism and anti-communism. Furthermore, the ascendancy of the revisionists on colonial matters was facilitated by the support they received from the British Trades Union Congress (TUC), whose role in decolonisation has been underappreciated by historians. Such considerations were still operating in 1964 when Wilson's Labour government implemented a plan devised by another Conservative Colonial Secretary, Duncan Sandys, with the aim, once again, of securing Jagan's removal as Chief Minister of British Guiana.

The secondary literature on the Labour Party's relations with nationalist groups in the periphery, the role of trade unions in the Cold War and the Atlanticist instincts of the Party's revisionists offer useful context for an examination of Jagan's downfall. Existing interpretations of the development of Labour's colonial policy during the opposition years of the 1950s and early 1960s tend to portray it as a period during which the party carved out a singular and effective critique of late imperial Conservative policy. The Suez crisis, the Hola camp massacres in Kenya and the Devlin report's exposure of the problems of the Central African Federation, offered Labour the opportunity to distinguish their progressive ideas from those of their reactionary opponents.ⁱⁱ By contrast, the reluctant bipartisanship which prevailed when Guianese affairs were debated in 1953 and 1964 demonstrates the limits of the metropolitan left's anticolonialism. The precedents for Labour's hostility to Jagan can be found in the suspicion of anticolonial nationalism which prevailed for much of the party's first half century. In his work on the party's Indian policy, Owen illustrated the tendency of British Labour to adopt a paternal rather than fraternal attitude towards Indian nationalism. The purported waywardness of their anticolonial charges often threatened complete estrangement, most notably during the Quit India campaign of the Second World War.ⁱⁱⁱ

In the case of Guiana, Jagan's room for manoeuvre was restricted still further by the TUC's embroilment in the Cold War. In 1949 British trade unions played a pivotal role in the establishment of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) as a rival to the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU), which dominated trade unionism in the eastern bloc. During the 1950s the ICFTU's anti-Soviet remit required both the appeasement of anti-communists in the colonial periphery and a relentless assault on those whose sympathies appeared to reside with Moscow. Waters and Ramcharan have focused on Guiana as one of the key battlegrounds in this conflict.^{iv} What has not been forthcoming has been any analysis of what these conflicts tell us about the nature of debates within the metropolitan labour movement about colonial policy. Whereas the attitude of Labour's revisionists to Atlanticism has been thoroughly investigated by Black among others, only Stephen Howe has engaged in any detail with the question of how the left interpreted the rise of anticolonial sentiment in the colonies in the post-1945 period.^v The internal conflicts endured by the Labour Party during the 1950s have also been chronicled in great detail by the participants, but the attitudes of the protagonists to colonial affairs and the role of international labour diplomacy are rarely mentioned in these accounts.^{vi} Gupta's forty-year old monograph is

probably still the most comprehensive overview of the wider Labour movement's engagement with imperialism but he casts the role of the TUC to the margins and, in analysing British Guiana, focuses on the impact of those British trade unions who expressed sympathy for colonial liberation.^{vii}

The institutional focus of this analysis leans towards traditional historical methodology but the emphasis on non-state institutions places it outside the narrow sphere of diplomatic history and borrows from the transnational approach to labour history, which has been pioneered by van der Linden.^{viii} Two powerful national labour confederations, in the form of the British TUC and the American Federation of Labor- Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), alongside international labour organisations, such as the ICFTU, exercised influence over the fate of British Guiana. An examination of the records of these organisations and the Labour Party reveals that, although labour diplomacy was conducted in close relations with the state, it had a measure of autonomy which justifies extending the analytical purview beyond national governments. From the Guianese perspective Jagan's cultivation of liberationist figures from the British metropolitan left, most notably the Movement for Colonial Freedom, also demonstrates the importance which local nationalists accorded to a form of politics which fell outside the sphere of state-to-state international diplomacy. However, as the story of Driberg's introduction to *Forbidden Freedom* suggests, these forms of transnational association were always precarious and often ineffectual. Guianese affairs did not float free from national contexts and the particular traditions forged within the nation state are relevant. It was the inherent inequality of the colonial relationship which enabled British Labour to impose solutions which reflected their priorities on to the Guianese labour scene, which had been developing its own traditions before the decisive intervention of 1953. Labour's paternalism in dealing with anticolonial nationalists, the militantly anti-Soviet line of the British TUC and tensions between liberationists and Atlanticists within the parliamentary party mark a distinctive national tradition. British social democrats tended to interpret colonial affairs through the lens of metropolitan and international conflicts rather than in terms of global processes of colonial liberation. Despite these caveats the late British empire provide a fertile field from which historians can respond to the emphasis which Price has given, in his gloss on a recent essay by van der Linden, to 'the importance of understanding that the local patterns and structures of labour's experience are locked into national and international networks.'^{ix}

THE GUIANESE CRISIS OF 1953: MILITARY INTERVENTION, CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM AND ANTI-COMMUNISM

Although Guiana occupies a marginal position in histories of British imperialism, its workers played a pioneering role in the organisation of labour within the empire. From the outset protests about conditions of employment were tied to wider political grievances. In 1905, under the leadership of the 21 year-old Hubert Critchlow, Guianese dockworkers organised a strike which developed into a wider rebellion against colonial authority. Critchlow was later responsible for the registration of the British Guiana Labour Union (BGLU) in 1922, a year after the passage by the local legislature of an enabling trade union ordinance. During the interwar period he solicited support from Labour party politicians interested in colonial affairs, including Frederick O. Roberts, who was a minister in MacDonald's first short-lived government and Arthur Creech Jones, who founded the Fabian Colonial Bureau (FCB) in 1940.^x Enlisting sympathetic politicians in the imperial metropolis was a means by which activists in the periphery could circumvent the conservatism of the local elites who comprised Georgetown professionals and plantation owners. From the perspective of the metropolitan left, the cultivation of leaders like Critchlow, who as he entered middle age became increasingly sympathetic to British imperialism, was regarded as a means to channel labour unrest.

In contrast to British conditions, labour radicalism in Guiana had an agrarian rather than an industrial tinge. The country had its dockworkers, its civil servants, its taxi drivers, its shopworkers and even its miners in the bauxite industry, but those who endured some of the worst labour conditions were the very large class of plantation workers. During the inter-war period incremental reforms were implemented against a background of enduring socio-economic stagnation in rural areas. Violence on the plantations was common and in the late 1930s a strike on the Leonora Estate in Demerara developed into a wider insurrection. In the aftermath of the rebellion, responsibility for organising agrarian labour fell to the Manpower Citizens Association (MPCA) which was registered in 1937. From the perspective of the Colonial Office, it was the duty of the MPCA and its leader Ayube Edun to curb anticolonial

militancy and find responsible ways of representing workers' grievances. Edun was a somewhat eccentric figure whose ambition was to establish what he called the Rational-Practical-Ideal state which would feature amongst its institutions a Supreme Council of Intelligentsia.^{xi} The assertion of more mundane demands for improved conditions on the estates elicited hostility from the Sugar Producers' Association but, the meliorism of the MPCA attracted the patronage of the Colonial Office and the Labour Party. By the early 1950s conditions on the sugar estates were still characterised by hopelessly inadequate housing, low wages and the looming threat of punitive action by employers against trade unionists. Even conservative Colonial Office figures recognised the limits of what had been achieved by incremental reform. Stephen Luke, who visited Guiana during the controversies of 1953, reported that although 'local employers remained old fashioned in their approach to labour problems, they have done much to improve the conditions of labour but much remains to be done. Some of the housing on the estates for instance is very bad indeed.'^{xii}

By this point the influence of Critchlow and Edun was being superseded by a new generation of radicals with a new critique which drew on a Leninist analysis of the relationship between colonialism and global capitalism. In temperament they were sceptical about incremental reform, in method they were conscious of the need to unite industrial and political struggle and in ambition they desired a radical rebalancing of relations between overseas capital and indigenous labour. The first into the field was Joseph Prayal Lachmansingh who found the Guiana Industrial Workers Union (GIWU) in 1946. Despite its name GIWU aimed to displace the MPCA on the sugar estates and the struggle over the right to represent these workers would dominate Guianese industrial relations for the next two decades. A precedent for future violence was established in 1948 when five supporters of a GIWU-organised strike were shot and killed by armed policemen at Enmore. By this stage the industrial movement had acquired a political wing in the form of Cheddi Jagan's Political Affairs Committee, which became a fully-fledged party on 1 January 1950. Jagan had read Marx's *Capital* while undertaking training in dentistry in the United States. He stated that it 'was later to open up whole new horizons'; at the time it provided a point of ideological concordance with his American wife, Janet Rosenberg, who was a member of the American Communist Party.^{xiii} On his return to Guiana he placed the meliorist politics of reform in a new context: 'Nationalisation of the sugar industry and indeed of all major industries is our ultimate objective. In the interim while British Guiana is still tied to British imperialism, with limited

constitutional powers, certain reforms should be undertaken to break the back of imperialism.^{xiv} Jagan's linking of the economic grievances of workers to political demands for democratisation and reform of the industrial regime would feature on the charge sheet of allegations levelled against him after the PPP won the elections of 1953.

Jagan's initial breach with potential metropolitan sympathisers on the British left was precipitated by disagreements over constitutional reform, while questions of industrial relations widened the scope of an established mistrust. Jagan initially followed the precedent established by Critchlow in seeking support among British progressive opinion, most notably the Fabian Colonial Bureau. One of the causes taken up by the FCB during Rita Hinden's time as Secretary was the Enmore killings and, at Jagan's request, she arranged for a parliamentary question to be asked on the subject in July 1948.^{xv} Three years later Hinden, and the historian, Vincent Harlow, visited Guiana as part of John Waddington's Constitutional Commission. Had a Conservative government been in power, it is unlikely that progressive figures such as Hinden and Harlow would have been appointed and, to that extent, the Attlee government could claim credit for the democratic reforms suggested by Waddington. During her visit Hinden established a 'very friendly' relationship with Cheddi and Janet Jagan and arranged to disseminate some of their work on the economic aspects of imperialism in Britain.^{xvi} Once the commission reported, however, amity was replaced by deep enmity. As well as proposing the establishment of universal suffrage, the Waddington Commission recommended offering greater powers to elected members than was available on the nearby islands of the eastern Caribbean. Six of the ten members of the executive were to be chosen from the elected members and given portfolios. From Hinden's perspective this was a generous package of reform but the PPP objected to the perpetuation of the usual colonial paraphernalia such as official representation on the executive and the retention of reserved powers by the Governor, all of which the report endorsed as a means of safeguarding British interests. Hinden interpreted the PPP's objections to these features of the new constitution as evidence of the 'totalitarian' instincts of the party's leaders.

Waddington, Hinden and Harlow did not anticipate that the PPP would win 18 of 24 seats in the legislature when the first elections under the new constitution were held in 1953. This success gave Cheddi Jagan, as Chief Minister, a sense of legitimacy but for Hinden, the PPP

was guilty of recklessness in office, particularly on the industrial relations question. When Lyttelton suspended the constitution she had helped devise, Hinden offered some tepid criticisms of the Conservative government, alongside unqualified condemnation of the PPP for attempting to establish ‘a “one party” state’ in British Guiana.^{xvii} As editor of the Gaitskellite journal, *Socialist Commentary* Hinden was the bureaucratic embodiment of the affinity between anti-Bevanism and anti-Jaganism and would continue her attacks on the PPP into the 1960s. Her affiliation with the Gaitskellites was significant because the controversy over the suspension of the Guianese constitution occurred in the midst of the British Labour Party’s greatest internal crisis since the split of 1931. Two elements in Guianese affairs stimulated anti-Jagan feeling among the Gaitskellite wing. Firstly, Jagan’s espousal of Marxism and the contacts he made with countries in the Soviet bloc had Cold War implications. According to intelligence reports Cheddi Jagan was reported to have met Czech officials in Prague during the summer of 1951 and Janet Jagan travelled to Rumania two years later. Both were also overheard by the devices of the Security Service when they visited the headquarters of the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB).^{xviii} For the Gaitskellites, scrupulous monitoring of Britain’s colonies for the potential emergence of communist influence was the colonial counterpart of their sponsorship of NATO in Europe. This factor became more significant once Washington declared that Guiana was a test case for Labour’s reliability as a Cold War ally; more pressing in 1953 was the perception among British trade unions that the PPP was promoting the interests of the nascent GIWU at the expense of the MPCA. One of the six new PPP ministers was Lachmansingh who was identified, along with Cheddi Jagan and Sydney King, as one of three ‘Extreme Left Wing’ ministers. Their attempt to introduce a Labour Relations Bill which would have enabled GIWU penetration of MPCA strongholds on the sugar plantations became a defining moment in the conflict between the colonial administration and elected ministers. Jagan’s argument that the bill was inoffensive rested on the fact that its contents were modelled on the American Wagner Act and were actually ‘aimed at minimising inter-union rivalry and preventing jurisdictional disputes.’^{xix} By contrast, the Governor, Alfred Savage, accused the PPP of exploiting labour unrest and employing coercion to promote the interests of its allies among the trade unions. During the course of a strike on the sugar plantations, the leaders of the PPP and GIWU were reported to have ‘vied with one another in seditious and inflammatory speeches.’^{xx}

British troops arrived in Guiana just as the Labour Relations Bill was due to be debated in the Legislative Council. Jagan's dismissal and the suspension of the constitution prevented its enactment. Plans to arrest the PPP leaders were never implemented because Savage did not want to risk alienating moderate opinion in the Colony.^{xxi} Consequently, Jagan was at liberty to fly to Britain in an attempt to mobilise metropolitan opposition to the constitutional coup. It was his misfortune that he arrived at a moment when the leaders of the British trade unions were aligning themselves with the Gaitskellites against the Bevanites. As Barbara Castle ruefully recalled the 'naked display of trade union power' in backing Gaitskell at a succession of Labour conferences gained the approval of the Tory press: 'It was not until the big unions swung left... that the newspapers began writing angry editorials about the iniquity of the block vote.'^{xxii} British trade union leaders detected parallels between their ongoing conflicts with communists inside their organisations and industrial relations controversies in Guiana. The future TUC General Secretary, George Woodcock, described the PPP leaders as 'mostly, young, vain and inexperienced' and, while recognising some differences between individuals, concluded that 'the more moderate elements were held firmly in the grip of their communist colleagues.'^{xxiii} Although the historiography on Bevanism pays scant attention to colonial affairs, secondary accounts of the Labour Party's internal conflicts of the 1950s emphasise that the leaders of the largest metropolitan trade unions were the most strident anti-Bevanites, while support for Bevan came mainly from constituency parties. To take one example from the historiography on domestic industrial relations, Jim Phillips has analysed the way in which Arthur Deakin's anti-communism was rooted in ongoing conflict with the left in the Transport and General Workers Union.^{xxiv} On the international front, the TUC cooperated with the Foreign Office in promoting the ICFTU and portraying the WFTU as a communist front organisation. After examining the TUC's relations with the Foreign Office's clandestine Information Research Department, Hugh Wilford concluded that 'a strong corporatist partnership continued to exist between the right-wing leadership of the labour movement and the British secret state in what was a joint front against communism in the unions.'^{xxv}

As Britain's trade union leaders extended their search for left wing infiltrators into the colonies the rivalry between the WFTU and the ICFTU provided a useful indicator of the loyalty of colonial unions. Unlike GIWU, the MPCA followed the British precedent by disaffiliating from the WFTU and joining the ICFTU which had the support of the American as well as the British labour movement.^{xxvi} Jagan could thus be accused of two counts of

promoting WFTU interests: he had sponsored a Labour Relations Bill designed to promote the interests of GIWU at the expense of the MPCA and he had established a close relationship with the WFTU's principal agent in the Anglophone Caribbean, the Jamaican trade unionist, Ferdinand Smith. These circumstances ensured that he did not receive a fraternal reception from the leaders of Britain's trade unions. The current General Secretary of the TUC, Vincent Tewson informed ICFTU representatives that he was more sympathetic to Lyttelton's position than to that of the parliamentary Labour Party and that this might generate a split between the industrial and political wings on Guiana.^{xxvii} The extent of hostility to Jagan became evident at a meeting of the National Council of Labour on 22 October, during which the question of his WFTU contacts was aired. Tewson stated bluntly 'the colonial people were apt to think that there was no danger of communism. They did not recognise what was actually happening before their eyes.' Deakin insisted that the WFTU had already penetrated the Caribbean and 'imbued the people with communist philosophy.' The President of the National Union of Miners, Will Lawther, suggested that communist trade unionists were utilising 'stooges' in the region.^{xxviii} The world view of Tewson, and the similarly inclined Lawther and Deakin, was predicated on the notion that, in combating Bevanism at home and the WFTU abroad, they were engaged in the same vital Cold War work.

On the same day as the NCL meeting Labour MPs vented their differing views on the Guianese intervention in Parliament. Jagan watched the debate from the public gallery of the House of Commons and was disheartened by the contributions of Labour's front bench.^{xxix} The party's colonial spokesman James Griffiths quibbled with Lyttelton over his justification for ousting the PPP, while insisting 'we stand by democratic parties and the democratic unions affiliated with the ICFTU.'^{xxx} Having met the PPP leader the day before, Attlee was more avid in his criticism of Jagan's government than he was of Churchill's. He reported: 'I have seen the leaders of the PPP and had a considerable talk with them. They did not in any way disabuse me of the idea that they were behaving extremely unwisely and that they were either Communists or Communist dupes. However I understand that there are these other elements, and the important thing is to appeal to those elements.'^{xxxi} Evidence of a division between Cold Warriors and anticolonialists on Labour's backbenches could be found in the contributions of John Hynd and John McGovern. Hynd offered the fewest qualifications in his defence of the PPP and was the most outspoken critic of Lyttelton's actions. In examining

the justification which Lyttelton had published he concentrated on the parallels between British domestic politics and colonial affairs: ‘much of this White Paper smells of the usual political boycott by big capital against this party. It smells of the Tory practice in this country, the establishment of rival unions and talk of destroying the economy.’^{xxxii} By contrast, McGovern, who had only recently left the Independent Labour Party, declared ‘Dr. Jagan and his party are a menace’ and criticised Griffiths for offering insufficient support to Lyttelton’s efforts to resist communist influence in the colonies.^{xxxiii}

While Jagan’s demands for radical economic change and his connections to the WFTU ensured that he was shunned by the right of the labour movement, they constituted an incentive for the various factions on the left to court him. From the moment he entered Britain he was placed under surveillance by the Security Services. Their investigations revealed a battle for Jagan’s allegiance between the Bevanites and the Stalinist leadership of the CPGB. One of the key elements of the Bevanite critique of the Labour leadership was that they were beholden to an American Cold War agenda and these suspicions gathered force when Attlee supported Truman’s intervention in the Korean War.^{xxxiv} On the home front the Bevanites were obliged to defend their left flank against the CPGB. In the pages of *Tribune*, the leading Bevanite MP, Ian Mikardo, parodied the influence of late Stalinist paranoia on the CPGB’s portrayal of the leader of the Labour left: ‘Aneurin Bevan’s real name is Al Bernstein, an American Jewish financier who speaks in a secret Welsh code.’^{xxxv} All of this had implications for Jagan whose status as a leading anticolonial radical made him the subject of a tug of love between the Bevanites and the CPGB which was observed and disdained by the British security services and the Labour right. An unnamed human source supplied information on Jagan’s contacts with the Bevanites and the CPGB after he arrived in London. A party at Bevan’s house was described as ‘the culminating point in a great effort made by the Bevan (sic) Group to do everything possible to “shield” Jagan from the Communist Party.’^{xxxvi} The two booklets which Jagan wrote to publicise the PPP’s interpretation of Lyttelton’s actions had prefatory comments by leading Bevanites: Driberg’s qualified endorsement for *Forbidden Freedom* followed the precedent set by Jennie Lee, who performed the same service for a pamphlet issued under the auspices of the Union for Democratic Control entitled *What Happened in British Guiana*.^{xxxvii}

His willingness to be wooed by both Bevanites and Communists did nothing to moderate the British unions' hostility to Jagan, while the qualified endorsement of the PPP offered by figures such as Lee and Driberg were sufficient to rile the Gaitskellites. These effects were evident when Jagan, Burnham and other Guianese politicians appeared before the NEC's sub-committee on Commonwealth and Colonial Affairs on 3 November 1953. Alice Horan of the National Union of General and Municipal Workers, was particularly dogged and critical when she quizzed Jagan about his connections to the WFTU. This theme was then taken up by Tewson who pressed Jagan to explain his relationship with Ferdinand Smith.^{xxxviii} It seems unlikely that Horan and Tewson would have been quite so well informed about Smith, who had spent his entire career as a political activist in the United States and was not a well-known figure in British politics, had they not been directly or indirectly briefed by the Security Service, who had in their possession a letter Jagan had sent to Smith encouraging the WFTU to take an interest in colonial territories.^{xxxix} Those with reservations about leashing the party too firmly to the American Cold War standard resented NEC instructions not to provide a platform for the PPP leaders. Many constituency parties were inclined towards Bevanism and 75 protested against the line which the leadership was pursuing on Guiana.^{xl} Mikardo and Driberg argued that the affair demonstrated the overbearing role of right-wing trade union leaders in setting the party's agenda on colonial affairs. In an article for *Tribune*, Mikardo registered his surprise that the Conservative Colonial Secretary 'has found a friend at last. Thirty friends in fact. To wit the members of the General Council of the TUC.' Mikardo's facetiousness led to a furious row. At Tewson's behest, he was rebuked for writing the article and for attending a meeting with Jagan in Reading. The passage of an official motion of censure was highly unusual but was enacted against Mikardo at an NEC meeting on 16 December 1953. *The Times* informed its readers that, during the discussions, 'the Christmas spirit of good will was noticeably absent'. Evidently they were well informed because the great chronicler of NEC squabbling, Richard Crossman, confirmed in his diary that the Guianese controversy had become a proxy for the wider conflict over the proper limits of TUC influence in the British labour movement: '...it was pushed to the normal vote and Nye made a sensational blow-up at this point, saying they were trying to pick us off one by one and wouldn't be successful. "Anyway" he concluded the vote is given by stooges of the TUC.' To which Alice Horan replied "Well your stooges of the Kremlin", and when asked to withdraw, said she would rather die than take back a word of what she believed to be true. Nye then left the room, I thought to go to the lavatory but in fact it was a walk-out

though none of us knew it, and he apparently didn't think it worth staying to deal with the Egyptian problem when it came up.^{xli}

The row over Mikardo's censure came at the height of the conflict between Bevanites and Gaitskellites and illustrated the numerous and often contradictory factors which influenced the development of Labour's colonial policy at this time: the implications for colonial territories of the conflicts between the WFTU and ICFTU, the ascendancy of anti-communists at the top of the British trade unions; the countervailing pressures exerted by the longstanding ties between the Labour party and nationalist activists in the periphery and the danger that, if the party discontinued this support, a more radical generation of activists would turn to the Communist Party for assistance. Given that these currents were pulling in different directions it is perhaps unsurprising that Driberg's endorsement of Jagan in *Forbidden Freedom* was hedged about with caveats. By the time *Forbidden Freedom* was published Jagan was in prison and his cause was taken up by two of the organisers of the new Movement for Colonial Freedom, Fenner Brockway and Jennie Lee.^{xlii} Alongside the emergency regulations in Kenya and the establishment of the Central African Federation, events in British Guiana were one of the three issues which provided motive and impetus for the establishment of the MCF. The new organisation was committed to liberationist politics and although it contained many Bevanites, its support extended beyond the Labour left. By the time of Jagan's return to power in 1957 the left-right split on colonial issues had become less pronounced but Labour's internal disagreements over foreign policy issues would continue to have ramifications for decolonisation. In particular, the increasing interest in Guianese affairs taken by policymakers in Washington, which occurred at the same time as the triumph of the revisionists, who were also champions of Atlanticism, provided a further illustration of the way that the colonial policy of the British Labour Party was distorted by the exigencies of Cold War fighting at home and abroad.

THE GUIANESE CRISES OF 1962-64: SUBTERFUGE, ELECTORAL REFORM AND ATLANTICISM

The second ousting of Cheddi Jagan in 1964 was a consequence partly of external manipulation, in which British and American trade unionists had a large role, and partly of the instability of Guianese anticolonial nationalism which was beset by overlapping class and racial divisions. As Rabe and Palmer have demonstrated Guianese politics became a preoccupation of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations^{xliii} Its geographical location on the American mainland made the political affairs of a colonial country of only half a million people an urgent priority at a time when Washington was determined to contain the impact of Castro's revolution. Once Washington became committed to the removal of the left-wing PPP government prior to independence, Labour's revisionists accepted that Jagan had to go. Although Britain's labour diplomats did not take on the role of subversives, as their American counterparts did, and some even expressed concern for the plight of the PPP government, the TUC again played a significant role in validating the Cold War calculations of the right of the parliamentary party. After Labour's 1964 election victory, Jagan's sympathisers in the MCF were unable to prevent Wilson's government from implementing the plan for electoral reform hatched by the previous Conservative Colonial Secretary, Duncan Sandys, with the express purpose of ousting Jagan. Any other policy, the revisionists argued, would tarnish their credentials in Washington. The Sandys plan exploited the fact that the interests of the sizable urban middle class in Georgetown, who were predominantly African-Guianese, diverged from those of the predominantly Indian-Guianese plantation workers whose support for Jagan's radical anticolonialism enabled the PPP to win victories in 1953, 1957 and 1961. Despite these successes, under the Westminster-style constituency system which the British introduced in their colonies, the PPP had never obtained support from 50% of the electorate. The electoral reforms proposed by Sandys and implemented by Wilson's government aimed to deny the PPP an absolute majority at the 1964 elections and facilitate a post-electoral pact between the disparate anti-Jagan forces of Forbes Burnham's People's National Congress (PNC) and Peter d'Aguiar's United Force (UF).

The scheme rested on the misapprehension that Burnham, who had led the majority of the Afro-Guianese members of the PPP out of the party in 1955, was a moderate in domestic affairs and a potential Cold War ally for the West after independence. With encouragement from anti-communist zealots in the American trade union movement Burnham portrayed himself as the reliable and pragmatic face of Guianese nationalism. His PNC party adopted a dual strategy comprising demands for electoral reform on the one hand and popular protest on

the other. The catalyst for violent opposition was an economic one, namely raising of taxes and the imposition of capital controls in the PPP's 1962 budget. American trade unions and the CIA had been complicit in the disorders which exacerbated racial tensions within the colony. Once the coalition was in place the American government was expected to end their efforts to subvert the Guianese government and to offer economic assistance. This in turn would smooth the path to independence. The Wilson government's response to these events was not based solely on internal Labour Party politics; Britain's financial dependence on the United States and the requirement not to aggravate the offence caused by differences over Indochina policy, constituted the crucial financial and diplomatic context. Nevertheless, in opposition, the Labour Party had criticised the introduction of a new electoral system as an unprecedented expedient which was likely to aggravate ongoing civil strife in Guiana. By once more pitching pro-Atlanticists on the right of the party against liberationists on the left, the question of whether to cancel the Guianese elections reopened controversies about the directions of the Labour Party's colonial policy which seemed to have abated since the suspension of the constitution in 1953.

Jagan believed that he was in a stronger position to rally metropolitan support than he had been in 1953 and judged that a victory for Labour in the 1964 elections offered the best opportunity to avoid the introduction of proportional representation. His account of events in *The West on Trial* begins by identifying Harold Wilson as a former Bevanite and therefore a potential ally. In order to emphasise the full extent of the subsequent betrayal, he then catalogues the public and private criticism of the Sandys formula made by Labour in opposition.^{xliv} When he returned to power after the 1957 election, Jagan established a *modus vivendi* with the colonial administration. During the next four probationary years Jagan's reputation was rehabilitated to the extent that the local colonial administration characterised him as a more plausible leader of an independent Guiana than Burnham who was accused by the Governor, Ralph Grey, of recklessly stirring up the racial resentments of his supporters. After Jagan's third election triumph in 1961 the Macmillan government made plans to make the country independent in 1962. There were, however, two elements of Jagan's programme, which endangered his chances of becoming the first Prime Minister of an independent country. The first related to his wider ideological position and, in particular, his rhetorical determination to place colonial subordination within the context of the wider operations of international capital. It was this which led to accusations that he was, either as Iain Macleod

suggested to Arthur Schlesinger an 'LSE Marxist', or, as Reginald Maudling rather more crudely put it, an 'utter fool and bloody bastard'.^{xlv} The sense that he would orientate Guiana towards the Soviet Union after independence was hardened by the visits he and his wife made to the eastern bloc. This injudicious ideological positioning left the Jagan's more vulnerable than those leftist anticolonialists such as Julius Nyerere in Tanganyika, who were more careful to distinguish their socialism from the Soviet iteration. Furthermore, unlike Nyerere, the Jagans were conducting their campaign for independence on the American mainland.

When he visited Washington in October 1961 Cheddi Jagan infuriated Kennedy by making disobliging remarks about American foreign policy which appeared to echo the increasingly anti-American tone of Castro's revolutionaries. From the discussions, Washington policymakers concluded that he could become the first leader of an independent communist state on the American mainland. Kennedy's Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, told Sandys and Douglas-Home that the administration 'considered it extremely serious to have another Marxist regime in the Western hemisphere... If the British Government insisted on granting independence considerable difficulties might arise.'^{xlvi} The hostility of American unions became a further factor in Kennedy's calculations. One familiar item of the PPP programme attracted particular attention from the ICFTU and the AFL-CIO, namely the reform of Guianese industrial relations regime which would challenge the domination of the MPCA among plantation labourers. The relentless pursuit of suspected communists by the legendary American trade unionist and former leader of the American Communist Party, Jay Lovestone, extended to British Guiana. Lovestone and his acolytes believed the promotion of nationalist influence within colonial trade unions such as the MPCA was a useful tactic in repelling attempts at communist penetration. The details of the AFL-CIO's Guianese adventures have been provided elsewhere and one example will suffice to indicate the nature of their involvement.^{xlvii} When Jagan mobilised his supporters in the renamed Guianese Agricultural Workers Union (GAWU) against the imposition of proportional representation, Lovestone's agent, Gene Meakins, was unembarrassed about the necessity to provide covert funding for thugs to attack its members. In a letter written from Guiana on 6 March 1964 Meakins argued that the MPCA strikers were intimidated by the GAWU, which had been formed in 1961 with support from Jagan's government. He suggested a solution: 'it is going to take money to keep bands of supporters organized throughout the estates to clash with GAWU to show the workers they need not be afraid. These supporters... would have to be paid to go off the

job...if it goes on for very long it is my assessment that the MPCA will need some financial support. It looks as though it going to amount to which side is the toughest with a club and the club wielders would have to be paid.^{,xlvi}

The TUC resented the meddling of their American counterparts in Britain's remaining colonies. Although they were ostensibly part of a united front inside the ICFTU, during the 1950s and 1960s, British and American unions engaged in frequent squabbles over the question of how best to conduct the Cold War against the Soviet-backed WFTU. British unions, working in close collaboration with the Colonial Office, maintained that nascent colonial unions should be non-political and restrict their activities to promoting better pay and conditions. Consequently they looked askance at AFL-CIO sponsorship of violent anti-government protests and strikes. American funding and direction were conspicuous first, in the protests against Jagan's 1962 budget, which increased taxes on the country's middle classes; then, during the strikes in opposition to the industrial relations legislation introduced by the PPP in 1963; and finally, in rallying support for proportional representation which Sandys had fabricated with the express purpose of defeating Jagan in the 1964 elections. According to reports received by the ICFTU 'there is little doubt that the MPCA could have continued without heavy financial assistance from the US labour movement.'^{,xlix}

The unease generated in the British labour movement by the use of strikes as a political weapon and the Cold War zealotry of the AFL-CIO was aggravated by doubts about the probity of their allies inside Guiana, most notably the MPCA, which dated back to the mid-1950s. At this time the TUC had hoped to reform and strengthen the Guianese industrial relations framework by offering £3,000 to 'responsible trade unions'. An official, Andrew Dalglish, was despatched to Guiana to advise on organisational matters. Dalglish reported in May 1955 'I had not been long in Georgetown before complaints were made about the MPCA'; while George Woodcock who supervised the Dalglish mission recorded 'it must be admitted that the MPCA was weak and in some districts unpopular and the rival GIWU does undoubtedly possess the support of many sugar workers.'¹ Seven year later Walter Hood, the TUC's agent in British Guiana, again noted the vulnerability of the MPCA to 'pirate unions' and suggested that the 'cancer' which weakened the union's defences was the dependence of its leaders on external subsidies, including from the American unions, rather than fee-paying

union members.^{li} With encouragement from the Colonial Office, the TUC directed additional funds towards the MPCA from April 1963 but such assistance became increasingly contentious once the extent of American encroachment into the country's affairs became apparent. Hood complained of the MPCA's determination 'to get rid of the Government'. Robert Willis, who attempted to mediate between the parties on behalf of the TUC, was shocked by the unwillingness of the MPCA to compromise and even formed a sympathetic view of Jagan.^{lii}

Despite their criticisms of the irregular conduct of the MPCA and exposure to the subterfuge in which both the British and American governments were engaged, hostility to Jagan trumped other considerations in TUC deliberations about reforming Guiana's electoral system. The Conservative government initially resisted Washington's call for Jagan's removal and the imposition of direct rule but agreed to postpone independence. This provided the necessary time for Sandys to devise a system of proportional representation which offered a means of propitiating Washington while maintaining an appearance of probity and due process. It also avoiding a repetition of the events of 1953 which would attract further domestic and international criticism. Although apprehensive about the likely consequences of American efforts to unseat Jagan, the TUC's International Office insisted there was 'no convincing alternative' to Sandys' proposals. Once again the communist affiliations of Cheddi and Janet Jagan, and their enthusiasm for the Cuban revolution were offered as justification. The attitude of Harold Wilson's ally, Frank Cousins, is instructive. His adventitious rise through the ranks of the TGWU in the 1950s presaged a leftward shift within British trade unionism which encompassed, in foreign affairs, a greater scepticism about any blanket endorsement of Atlanticism. Despite his association with anti-revisionism and the prevailing mistrust of proportional representation in Labour circles, after visiting Guiana Cousins did not reject the Sandys plan; he argued instead that it was unrealistic to expect Jagan's opponents in the Guianese trade union movement not to endorse the novel electoral system which Sandys had designed to dislodge the PPP.^{liii}

While anti-Jaganism in the industrial wing of the party generated some sympathy for Sandys' Machiavellian schemes, there was greater resistance to the electoral changes on the political wing. The singular nature of Sandys' reforms was one advantage which Jagan's sympathisers

among Labour MPs could exploit. The revised Guianese electoral system was based on the Israeli method of strict proportionality which effectively turned the entire country into one constituency; it was used nowhere else in the empire and was accompanied by auxiliary, clandestine measures to embolden the PPP's opponents and foster the emergence of new parties.^{liv} In its internal assessment the International Department of the Labour Party described the introduction of proportional representation as 'a blatant attempt to tilt the balance against Jagan'. Arthur Bottomley, who was Labour's spokesman on Commonwealth affairs, criticised the Sandys plan.^{lv} Speaking to official at the American embassy on behalf of the International department, David Ennals warned that Labour would oppose Sandys' electoral revision on four grounds: it was 'obviously designed to oust Jagan', would exacerbate racial grievances, cause political instability and, finally, would make Jagan 'more receptive to extremist advice.'^{lvi} In this spirit, during the first half of 1964, the founding father of the MCF, Fenner Brockway, bombarded Sandys with Parliamentary questions about Guianese affairs, much to the latter's irritation. On 24 March Brockway suggested that the introduction of the revised constitution should be postponed, while Bottomley warned of the consequences if Guiana's warring parties were not reconciled. Sandys responded: 'The outlook is not very rosy but I do not think there is anything further that I can do at this stage.'^{lvii}

While the Party's liberationists attempted to establish the basis for a reversal of Sandys's policies, the Atlanticists on Labour's revisionist wing were preoccupied with the consequences of Guianese policy for relations with Washington. As Black has explained, in the 1950s and 1960s the zealous anti-communism of Ernest Bevin was taken up by younger revisionists and modified further by an increasing sense of admiration and loyalty to the United States.^{lviii} Any slight ebbing in Cold War commitments caused by distaste for Sandys' methods was counter-balanced by a desire to propitiate two Democratic Presidents who had registered Guiana as a foreign policy priority. Despite misgivings about the constitutional manipulations of the Conservatives, the shadow Cabinet were conscious that a reversal of the Sandys reforms would infuriate the Johnson administration. During a visit to Washington in February 1964 the Atlanticist and revisionist Labour politician, Patrick Gordon Walker, in his capacity as shadow Foreign Secretary, explained that the application of the Israeli system to Guiana 'makes the entire system into one constituency' and signalled that this was unappealing to mainstream Labour opinion. However, he offered reassurance that Labour

was eager 'find a way to give independence to British Guiana without affronting or injuring the US' and even suggested that they would not object 'if a way could be found for the US to put troops into BG.'^{lix} During a trip to Washington two months later, Bevin's acolyte Christopher Mayhew rehearsed the differences in the party about Guianese affairs for the benefit of State Department officials. He began by forecasting that 'there might be a real dispute in a future Labor government regarding policy towards British Guiana' and then explained that 'Gordon-Walker would accentuate the importance of Anglo-American relations... whereas Bottomley would emphasise the traditional Labor policy of bringing colonies to independence as rapidly as possible under the chosen national leaders.'^{lx}

One of the reasons for the Bottomley faction's eventual capitulation was the revival of the old accusation, which had first been propagated by Gaitskellites and the TUC leadership in 1953, that Jagan's policies on industrial relations marked him out as a potential future dictator. In July 1963 Bottomley spoke to Brindley Benn of the People's Progressive Party about Jagan's efforts to introduce new trade union laws. He explained that he 'was under strong pressure from the unions and from members of the party who, rightly or wrongly, regarded the Bill as evidence that Jagan's was a tyrannical government intent on breaking the unions.' Later in the year, when Jagan attempted to persuade the Fabian Colonial Bureau to oppose the introduction of proportional representation, he found his credibility challenged by his old adversary, Rita Hinden. She endorsed the Sandys plan in a letter to *The Times* which stated: 'I have watched the record of the Jagan party ever since I was in British Guiana as a member of the Constitutional Commission and no longer have faith that its leadership will respect a democratic constitution which does not suit their book. On the other hand the democratic elements in British Guiana have struggled consistently against authoritarian measures. We owe them an opportunity now and it is difficult to think of any way of protecting their rights other than what the British Government has now proposed.'^{lxi} Jagan, who had once placed confidence in Hinden as a conduit for the dissemination of PPP literature in the metropolis, complained to the FCB that the views of their former colleague were 'disgraceful'. Jagan was increasingly dependent on the MPs aligned to the MCF to present the case against proportional representation in the imperial metropolis.^{lxii}

It was the appointment of a former chairman of the MCF, Anthony Greenwood, as the new Colonial Secretary in the Labour Cabinet, as well as Wilson's past associations with the Labour left, which fostered some vestigial hope within the PPP that 'it was just possible that the British Labour Government might have reversed Sandys' decision.'^{lxiii} What Jagan discovered was that the Atlanticists were fully in the ascendant on issues of foreign, commonwealth and colonial affairs. From the outset Greenwood found himself outmatched by Gordon Walker. As Jagan rushed to secure an early meeting with Wilson, Gordon Walker flew to Washington where he promised the American Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, that the new British government 'intended to go ahead with the British Guiana elections.' Meanwhile Jagan's potential allies disabused him of the belief that Labour would radically change the course set by Sandys in Guiana. Bottomley, in his new role of Commonwealth Secretary, talked to Jagan during the Zambian independence celebrations in Lusaka and explained that, despite his own earlier criticisms of Conservative policy, 'a Labour Government could not be expected to retrace the steps which had been taken.'^{lxiv} Wilson was keen on a post-electoral grand coalition between the Guianese parties and pressed this notion very hard when he met a despairing Jagan on 29 October. His counter-factual suggestion that, if Labour had won an election in June there might have been time to alter course, was cold comfort to Jagan who responded by making clear that the depth of American hostility to his party precluded any form of post-electoral alliance between the PPP and PNC. His assertion that the American government would 'do anything' to keep the PPP out of power was wholly justified. On 9 November Gordon Walker informed Wilson that Rusk was opposed both to the continuation of a PPP government and to the establishment of multi-party governing coalition containing Jagan. Rather than revise the Sandys electoral system, Wilson placed his hopes on the possibility that a Commonwealth mission might achieve some rapprochement between the Guianese parties.^{lxv}

The decision not to cancel the elections led to a party split along the expected lines. In his new capacity as Colonial Secretary Greenwood was obliged to explain to his former allies in the MCF why Wilson's government was pursuing a policy of continuity with the Conservatives. Ian Mikardo and Bob Edwards responded by reminding Greenwood that the Labour Party had 'strenuously opposed' the Sandys formula. His response mixed normative arguments, that a reversal of policy now would constitute 'a breach of faith' with Burnham and D'Aguiar, with pragmatic considerations, the most significant of which was that any

announcement cancelling the elections would require the deployment of British troops to Georgetown. Although Greenwood no doubt felt uncomfortable in pursuing a policy which alienated his old allies on the liberationist wing of the party, he was cognisant of the strong anti-Jagan sentiment of British trade unions who endorsed the Labour government's decision to implement Sandys' electoral reforms. On 17 November, Hargreaves, Hood and Nicholson of the TUC's International Department, met Greenwood and his officials. Despite their own irritation at the role of the American unions and the contrary evidence of the Willis mediation, they reiterated the line which had been taken since 1953 that 'the root of the British Guiana problem was the incompetence of Dr. Jagan's ministers.' According to the Colonial Office record of the meeting they even went as far as to declare 'that British Guiana needed a period of stable, right-wing government and were inclined to think that Burnham might provide it.' This showed a remarkable lack of prescience but at the time what most impressed the Permanent Under-Secretary, Hilton Poynton, was the evidence of lingering bitterness regarding Jagan's attempts to reform Guianese industrial relations. He commented on the minute: 'Yes, very illuminating. The Labour Bill still rankles I suspect.'^{lxvi}

It was fortunate for Wilson that the PPP failed to win an absolute majority in the December elections because any other result would have generated a crisis in Washington during his talks with Johnson. Instead, the way was cleared for Burnham's PNC to form a post-electoral coalition with the United Force. After the elections Labour's Atlanticists remained conscious of the obsessive interest shown by American policymakers in Guianese affairs. Initially Wilson insisted Burnham should serve an extended probationary period as Chief Minister before independence. A draft Colonial Office telegram to Georgetown composed in January 1965 even envisaged the possibility that Burnham's coalition with the United Force might split before independence was achieved and force the PNC to share power with the PPP. Gordon Walker spotted this danger to transatlantic harmony and demanded that Greenwood change the text. By this stage Wilson seemed increasingly resentful, or 'not happy' as the records put it, about the constant friction between liberationists and Atlanticists regarding Guianese affairs. The notion of a coalition between the PPP and the PNC had been precisely the outcome Wilson had envisaged during his meeting with Jagan but it would never be countenanced by Washington. A revised text was composed which acknowledged the possibility that the current government might collapse but instructed the Governor not to 'stimulate' the idea of a Jagan-Burnham coalition. The extant PNC-UF government survived

and, with backing from the United States, Burnham was able to force the pace of independence during the course of 1965. Guianese affairs continued to elicit the occasional grumble from the former Bevanite rebel and now Prime Minister. In April it was agreed that Burnham should be granted authority to call a state of emergency. It was decided by the Colonial Office that it would be undiplomatic to remind Burnham 'that the emergency powers would have to be withdrawn from him if he abused them.' Wilson commented: 'Reluctantly I agree, we've been on the run ever since the constitution was fiddled. If Burnham is the angel he's made out to be he would have agreed.' When Guyana obtained independence from Britain in May 1966, Burnham was still Chief Minister. Jagan remained out of office for nearly three decades. Obtaining this outcome had helped establish the Cold War credentials of Wilson's Labour government and this was not to be jeopardised by criticisms of American manipulation. As Gordon Walker explained: 'Co-operation with the United States on British Guiana is absolutely essential to good relations.'^{lxvii}

CONCLUSIONS

The extent of trade union involvement in Guianese decolonisation calls for some reconsideration both of the links between domestic politics and late imperial policymaking on the British left and the significance of transnational labour movements in shaping the end of empire. After their victory at the British polls on 15 October 1964, Wilson's Labour government pressed ahead with the Guianese elections which had been announced on 25 September and were scheduled for 7 December. This decision represented an endorsement of Sandys's plan to oust Jagan. It was also a triumph for the Atlanticists in the Party whose priority was pacifying critics of the PPP in Washington. In many respects it replicated the decision taken by the Attlee-led party ten years earlier to offer at least partial endorsement to the ousting of the first elected PPP government. At that time, and even without an American president to prod them, Labour's leaders reacted in a surprisingly complaisant fashion as Lyttelton removed the newly elected government in a display of unvarnished imperial force. As far as the Gaitskellites were concerned Jagan's cultivation of and by the WFTU, the Bevanites and the British Communist Party sealed his fate. To that extent, the end of empire in Guiana offers validation for Whiting's argument that decolonisation was marked by consensus and that the leaders of the two major parties found more in common with one

another than with right- or left-wing radicals in their own parties.^{lxviii} What has not been acknowledged is the extent to which the pull towards centre ground in the Labour Party was a consequence of the anti-communism in the British trade union movement. When liberationist impulse collided with Cold War exigencies the metropolitan labour movement prioritised the ongoing conflict with international communism, although in the case of British Guiana these calculations proved wholly unreliable. After independence Burnham established one of the most authoritarian and corrupt regimes in the Americas. He also confounded the expectation of Britain's Labour revisionists and the Democratic Presidents of the United States by establishing close relations with Moscow.

Burnham's victory was at least partially determined by the operations of a transnational network of labour institutions which in many respects mirrored more traditional forms of western imperialism. Nascent colonial unions were forced to choose between the ICFTU and the WFTU. Once evidence emerged that Jagan favoured the WFTU, his activities came under scrutiny by the British TUC. Vincent Tewson, Arthur Deakin and Frank Cousins all had their say about affairs in Guiana and what they said was that Jagan must be kept out of power even if this meant endorsing Conservative policy. Wider ideological affinities which stretched across frontiers were also at work, such as those between the Movement for Colonial Freedom and the PPP or between the AFL-CIO and the MPCA. The form of liberationism espoused by the Jagan in the periphery demanded the fusion of political and industrial relations struggles: the goal of economic justice for the labour force necessitated the acquisition of influence in the executive and legislative branches of the colonial government, while the support of the workers was essential if the nationalist goal of independence was to be obtained. This kind of analysis was persuasive to many members of the MCF but the fragile alliance they established with the PPP was thoroughly outmatched by the range of support which the MPCA could marshal. The success of the Guianese MPCA in securing recognition and funding from the ICFTU, AFL-CIO and, with some degree of hesitation and ambivalence, the British TUC enabled them to play a decisive role in destabilising Jagan's government. To that extent the conflict between the MPCA and its Jaganite rivals in the trade union movement was a proxy for divisions within the global labour movement. What is clear from the Guyanese case is that bilateral relations between colonial and metropolitan labour movements cannot be studied in isolation from these wider ideological and institutional

currents. And in this instance Cold War considerations trumped the anticolonial cause to which the British left was ostensibly committed.

ⁱ T. Driberg, 'Foreword' in C. Jagan, *Forbidden Freedom* (London, 1954), 5-6.

ⁱⁱ S. Howe, *Anticolonialism in British Politics: The Left and the End of Empire 1918-1964* (Oxford, 1993); K. O. Morgan, 'Imperialists at Bay: British Labour and Decolonization', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 27/2 (1999), 233-254.

ⁱⁱⁱ N. Owen, *The British Left and India: Metropolitan Anti-Imperialism* (Oxford, 2007).

^{iv} L. Ramcharan, 'Cold War in British Guiana 1953-1966: The Trade Union Dimension', *The Round Table* 94/1 (2005), 113-128; R. Waters & G. Daniels, 'The World's Longest General Strike', *Diplomatic History* 29/2 (2005), 297-307.

^v L. Black, "'The Bitterest Enemies of Communism": Labour Revisionists, Atlanticism and the Cold War', *Contemporary British History* 15/3 (2001), 26-62; Howe, *Anticolonialism*.

^{vi} E. Summerskill, *A Woman's World*, 208-9 (London, 1967), ch. 17; B. Castle, *Fighting all the Way* (London, 1993), ch. 9; H. Wilson, *The Making of a Prime Minister*; D. Healey, *The Time of My Life* (London, 1989), ch. 7; H. Dalton, *High Tide and After* (London, 1962), chs. 41-45; M. Jones, *Chances: An Autobiography* (London, 1987), ch. 7; M. Foot, *Aneurin Bevan: A Biography Vol. 2* (London, 1973), chs 9-11; I. Mikardo, *Back-Bencher* (London, 1988), ch. 9.

^{vii} P. S. Gupta, *Imperialism and the British Labour Movement 1914-1964* (London, 1975), 360-361.

^{viii} M. van der Linden, *Transnational Labour History: Explorations* (Aldershot, 2003).

^{ix} R. Price, 'Histories of Labour and Labour History', *Labour History Review* 75/3 (2010), 269.

^x O. Nigel Bolland, *The Politics of British Labour in the Caribbean* (Oxford, 2011), 145-6.

^{xi} C. Secharan, *Sweetening Bitter Sugar* (Kingston, 2005), ch. 7.

^{xii} The National Archives, Kew [TNA]: CO 1031/119, Luke to Rogers, 12 September 1953.

^{xiii} C. Jagan, *The West on Trial* (New York, 1967), 54.

^{xiv} Jagan, *Freedom*, 29.

^{xv} Rhodes House Library, Oxford [RHL]: FCB Box 138, Jagan to Hinden, 23 June 1948, Hinden to Jagan, 14 July 1948.

^{xvi} RHL: FCB Box 140, Hinden (Georgetown) to FCB, 17 February 1951, Hinden to Cheddi and Janet Jagan, 28 March 1951.

^{xvii} RHL: FCB Box 140, FCB(53)5, 'The Crisis in British Guiana' by Rita Hinden.

^{xviii} TNA: KV 2/3601, SB report of Cheddi Jagan's activities, 30 July 1951, TABLE reports, 29-30 July 1951, DG (London) to SLO (Trinidad), 8 November 1951, KV 2/3605, Extract from report, 9 July 1953, SLO (Trinidad) to DG, 11 August 1953.

^{xix} Jagan, *West*, 123.

^{xx} TNA: CO 1031/128, Political Report on British Guiana, 6 October 1953.

^{xxi} TNA: PREM 11/827, Savage to Secretary of State, 7 October 1953, Secretary of State to Savage, 7 October 1953, Savage to Secretary of State, 7 October 1953, Secretary of State to Savage, 8 October 1953.

^{xxii} Castle, *Fighting*, 206.

^{xxiii} London Metropolitan University [LMU]: TUC Collection, Marjorie Nicholson Papers, Box 44, file 927.8(520) Notes on PPP by Woodcock, 20 March 1954.

^{xxiv} J. Phillips, 'Labour and the Cold War: The TGWU and the Politics of Anti-Communism', *Labour History Review* 64/1 (1999), 44-61.

^{xxv} H. Wilford, *The CIA, the British Left and the Cold War* (London, 2003), 70.

^{xxvi} Robert J. Alexander, *A History of Organized Labor in the English-Speaking Caribbean* (London, 2004); H. Watson, 'Guyana, Jamaica and the Cold War Project' in Perry Mars and Alma H. Young (eds), *Caribbean Labor and Politics: Legacies of Cheddi Jagan and Michael Manley* (Detroit, 2004), 89-125.

^{xxvii} International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam [IISG]: ICFTU records, 5256, Krane to Oldenbroek, 15 October 1953.

^{xxviii} Labour Party Archive and Study Centre, Manchester [LPASC]: Labour Party International Department, Box 110, National Council of Labour, 22 October 1953.

^{xxix} Jagan, *Freedom*, 67.

^{xxx} *House of Commons Debates*, 5th Series, vol. 518, col. 2184.

^{xxxi} *Ibid.*, 2267

-
- ^{xxxii} Ibid., 2206
- ^{xxxiii} Ibid., 2234.
- ^{xxxiv} J. Callaghan, *The Labour Party and Foreign Policy: A History* (Abingdon, 2007), 194-8.
- ^{xxxv} M. Jenkins, *Bevanism: Labour's High Tide* (Nottingham, 1979), 211.
- ^{xxxvi} TNA: KV 2/3609, F4 Source Report, 24 November 1953.
- ^{xxxvii} RHL: FCB Box 140, *What Happened in British Guiana* by Cheddi Jagan with foreword by Jennie Lee.
- ^{xxxviii} LPASC: International Department, Box 110, Summary of Statements and Answers to Questions given by British Guianese Politicians, 3 November 1953.
- ^{xxxix} TNA: KV 2/3603, Civil Censorship, Austria (British Element), Postal Intercept, Jagan to Smith, 18 March 1953.
- ^{xl} S. Howe, *Anticolonialism*, 209-10.
- ^{xli} Modern Records Centre, Warwick [MRC]: Crossman Diaries, MSS 154/8/14, 18 December 1953.
- ^{xlii} *House of Commons Debates*, 5th Series, vol. 526, cols 1123-5.
- ^{xliiii} S. G. Rabe, *US Intervention in British Guiana* (Chapel Hill, 2005); C. A. Palmer, *Cheddi Jagan and the Politics of Power* (Chapel Hill, 2010).
- ^{xliiv} Jagan, *West*, 320-1.
- ^{xli v} John F Kennedy Library, Boston [JFKL]: Schlesinger Papers, Box WH 27, Schlesinger Memorandum of Meeting, 27 February 1962.
- ^{xli vi} Churchill Archives Centre, Cambridge [CAC]: Sandys Papers, DSND 8/20, Record of a Meeting at Carlton Gardens, 28 June 1962.
- ^{xli vii} Rabe., *Intervention*.
- ^{xli viii} George Meany Memorial Archive, National Labor College [GMMA]: Series 3/1, Box 17/3, Meakins to McLellan, 6 March 1964.
- ^{xli x} IISG: ICFTU 5266, Report on Bavin's Visit to British Guiana, 31 July- 8 August 1964.
- ⁱ MRC: MSS/292/932 9/2, Minutes of the TUC Colonial Advisory Committee, CAC2(1954-55), minute 13, 15 February 1955, CAC 4/1(1954-55), Report on British Guiana, 4 May 1955.
- ⁱⁱ LMU: TUC, Nicholson papers, Box 44, Hood to Nicholson, 4 July 1962, 20 September 1962, 2 October 1962.
- ⁱⁱⁱ MRC: Walter Hood to Hargreaves, 17 June 1963, Minutes of the TUC General Council, 24 July 1963, Report of Visit by Willis, 22 July 1963.
- ⁱⁱⁱⁱ MRC: MSS 292B/972.8/5, Hargreaves to Woodcock, 4 December 1963, Cousins to Woodcock, 24 January 1964.
- ^{liv} S. Mawby, *Ordering Independence: The End of Empire in the Anglophone Caribbean* (Basingstoke, 2012), 197.
- ^{lv} LPASC: International Department, Box #110, British Guiana: Talking Points by George Cunningham, 1 November 1963, Note on British Guiana (ud), Note by Arthur Bottomley,
- ^{lvi} National Archives, College Park, Maryland [NA]: RG 59, General Records of the State Department, Central Foreign Policy File 1963, Box 3840, Bruce (London) to Secretary of State, 8 November 1963.
- ^{lvii} *House of Commons Debates*, 5th Series, Vol. 692, cols 233-4.
- ^{lviii} L. Black, 'Enemies', 26-62.
- ^{lix} NA: RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files 1964-66: Political and Defense, Box 1947, Memo of conversation between Tyler, Burdett, Armstong, Judd and Gordon Walker, 19 February 1964.
- ^{lx} NA: RG 59, General Records of the State Department, Central Foreign Policy File 1964-1966, Box 1949, Memorandum of Conversation between Mayhew and Knox, 8 April 1964.
- ^{lxi} *The Times*, 7 November 1963, 13.
- ^{lxii} RHL: FCB Box 140, Postcard from Jagan to FCB Secretary, 8 November 1963.
- ^{lxiii} F. Birbalsingh, *The People's Progressive Party of Guyana 1950-1992: A People's History*, (London, 2007), Interview #17, Moses V. Nagamootoo, 14 November 1998, p.130.
- ^{lxiv} TNA: CO 1031/4407, Record of Commonwealth Secretary's Meeting with Jagan in Lusaka, 25 October 1964.
- ^{lxv} TNA: CO 1031/4407, Note of Meeting with the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary on 9 November 1964.
- ^{lxvi} TNA: CO 1031/4407, Note for the Record by Piper, 6 November 1964, Record of a Meeting between Secretary of State and TUC, 17 November 1964, Piper minute, 25 November, Poynton minute, 25 November 1964.
- ^{lxvii} TNA: PREM 13/137, Draft Telegram to Governor (ud), Gordon Walker to Greenwood, 5 January 1965, Note for the record (ud), Secretary of State to British Guiana (Luyt), 7 January 1965, Stacpoole to Mitchell, 2 April 1965 with Wilson minute.
- ^{lxviii} R. C. Whiting, 'The Empire and British Politics' in A. Thompson (ed.), *Britain's Experience of Empire in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford, 2012), 161-210.