

# SOCIALIST REVIEW

NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW, BUT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

**JOURNAL**  
for the  
**Industrial Militant —**  
for  
**International**  
**Socialism**

9th YEAR No 15

DECEMBER 1959

SIXPENCE

CONTINUING THE DEBATE ON

## THE WAY AHEAD FOR LABOUR

by Eric Heffer, Chairman, Liverpool Trades Council and Labour Party

THIS ARTICLE is not concerned with the analysis of voting in the recent elections, or the many statistical tables that have flowered so in the political journals. It is concerned with Labour's future, its policy and program, and the very meaning of its existence.

Jay

After the severe "setback" or "defeat" (according to one's viewpoint) that the Party has suffered, many hoped that an orderly but principled discussion would take place on its future. Jay's article in *Forward* (October 16) shattered that hope but at least now the conflicting tendencies are

in the first place, and later realised that the best way to secure these aspirations was to build a socialist society.

It is precisely this that the Jay-walkers wish to destroy. The Labour Movement realised a long time ago that "Radicalism and Reform", despite the good it could do, was insufficient; only socialism could bring the end of rule by an economic hierarchy and bring real social advance and justice. Yet the Jay-walkers want to turn us backwards and start from where the Movement left off long ago. What would be the point of a Party which merely put forward a policy of reforming capitalism but which did not attack the

if we "water down" our beliefs we shall win wider support. The contrary has been the case, we have lost support and particularly within the very sector we hoped to attract.

### Nationalization

We have to reassess our ideas, learn from experience, and then present a socialist program applicable to the modern age, tackling problems firmly, and so shake the lethargy which years of watering-down have created.

Nowhere is reassessment required more than on the question of nationalization and common ownership. Rejecting the viewpoint that we must drop it from the program and possibly the Party's constitution, we must nevertheless admit that rethinking is required on the subject. But rethinking of such a kind that doesn't destroy the basic principle but rather develops and strengthens it. Nationalization has been equated with bureaucracy and bureaucracy with socialism. This equation has been one of the Tories most effective ideological weapons in their attack on the principle of common ownership.

### Answer

First, the Labour Party has been too shamefaced about the achievements of the nationalized industries and, second, has, as a Party refused to admit the genuine mistakes that have been made. **We must be honest and admit that we did commit mistakes: we paid much too much compensation and so crippled the industries financially; secondly, although the workers' status was certainly raised to some extent, we failed to give them any real control or management, and therefore created a bureaucracy sometimes more difficult to deal with than the previous private owners.**

Labour's object in nationaliz-

ing an industry must not be one of making huge profits, but of creating a service to the community and of changing the status of the people who work in the nationalized industries. What does it matter to a man or woman if, after the industry has changed hands, his or her position as a worker remains unchanged? This is surely the fundamental question for us as socialists and we must give an answer.

### Not Identical

Let us reaffirm our belief in national ownership where necessary, co-operative ownership where it exists and can be extended and in municipal ownership where possible. However, in doing so we must also work out a system of workers' control and management and ensure that bureaucratic methods are not adopted. The present bureaucracies must be opposed and, even now, proposals made to transform the structure of nationalized industry. All ideas should be explored, but let us beware the pseudo-syndacalism of Grimond with his so-called co-partnership. The interests of workers and employers are not and cannot be identical. First things first, power must be taken from the hands of the monopolies, the big businessmen and the state they support; thereafter, in the process of developing the new, the workers' position will be automatically transformed.

### Youth

Having re-affirmed our belief in our basic principles, what to do? Firstly, I think we must begin to build a Youth Movement that is given its head. The Party booklet, *The Younger Generation*, contains much that is important and useful but says nothing on

● contd. on page 8

### CONTENTS

- Trade Union Commentary page 2
- Shillally page 3
- Challenge to Tories page 4
- Labour and Class page 4
- Youth page 5

openly before all to see, the "whigs are on the green" and at long last fundamentals will be fully discussed. For that, and only that, we should indeed be grateful to Douglas Jay.

### Workers' Party

What does Labour exist for? This is the question that, in view of the stream of 'thought' coming from the Right-wing, must be asked. Does the Labour Party exist to put MPs into Parliament at all costs, on almost any program, or does it exist because it believes in a certain type of society, one fundamentally opposed to capitalism? Did the pioneers fight elections merely to become MPs, or did they try to become MPs for a serious purpose? The answer is obvious. The Party was built and developed on the basis of its support for working-class aspira-

whole basis of capitalist society? The abuses of capitalism spring from its very nature, and not just because Tory leaders are misguided or evil men.

Jay's answer is that Labour should jettison its whole basis, no longer represent the working class (who apparently no longer exist!) and turn back from a real attack on those who wield power in capitalist society. My advice to him and his co-thinkers is: go and join Grimond, don't bring your Liberal-Radical ideas into the Labour Party. In fact you have already influenced the Party too much and over too long a period in the past. As Bevan said in his *News of the World* article after the elections, "socialism wasn't an issue", when, I am sure, the mass of members would have wanted it to be.

Their argument has been that

**CRISIS IN INDIA, pages 6—7**

# INDUSTRIAL AFTER THE ELECTION—John Phillips discusses

## THE TRADES UNIONS AND THE TORIES

THE defeat of the Labour Party at the General Election is going to mean, among other things, a lot of re-thinking and heart-searching on policies and ideas within the party. In the immediate aftermath there has been much discussion on the possibility of a Lib-Lab union, a big left-right split in the movement, where Bevan is going to move next, etc., etc., and not much has been heard of the effect another five years of Tory rule is going to have on the Trade Union movement.

I think first we must examine a couple of factors which had a direct result on the election. It was seen quite clearly that in areas of higher than average unemployment such as the Lancashire cotton belt, Scotland and Northern Ireland the Labour Party made substantial gains. In the Midlands, however, the Tories romped home purely on the factual evidence of increased prosperity and standard of living. Also in the new towns around London, like Harlow and Stevenage where Labour expected to win on the influx of working class votes, the swing was against them.

Again Labour received a blow from the 21-30 age group, who unlike the solid block of ten million supporters haven't had the struggle against unemployment or the bitter fight even to maintain living standards.

Of course this all looks rather grim. It is very easy to say that because the post-30's generation are not attracted to Labour then in successive elections the Labour support will dwindle until it becomes non-existent.

### Shop Stewards

Fortunately it is not as black as all that. For even though the younger generation in particular are becoming increasingly apathetic towards a party of only moderate reforms when it comes down to pure bread and butter issues at workshop level they can be just as militant as any of their more experienced workmates. There we have then this contradiction of better off, suburbanized workers showing an almost classless attitude in the political arena

and yet still proving their true class position when faced with real issues in the factory.

Secondly, we should try and analyse what the victory for the employers will mean in their attitude towards the unions and shop stewards. There has been some talk, even before the election campaign, of legislation to limit powers of shop stewards committees. On this point it is difficult to guess how far the government will go in having such a showdown with the grass roots of trade unionism. As far as predictions can go it seems safe to say that they will not openly attempt such a thing at the moment. **For as much as the Tories would like to smash the shop stewards even they know that to bring politics onto the shop floor in such a way would in the long run damage them politically.** They are quite happy with the present situation of politics separate from industrial problems. It will have to be done in a much more subtle way if at all.

The most obvious is that pressure will be brought to bear on the trade union bureaucracy to try and get them to do the dirty work.

### Within Unions

This is quite possible and will be attractive to the trade union official, because any lessening in power of the shop stewards will mean that the rank and file will have to rely more and more on the paid official. In fact the way the Municipal Workers Union got their own back on the oxygen strikers after the election (and the ecstatic response this brought from the "Daily 'wildcat' Mail") shows a trend. Also the banning of the two unofficial shop stewards meetings by threatened expulsion by the AEU confirms this, although we mustn't be too rash and say this is a completely new trend. Labour officialdom has always frowned upon its flock when it wants to go into new pastures, but with the increased strength of the right wing the officials are more confident that no real organization will be set up to oppose them, and even if one appeared, at present it could be

easily smashed.

If we then agree that the right wing is on the offensive the fight against them can only be in one direction. It cannot be done by organizations outside the movement offering tempting dishes of militancy and revolution at bargain prices as a palliative to the backwardness and apathy of the movement.

That leaves the left with only one alternative—to organize within the trades unions. What must we organize around? Since the war, and even more so now, we have the situation where the pattern of industrial disputes have been localized around limited issues thus divorcing worker from worker, factory from factory, and industry from industry. This has been because by being separated from their union officials workers really have no central organization where local issues can be co-ordinated into a national policy. This can only be achieved by

democratizing the movement.

This would mean fighting for the election of ALL officials, particularly those on policy making committees, and the right of immediate recall of those officials, therefore making the official directly responsible for the demands of the rank and file, it means bringing officials to within shouting distance of workshop conditions by seeing that they get no more than the average skilled wage ruling in the industry they are bargaining in. It means exercising the basic democratic right of organizing unofficial opinion within the union ranks.

It is only along these lines that we can ensure that our union machinery connect up local, sectional struggles into a broad movement and that the leadership is sufficiently dynamic and far-sighted to knit the entire movement around a struggle for basic demands such as the forty-hour week.

### Nigel Harris Reviews

## Jim Crow Guide to the U.S.—S Kennedy

THIS is a very unpleasant book.

It is not deep, and only incidentally searching in relationship to social conditions, but effectively it demarcates the area of American affluence and the grotesque conditions that exist outside that area. Moreover, it concisely pinpoints America's tacit acceptance of implicit apartheid, the ignorance of much of the American public of what is happening on its own doorstep, the tolerance and sometimes open support of racial discrimination that goes right the way up through the administration.

In a country which has a population whose physical characteristics are roughly similar, social depression of a specific group is less clear than where the exploited can be pinpointed as easily as can the racial minority groups of America. Sucked in by a variety of economic means (or exterminated by invasion as with the Red Indians), the racial minority is maintained in a state of poverty and persecution as a reserve army of labour — prosperity obscures their function and absolute deprivation without relieving any of the horror of their relative position.

Once the system is laid down then a variety of ideological means are used to maintain the subjection—most of them devolving into a crude Nazi theory of racial superiority (cf. Imperial Wizard Simmons: "The Anglo-Saxon is the typeman of history." To him must yield the self-centred Hebrew, the cultured Greek, the virile Roman, the mystic Oriental. The Psalmist must have had him in mind by poetic image when he struck his sounding harp and sang: "Oh, Lord: Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels and hast crowned him with glory and

## BOOKS

honour", or the slightly blunter Senator Eastland, Chairman of the Senate Sub-Committee on International Security: "I believe in white supremacy, and as long as I am in the Senate I expect to fight for white supremacy . . . Asiatic exclusion and Negro repatriation are the eugenic ideals"). And when a morality of this kind can be successfully generated, solitary individuals can do more than conform lest they too be made pariah. The fantasy of race obscures all conflict as it did in Hitler's creed—class-lines are lost in race-lines (cf. the modern program of the Welsh Nationalist right-wing) and the battles are lost in irrelevancies.

### Conditions

Sixty years ago, a Populist leader put it to a mixed audience that: "You are kept apart in order that you may separately be fleeced of your earnings. Racial prejudice is the keystone of the arch of financial despotism that beggars both". For ordinary individuals in the twenty-nine states of the South, the conflict is too great and the morality too strong—only if the leaders of the South can be driven to make other pronouncements than they do make, will the moral impulsion be peacefully thrown back on individual choice.

It is significant that the emotional aspect of discrimination can only be maintained en masse, in relationship to a community—mobs generate the fever, store-keepers watch their white patrons when they abuse. More sophisticated arguments arise—such as that of the openly acquiescent unions: "Why risk gutting the organization in the interest of a gesture, however worthwhile?", which is the permanent seal of

● See next page

## S R EDITORIAL

At the time of writing, we still don't know whether Gaitskell and the rest of the Party's right-wing leadership are going to swing farther to the Right or just drift in that direction. Of one thing we are sure—the direction. The leadership is bent on continuing in the suicidal path they have been following from defeat to defeat every since 1950. Once again they are playing the Tories' game by hunting the "wildcat", ensnaring the shop-steward, and killing rank-and-file initiative.

We have to know what we're fighting for. We have to continue the debate beyond Conference. Labour's Right must not be allowed to get away with the murder of the movement. Once again, we are devoting a large part of SR to the fundamentals of socialist policy. Once again we are hoping to make our contribution, be it ever so small, to the debate on the future of our Party, to the strengthening of the Left within it.

## Short Story

## MEETING THE PEOPLE

by Shillaly

"I was rather hoping that the 'Meet the People' campaign would be abandoned", said the new Prime Minister to the Party Chairman. The Party Chairman gazed at him in horror "abandoned!" he exclaimed "why it is the main plank in our program!"

"I feel it was rather undignified for my predecessor to make his exit while dancing the Wonky with a group of teenagers", the PM remarked timidly. "Of what importance is dignity", replied the Chairman "why the National Press called him a martyr who died preserving our National-heritage. "Of course", he added "if you feel unsuited to the immense tasks before us we will be willing to consider your resignation". "Oh no, indeed no", said the Prime Minister hastily, "I am quite ready to do anything you suggest".

"Very well", replied the Chairman, "our Publicity Manager has arranged a tour, the details of which you will receive in a few days. In the meantime, he has instructed me to send you to Molita's Dancing Academy to learn the Chunky, the very latest thing in dancing so I am told." "Thank you", said the Prime

Minister courteously, but he could not suppress a small sigh. "Pint of M and B Mike" ordered Big Bert. He was sitting in his customary place in the Crossed Garters. "Beer gets worse an' worse 'ere", he remarked to his mate Charlie. The two men gloomily contemplated the beer for a moment. Charlie nodded towards a group of men playing solo, "look at old Sam over there. Can't lose tonight. Must 'ave picked up a quid by nah". "Well the other blokes ain't so 'ot at the game", replied Big Bert.

Charlie was about to make another remark concerning solo and card games in general when the door opened and a well-dressed, small, bald man entered. He half-bowed from left to right and walked to the bar. Behind him came two men in grey trilby hats. Bert's practised eye told him that these two were detectives. Following the detectives came a dozen camera-men and newspaper men.

Sam was about to pocket his winnings, when looking round he saw the two detectives. In the local idiom he "went white". "Bleedin' raid", he muttered to himself and hurried out of the

pub. "Sam don't want his money", remarked his mates gleefully, and returned the cash to their pockets.

"I've seen that geezer somewhere", Bert murmured to Charlie. "So 'av I", replied Charlie in a puzzled tone. The bartender was quickly and happily pouring out whiskies and sodas. "Been a fire mate or", he added more hopefully "a murder?". "PM", replied one of the newspapermen. "Something happened this evening", Mike murmured to Maggie, the barmaid, "bloke just said PM. That stands for night time".

"I know 'oo that geezer is nah", said Bert "saw 'im on the telly up the Eagle. 'E's the Prime Minister". Bill the beer ponce was listening. "You mean the Guv'ment?" he asked and without waiting for a reply he was sitting at the little man's table. Bert and Charlie could hear him explaining how he had supported the Prime Minister and the Party since he was a nipper. "I've suffered for the corse", he declared. "'ad bricks and milk-bottles frown at me". "So 'e 'as", muttered Charlie, "but not for the corse", replied Bert.

Then Bella came into the pub. She was usually known to Bert and his mates as "that tart out of Limbo Street, dim as a candle". "What's going on?" she asked. "Film director from 'Ollywood looking for a leading lady", replied Charlie, winking at Bert. Bella made her way to the little man's table. "Allo", she said "can you and I get together?" She waggled her large hips from side to side, then she turned round and

gave the little man the benefit of her rear view for a moment. Turning back again she stretched her mouth into a broad smile.

"Oh, yes, of course", replied the little man, looking rather uncomfortable, "we particularly want the support of the ladies". "Or leading ladies?" Bella asked archly "come 'ome with me and we'll go over the script". The little man was saved from replying because the door burst open and in came Dick who was known as a plain speaker. "Bleedin' well meetin' the people is 'e", he shouted, "let 'im meet 'em up my street. All our ceilin's are comin' dahn, pools of water on the floor, and the bleedin' landlords are putting up the rents". One of the detectives moved over to Dick. Dick did not go quietly, but he went.

By then a crowd of people had collected outside the pub and two squad cars had arrived. It took them about ten minutes to clear the crowd and the Crossed Garters had two broken windows.

One of the detectives came up to the Prime Minister. "Clear off or you'll be done for soliciting", he whispered to Bella. She gave him a nasty look, but she left the pub. "There has been a mistake, sir", he said to the Prime Minister "apparently the local officials of the Party are waiting in a public house in the next street. Shall we proceed?" "I'd like to go home", murmured the little man rising to his feet and tottering to the door. The two detectives and newspapermen followed him and a deathly silence settled on the Crossed Garters. "Two pints of M and B Mike," Bert ordered.

## • Jim Crow Guide — continued

the status quo.

The conditions for coloured existence in America must be read to be believed—discrimination extends throughout the whole social contact of the coloured man's life, in recreation, religion, education, politics, law, housing, breadwinning and so on. The situation is widespread throughout the United States and not merely in the South — however, the South maintains the situation through a variety of legislative means as well as violent social pressures; the North operates more on English class-lines: jobs are difficult in all but unskilled positions, housing is zoned, etc., university and college education is widely discriminatory.

**In the great Reconstruction period after the Civil War in the last century some firm measure of unsegregated life was established—for example, a proportionate number of Negroes sat on State Legislatures (one in three people are Negro in the Southern States), there were seven Negro Congressmen and one Negro Senator. Now there are none—and none sitting even in municipal councils.** Through a variety of social and legislative pressures, the Negroes are prevented from voting — a 1948 survey estimated that "the total number of persons not voting in eleven Southern states because of the poll-tax and other local reasons" was 7,700,000.

The unions have not taken up the battle and the forcible emancipation of foreign territories has not produced an ideological revision—nor has prosperity. The racial minorities (which include, when Negro open slave traffic was brought to an end, Chinese and Japanese) are a group outside the basic definition of "man"—even the legislative help given to

the Negroes does not help the other groups. The Red Indians, a million or so when the first white men crossed America and a quarter of a million by the 1930's, have been exterminated by direct violence, by economic dispossession (being driven into desert regions), by the disease and starvation following upon their position. The average expectation of life of the Pueblo Indians is seventeen years—scarcely enough to reproduce the nation. The Negroes have the highest crime rate in the country, their expectation of life is ten years below that of the white population. Negroes are five times as likely as whites to contract tuberculosis, eight times as apt to get syphilis, and so on.

"The real problem is not the Negro but the white man's attitude towards the Negro." (Bailey). Patriotism, Imperialism, and Racialism find a common source in the tribal morality which always raises irrelevant issues to obscure the basic situation, to blanket ignorance, to keep the sensitive conscience clean. This book, too detailed and extensive for a short review to do it justice, must be read not as an excellently close survey of a diehard last stand, but as the description of a very real state of affairs. It is a state of affairs our betters are disposed to ignore in the interests of international demands, a state of affairs the United Nations passes over, that the South Africans are trying to emulate, and we as socialists must face if moral statements are to lose their exclusionist qualifications. We do not have to be Communists (and this is the first American counter-charge) or remotely sympathetic to Communists to believe that race is not a condition for the application of human rights.

## IT'S RICH

"History is mainly concerned with putting the rate of interest in its place"—George Schwartz, *Sunday Times*, September 20.

"If we didn't have any washing machines, and electrical appliances for the home, we could produce a sputnik"—Sir David Eccles, Minister of Education, Speaking at Newcastle, November 9.

"The majority of people sent to Gokwe (detention area) appreciate the efforts being made to rehabilitate them, but a few trouble-makers are making it impossible at present for this to come about"—Mr. Jack Quinton, Southern Rhodesian Acting Minister of African Affairs, *Times*, November 4.

"He was asked about another boy who was made to sweep the yard for days 'rather in the manner of a glasshouse'. Mr. Price said he would not agree that this was pointless; it was, he said, a genuine attempt to try to do something positive with a difficult boy"—*Times* report on Carlton School enquiry, November 7.

"If Labour is ever to persuade the nation that it can govern a prosperous Britain, the Socialist True Believers will first have to suspend their moral disapproval of the high profit-making private sector"—John Beavan, *Observer*, November 8.

"There's nothing better than a lorry to get rid of a few people"—Pc. O'Hara at the trial of the printworkers, Old Bailey, November 11.

"We don't want to see a change in the social order of your country" — Krushchev, to leaders of the CIO-AFL, San Francisco.

"It is known that historically formed close bonds exist between Algeria and France"—Krushev, speaking to Supreme Soviet, October 31.

"For this (getting the housing program restarted in Stepney) is the real socialism, not some pie-in-the-sky idea of revolution"—Cllr. Solly Kaye, *Daily Worker*, September 17.

"The first requirement of a person who seriously believes in theory is to put himself right with the historical reasons for his development" — Gerry Healy, *Labour Review*, October-November.

"Title or not, I know that I shall still be Herbie to the boys"—Lord Morrison of Lambeth.

"It's poor without readers' contributions"—SR Editor.

We are happy to reproduce from last month's issue of  
**THE PLATFORM** rank-and-file busworker's journal

**FORUM**

## LET US CHALLENGE THE TORIES by 'punch'

WHEN, in 1945, the British workers and returning soldiers united to put the Tory Government of Winston Churchill into the garbage can, they carried out the operation with a thoroughness that left Fleet Street and the political "experts" gasping. A new page in British political history was written. The common man, it appeared, was on the march.

Fourteen years later, a general election has returned that despised and rejected Tory Government for the third time in succession with an increased majority, to the thunderous cheers of Fleet Street, the stock exchange, financiers, landlords, and every cheap chiselling crook from Land's End to John O'Groats.

### 1945 Election

How do we explain this? Are we to assume that Viscount Montgomery is right after all — that the British working class is, in fact, "barmey"? Or is there a fundamental political explanation?

When the British electorate voted in 1945, soldiers of the first world war marched into the polling booths side by side with their sons returning from the second world war and their women folk from the bomb-scarred cities. We were a united people who, in the space of one lifetime, had been forced to endure two murderous wars and two decades of mass unemployment.

In 1945, the British worker voted from his heart, as never before in our political history. He voted for a new deal, for a new society. He voted for an end to destruction, disease and dirt. He voted for peace and progress, for human dignity and decency.

He had been tricked once before with the promise of "A land fit for heroes to live in." This time he would not trust the politicians of the old school. Not even the great "father figure" of Churchill could save the Tories. The British people wrote a blank cheque for a Labour Government to begin to build a new society at home and enduring peace abroad.

### 1959 Election

The Tory majority of 1959 is the measure of the failure of the 1945 Labour Government to live up to the high ideals and aspirations of the people. Elected to apply socialist policies to problems at home and abroad, the Labour Government quickly emerged as the champion and defender of capitalism on all fronts. Wage restraint and devaluation allied to sharply rising prices undermined the living standards of the people at home. Servile acceptance of American domination through Nato, support of the Korean war and of German rearmament — all these

policies bore the authentic hallmark, not of Socialism, but of Toryism.

The first ever British Government presented itself to the world with a Fabian tract in human brotherhood in one hand, and a hydrogen bomb in the other. Thus did they dig their own grave and guarantee the return to power of the Tories. That the architects of this disaster should have the brass nerve to blame the working class for the consequences of their own political bankruptcy, is surely the most nauseating spectacle of all time.

And where do we go from here? In their defeat as in their victory, the right-wing clique that dominate the Labour Movement show that they are a world apart from the man on the factory floor. The conclusions they draw from the election result hardly differ from those of Fleet Street and the Tories themselves. In effect, they say:

Britain is no longer a nation of two classes, but one equal society. The class struggle is old fashioned and out of date. Let us, therefore drop such terms as "Socialism" and "Working Class". Let us even drop the name "Labour". After all, it has such a horrid, common ring that smells of the Old Kent Road. How could any self-respecting millionaire be expected to join such a Party?

What sort of political dopes do they think we trade unionists are? Do they really believe they can

kid us that £10 a week Nobby Clark who drives a bus is the twin brother of £200 a week Sir Brian Robertson who drives Nobby Clark? Is Judy O'Grady the clippie, really a sister under the skin to Lady Muck? Are Charlie Brown of Wapping and Sir Bernard Docker just a couple of old-age pensioners enjoying a spree under the welfare state? Is there really no difference between working for a living and having ten thousand other blokes doing it for you? No difference between the exploiter and the exploited?

No class system, eh? So long as we have a capitalist system — so long will we have classes. So long as we have classes — so long will we have class warfare — and, so long will we trade unionists stand in the front-line trenches in that war, whether we consciously recognise it, or not.

If the Labour Party is to survive there must be a return to basic socialist ideas and policies accompanied by a drastic pruning of much dead wood at the top. Frank Cousins sounded the note for this when, at the recent T.U.C., he said:

**"What we want is a Labour Government pledged to genuine socialist policies."**

If the entire Labour and Trade Union Movement is roused and united for a genuine fight for its already declared aims, then despite its apparent strength, this Tory Government can be brought down long before its 5-year term

is completed. When the whole Labour Movement is inspired and in action it will prove invincible. But let the next five years of Labour "opposition" follow the pattern of the last five years — and the Tories might well still be in power when the 21st Century dawns.

The present situation demands, above all, some central issue around which the entire Labour Movement can be rallied for action NOW without waiting for the 5-year parliament to unwind its weary length. Such an issue is the 40-hour week, which is the declared aim of every major trade union in the country — a claim that is a hundred times justified by present day conditions throughout industry.

Here is a golden opportunity for Frank Cousins to justify bold words about "genuine socialist policies" by leading the whole trade union movement on this great issue.

**It was a loud election boast of Macmillan and the Tories that our economy was booming — that the nation was never more prosperous. Very well. We can challenge him on his own ground. Let the working class share in that prosperity — in the shape of the long-awaited 40-hour week. Here is common ground upon which the Labour Movement can challenge Toryism and set into motion the revival so urgently needed.**

## THE CLASS CHARACTER OF THE LABOUR PARTY by P Mansell

THE LABOUR PARTY, alone among the three major parties that have dominated the British Political scene in the last hundred years, openly proclaims its class character.

Its very name identifies it with the working class. The Tories label themselves Conservatives or Unionists or what you will, but they never label themselves the Landowners' Party or the Tycoons' Party. The Liberals have never called themselves the Party of the Middle Class or the Shopkeepers' Party.

This difference is not accidental. Any capitalist party must hide its class character even from itself. Because it represents the interests of a minority class, it must claim to be above class and "national", hoping thereby to appeal for support from the working class, or from sections of it at least. It must confuse and blur the deep class contradictions that lie at the heart of capitalist society.

### Awareness

A party of the working class has no need for such subterfuges. It represents the majority class

in a capitalist society, and represents the genuine national interest infinitely better than a capitalist party. If it is true to its class position and imbued with Socialist consciousness, it is proud of representing the class which alone is progressive and capable of carrying society forward to its next and higher stage. This awareness of present, and even greater potential, strength is an essential

element in the ultimate victory of the working class.

But the working class character of the Labour Party goes far deeper than a mere name. Even fascists use the name (National) Labour. Its main distinctive feature is its close association with the trade unions, the organ of

● See next page

### BUILD THE SOCIALIST REVIEW!

Please send a free trial copy of SOCIALIST REVIEW to the following:

Name.....

Address.....

Name.....

Address.....

Name.....

Address.....

Send to SOCIALIST REVIEW,  
35b Priory Terrace, NW6

### ● Labour and Class

working class industrial organization. As we all know, the Labour Party was the child of the trade unions. The Socialist groups that preceded it made comparatively little headway largely because they lacked any organized connexion with the unions (even though prominent individual trade unionists were often among their members). As the Labour Party developed, a place was found for individual members, in addition to membership through affiliated organizations; constituency parties were formed; the Parliamentary Labour Party developed on its own lines.

Nevertheless the connexion between the two wings of the movement has remained intimate on all levels, from the top brass of the NEC, down to the level of the constituency party to which local trade unions affiliate and send delegates to General Management Committees, etc. In the eyes of the great majority of workers, the Labour Party is **their** party and it can count on a massive, instinctive loyalty from these workers. All this, of course, does not exclude the fact that the leadership of the Labour Party can and does play a reactionary and often anti-working class role. But the character of the leadership does not define the character of the party.

#### Argument

Now, since the election, the idea is being openly canvassed that it is time the Labour Party lose its class character. The very name is said to be damaging and the identification in the public mind of Labour Party and Trade Unions is said to have lost us a lot of votes, because the trade unions are unpopular and because workers in one industry have little or no sympathy with the struggles of workers in other industries.

The argument runs something like this. At a time of relative prosperity such as this, the individual worker is keen to "get on" socially. He wants, quite naturally to move into a better house, to have a car, to get a good education for his children, etc. In other words, he wants to move into a type of life which in the past has been characteristic of the middle class, rather than of the working class. To do so, he feels it necessary to bury his working class "past" and to proclaim his new status by voting against

#### Two classes

a working class party.

There is an element of truth in the assertion that people do seek what they feel is a higher status. In a society which for centuries

has been stratified into classes, whose mainspring has been ruthless competition between individuals, where the good things of life (not only materially but culturally) have been reserved for the few, where all the agencies moulding public opinion have openly and by implication held up manual labour to contempt, it would be very surprising if this were not the case.

to-day by dint of overtime working, plus wives' earnings, can

But the fact that some workers achieve a better standard of living than in the past does not mean that their class position has altered. **It remains as true as it ever was that there are two opposing classes—capitalist and worker. To deny this, or to slur it over, serves the interest only of the capitalist class.** The present system suits them fine. They want the worker to be as content with it as they are themselves. The more fragmented the working class, the more each worker is thinking of "getting on" himself, the weaker are the workers collectively.

Besides the extent to which any

worker can "get on" under capitalism unless he has exceptional luck is so limited. It is not our job as a party to create or foster any illusion either that the present relative prosperity can last for evermore or that the emancipation of the working class can be achieved by any means other than collective action. **It is precisely at a time like this that we must emphasize again and again that the only way the workers are going to get a really full life, instead of a few extra crumbs, is by collective action for a class end. The Labour Party must unequivocally reassert its class character.**

Similarly there must be no, repeat no, loosening of the links with the trade unions. If there is a feeling among the workers that only their particular struggle matters and that strikes in other industries are usually "wild cat", and a damned nuisance, **it must be explained, over and over again, that the common class interest transcends particular sectional interests and that a victory for any group of workers is the best assurance of victories for others.**

A divorce from the trade unions would be a catastrophe for the Labour Party. The possible gain of some floating voters, some middle class elements and some aspirants to middle class status would be no compensation. It has been suggested that the Left would benefit if the trade unions ceased to be affiliated, because the control of the Party would pass to the constituency parties and the dead weight of the block vote would be removed. But this is hopelessly short-sighted. **The problem of pushing the movement towards the left is not to be solved by truncating it in this way. The way is to fight against apathy and for more democratic practices within the trade unions so that the block vote is a truer reflection of rank and file opinion.**

**The Labour Party must set itself resolutely to the task, not of wooing the vague "centre" voter, but to win over once and for all those workers who now vote Tory. It must assert and by its actions prove that it is the champion of the workers' interests.**

M Millett

## YOUNG PEOPLE AT WORK

**T**HOSE RESPONSIBLE for "A Charter for Youth" have managed to cover most of the problems of today. So much so, that several demands, each one reasonable by itself, are incompatible with each other. This is the trouble with the section on "Young Workers in Training".

#### The point

The demand: "Eventually the apprentice and the adult worker must receive the same wages in all cases" and the aim "to extend the opportunities for sandwich courses of six months in school and six months in industry" go uneasily together. And possibly equal wages for youth and adults are not a desirable social aim. Given that there should be a progressive elimination of the overtime and piece-work worked by adults, what would be the point in growing up?

#### Basic solution

The section on young workers in less-skilled jobs suffers from the same lack of basic principle. Agreed that young workers in unskilled occupations should not be doing the work of adults for less wages. But they should not be doing it for the same wages either. They ought not to be there

at all. They ought to be learning something more useful, more constructive than addressing post cards or glueing plastic heads on plastic soldiers.

I believe that the basic solution to the various problems of youth is to conceive of education and the state's responsibility for it continuing until twenty or twenty-one. Under this age, everybody ought to be at school or attending an approved apprenticeship or sandwich course. This is more "school" than is strictly required for many occupations but this is an opportunity for extending general education at the ages (sixteen to twenty) when it is very likely of most advantage.

#### Youth away

Of course, the concept of approved apprenticeship for all is easier to put into effect than the six months sandwich courses. For a start, a program would probably have to confine itself to extending one-day release to all young workers.

Since it is a physical impossibility to provide every sort of training in every town attention must be paid to the problems of youth and students living away from home.

#### Utopian?

Consideration might be given to a non-military form of National Service. Work in underdeveloped countries would be of particular advantage. If this idea is ever developed, I think it is important that supervision should be by nationals of the country concerned and the life and conditions of the young temporary workers should be as closely integrated as possible with the life of the country. This service should not be compulsory and I do not think that there would be any lack of volunteers.

Now all this might seem a bit Utopian. But there are other factors involved. Two of the difficulties of the capitalists of the West are the need for automation to make their industries competitive and the quite remarkable technical success of the Soviet bloc. It is increasingly recognised by capitalists that in their own interests both these problems require a great increase in the standard of education. Therefore in the future it is quite likely the problem will not be a shortage of money (for even British capitalists will start spending money twenty years too late) but to ensure that it is spent in the most constructive way. The thing to avoid is the capitalist concept of a highly educated elite, largely drawn from their own cultural class, backed up by a highly certificated but narrowly educated section of technicians. The rest of the population is then of course a vast highly mobile labour force, equally suited for button pressing or suit pressing.

By historical accident, socialists have, even under capitalist governments, a considerable influence upon educational policy. Local education authorities are more often than not under the control of labour councillors. And once I heard the Labour Party rather rudely described as "The League of Militant School-teachers". However, the driving, politically most advanced force in the French Revolution were the lower middle class lawyers. This was also true of the American Revolutionaries and the English Commonwealth. Similarly, the League of Militant School teachers may yet have its historical function.

**NOTTING HILL  
NOTE BOOK  
PAGE EIGHT**

### SOCIALIST REVIEW SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I enclose <sup>16s.</sup> <sup>8s.</sup> <sup>4s.</sup> subscription for <sup>1 year's</sup> <sup>6 months'</sup> <sup>3 months'</sup> issue of

**SOCIALIST REVIEW.**

Name.....

Address.....

Send to Socialist Review  
35b Priory Terrace, NW6

Dev Murarka

# THE CRISIS IN INDIA

## INTERNATIONAL

The recent crisis in India, which has ostensibly come about due to the Chinese aggressiveness on the Himalayan border of India, has deeper roots. The crisis is being used by the corrupt politicians of the republic to divert the masses from the real issues. The fact is that since 1947 economic development in India has not only been inadequate but also extremely uneven. Although her planners claim to plan for a socialist pattern of society, whatever they may mean by that, the net result of their ten years of planning has been increase in poverty, inequality and unemployment. The gap between hungry mouths and food supplies has widened. Instead of the mirage of a welfare state, the people are now faced with high prices, scarcity and bankruptcy of political morals.

### Butchery

These results were inevitable when we consider the opportunism and muddleheadedness which has passed for an empirical economic policy. The ruling party, called the Indian National Congress, is a vast amorphous organization of conflicting interests. It has survived due to three factors. The first is the political prestige and organization it acquired as a national party fighting for independence. Secondly is the enormous popularity of national leaders like Gandhi, Patel and Nehru. The popularity of Mr. Nehru in particular has helped it to survive even when it is thoroughly discredited in urban areas and parts of the country. Thirdly is the failure of any coherent opposition to emerge during all these years. The Communist Party was too discredited in the years following independence and recovered too slowly to take advantage of the failure of the Congress. Its recent success has again been undermined by the Chinese butchery in Tibet and their affront to Indian nationalism, still a powerful force.

### Congress

At this stage, it is useful to examine the role of Mr. Nehru in Indian developments. He has been the Prime Minister since 1946 and with Gandhi's murder on the 30th January, 1948, and Patel's death in 1950, the mantle of leadership has fallen solely upon him. By and large he has an effective voice in the country's policies and therefore is it not unfair to praise or blame him for the major decisions of importance which affect the economic policy of India. Of all the personalities who shape the policies of the present government, he is the most liberal and cosmopolitan in outlook. But his political outlook is a hybrid one. He has a shrewd eye for the middle position and his politics too is a partially successful exercise in the middle way. Inside the Congress he adopts a neutral position between the warring factions.

Economically he wants a mix-

ture of private enterprise and nationalized industries. On the great question of agriculture in relation to industrialization, his attitude is ambiguous. Still, the ruling party relies on him to win elections, to act as mediator in its disputes and to act as a superb showman for its show. Outside India he has acquired fame as the exponent of neutralism, a foreign policy which is unaligned to either bloc in theory. In practice, however, it leans towards either bloc as is deemed convenient for the diplomatic game.

### Hatred

Apart from the Communists the only political party of importance in opposition is the Praja Socialist Party. It originates from a dissident group of Congressmen who claim to be democratic socialists. Every two years it divides and joins in all sorts of permutations with other parties. In the name of policy it has two ideas. One is the irrational hatred of the Communists which is amply rewarded by the Americans in the form of generous funds and a boost up in the American magazines like "Time" which have a wide circulation in India. Second, is the vilification of the Congress and Nehru.

### Four Problems

This is not very successful because they do not offer a real socialist alternative but a hotch-potch of Gandhism-Fabianism-Socialism and their opposition sounds hollow. Their leader is Jaya Prakash Narayan, once a Marxist and now a Bhoodanist under the influence of Vinobha Bhave and his landgift movement. Nominally he does not even belong to the party but those familiar with Indian politics know that he is merely "doing a Gandhi" (for Gandhi also did not belong to the Congress party in his later years). He is a quixotic opportunist who hopes to capitalize on his increasing popularity when Mr. Nehru is removed from the scene.

In the absence of serious Marxist economic thinking and action, it is natural that all political parties wallow in mudslinging and distract the public from concentrating on fundamental issues. This is one reason for the excessive and slightly unnatural obsession with "foreign policy" to be found among us. The young generation is becoming increasingly disillusioned and even apathetic to politics in India and in our stage of development this is extremely dangerous. It is being increasingly exploited by the reactionary forces in India to their advantage. Twelve years after independence, we have not solved the four basic problems by which a nation's advance is judged. These are food, health, education and employment.

Let us take education as an example. According to the Census of 1951 83.5 per cent. of the population was illiterate. By 1955 this had been reduced by only

1 per cent. In 1956 the number of primary students in India was only 60 per 1,000. This can be compared to 87 in China in 1955, 144 in Japan in 1956, and 125 in Russia in the same year. This underlines the greatest weakness of Indian educational system which is a slavish imitation of the British system. The position is somewhat better in secondary and higher education. But the facilities are so poor that qualitatively the standard of our higher education is lower than in other countries. Moreover, the ratio of students taking up arts, commerce and law is disproportionately higher than those taking up science, technology, or medicine. In spite of the need for ever greater number of scientists, technologists, and doctors, there is higher rate of unemployment among the educated. Thanks to the neglect of education, our system has become top heavy, wasteful and utterly unsuited to modern requirements. Besides, higher education is still a matter for the privileged classes as the working classes cannot afford the cost.

### Doctors

In the sphere of health conditions are no better. The number of doctors in India is about 176 per million of population. The ratio, however, varies from one area to another. In West Bengal there is one doctor to every 1,700 persons. In Rajasthan only one for 25,000 persons. What is even worse is that most of the doctors reside in towns and urban areas and therefore in rural areas the conditions are truly appalling. There are many areas where there is only one qualified doctor for 50,000 or even 100,000 persons. Again the people who need medical help most are those who get the least help. This extreme inequality in the distribution of medical expenditure is shown by the following figures:

	Per cent. of Households	Cumulative percentage of expenditure on			
		Medical Services		Medicine	
		U.S.A. 1950	India 1955	India 1952	India 1955
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Bottom	10%	5	0.1	1	1
(lower half)	50%	37	6	9	8
Top	10%	19	64	45	56

N.B. This table and most of the statistical material used in this article is taken from an address by Mr P C Mahalanobis, President, National Institute of Sciences of India and closely associated with the formulation of the Second Five Year Plan. This was printed in *Science and Culture* of March, 1959. Needless to say the conclusions are my own. (D.M.)

From the above table, two significant points emerge. One is that most of the benefit from expanding medical services is going to the top class families who can afford to pay the price. Secondly, as far as the bottom and middle group of families are concerned, their share of facilities is not only not expanding but has either remained static or actually declined from 1952 to 1955 as the figures in column 4 and 5 show. To this, it must be added that rural areas are still the worst off and have benefited even less than the urban areas.

In the field of food production, something like a major disaster

is likely in the very near future. A recent study by a group of American agronomists paints a sobering picture of our failures on this front. They estimate that by 1965 the Indian population will be about 480 millions. To feed this population on a bare subsistence level 110 million tons of food-grains will be required. The rate of increase in food production since 1949-50, the first year of the First Five Year plan has been at the rate of 2.3 per cent. per year on an average. They claim that to achieve the target of 110 million tons we will have to produce at the rate of 8.2 per cent. for the next 7 years. This does not take into account the lean years of drought or floods when food may be very scarce. The magnitude of the task can well be imagined when the targets for the Second Five Year plan is only 80.5 million tons. Yet, the blame squarely rests on the failure of the ruling party. It has failed to carry out the barest land reforms which will create enthusiasm among the peasantry. Not only are racial land reforms shirked but the provision for fertilizers and irrigation is totally inadequate for the required increase in food production.

### New Jobs

The failure in the matter of employment is even more significant and disastrous. A socialist society should ensure full employment. But so alien is this basic concept of socialism to our planners that even in the formulation of the Second plan it was assumed that at the end of it there will remain nearly ten million unemployed. The figures are like this. At the end of the First plan the number of unemployed was stated to be 5.3 millions. During the Second plan period ten million new unemployed were expected. But, provision was made for creation of only 8 million new jobs.

This gives a net figure of 7.3 million unemployed. But it has been freely acknowledged that unemployment figures were on the conservative side while new employment figures were generously optimistic. Thus the figure of ten million unemployed at the end of the Second plan is not an unreasonable one. This does not take into account the vast numbers who are unemployed half of their normal working time. If these are included, the figure for unemployment, according to Prof. Mahalanobis, will reach the 25 to 30 million mark.

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that there is great ferment

in India. In spite of lack of political direction, people find various means of putting pressure on the rulers. Like all reactionary regimes the present regime does not hesitate to shoot or imprison its opponents. Even the short-lived communist rule in Kerala followed the same pattern. These are conditions in which a properly organized and principled socialist party can provide the necessary dynamism and leadership to the masses. The tragedy of India today is that there is no such party on the scene. On the contrary some very disturbing tendencies have appeared recently.

**Middle Class**

One is the formation of the Swatantra Party. It is composed of big industrialists, professional anticommunists and some frustrated elements of the Congress Party. Its figurehead is Mr. Rajgopalachari, an old debilitated reactionary. The moving spirit behind the idea is that of Mr. M. R. Masani, an Indian version of Macarthy and a leading member of the notorious Congress for Cultural Freedom. It is well supported by the group of capitalists who have banded together under the title Forum for Free Enterprise which has been carrying on an expensive advertisement campaign against nationalization similar to the one carried on here by the Steel manufacturers. At present the appeal of this organization is limited to the hard-pressed middle class and small shopkeepers. But it has started a campaign against land reforms, particularly against co-operative farming.

**Unpopular**

The second is the celebrated affair of Mr. Krishna Menon. Briefly, for the past few years a systematic campaign has been going on for the removal of Mr. Menon on the alleged ground that he is a secret communist and that he has pursued a wrong policy in the United Nations Organization as leader of the Indian delegation. Another argument is that he has become personally unpopular in the United States and thus prevents financial aid in greater measure from that country. Nothing much happened but a few weeks before the Sino-Indian clash it leaked out that the Indian Chief of Staff had resigned due to Mr. Menon's interference in matters of staff promotion. In no time a huge campaign built up demanding his sack. For the time being the crisis has blown over but the last has not been heard about this matter. We are not

concerned here about the past or future of Mr. Menon. But there are some aspects of this affair which can be illuminating for the understanding of the currents developing in India.

**Episode**

It is interesting that the anti-Menon campaign has been carried out mainly by those associated with the Congress for Cultural Freedom in India and **The Guardian** here in Manchester. About the sinister role of **The Guardian** in Indian politics we shall have more to say. At a later stage the anti-Menon campaign was backed by the Praja-Socialist Party. When the row between Mr. Menon and the Army Chief leaked out, except for the

**BOOKS!**

**BOOKS!**

**BOOKS!**

**BOOKS!**

The largest range of the writings of Leon Trotsky in Britain today, available with many other socialist books and pamphlets. Socialist Review on sale. Pay a visit or send s.a.e. for list to.

**INTERNATIONAL BOOKSHOP**

4, Dane St., Nottingham

Communists, almost all from the extreme right to the extreme left joined in demanding Mr. Menon's head. For the parties of the left this is an extremely short-sighted and stupid thing to do. India is surrounded by military dictatorships of all shades. Admittedly the wretched capitalistic democracy of India is not worth much. But, how could it be assumed that a military dictatorship of Sandhurst trained reactionary officers will help the mass struggle or bring the goal of socialism near? By making heroes of Indian Army Chiefs and openly encouraging them to defy political control the opposition is not only inviting disaster but putting the clock back for several decades. It is nonsense to argue that because Mr. Menon is unpopular with the Americans he must be removed from the political scene. This single episode shows the corruption and the danger of the situation in India.

An acute observer of the In-

dian affairs once said that behind the facade of democracy India was a Brahmin-Bania tyranny. He was wrong. In reality the Indian power elite is even smaller. It consists of the English speaking Western orientated 1 per cent. of the population. And this power elite is obsessed with chits of foreign praise. Thus foreign prestige is an integral part of the hold of ruling party. Of all the foreign chits of praise none is valued more than **The Guardian**. Seen in this light the role of **The Guardian** assumes a great importance. Some very curious facts emerge if we examine the sources and the way this paper handles Indian news. Its chief correspondent in India is one Taya Zinkin. She is wife of Maurice Zinkin, a member of the Indian Civil Service before independence and now a director of Hindustan Lever Ltd., a subsidiary of Unilever Ltd. Will it be too much to read any significance in this? Are we to assume that the plugging of Swatantra Party, the campaign against Nehru and Menon, the frequent eulogies of Indian bureaucrats and such other reportage from India which has filled **The Guardian** so often is merely objective news service? It seems that opinions are sacred but facts are free. The regularity with which Mr. Moraes of the **Indian Express** is quoted as the supreme arbiter of common sense in India is also interesting in view of the fact that he is one of the pillars of the Indian Congress for Cultural Freedom. It may be useful here to note from **The Observer** of November 15, 1959, what their New Delhi correspondent has to say. "The fact is that most of the criticism of Nehru's 'weak-kneed' attitude towards China has come from fewer than half a dozen English-language newspapers in India. It is not to be thought that these journalists are anything but honest men. But generally they are tied to the world of finance and industry, and reflect the no-doubt-genuine beliefs of those Indians opposed to 'half-baked-socialism' and now inclined towards an open military alliance with the West." Considering that the power elite in India is extremely sensitive to the opinions of this kind, the mischief and damage done by **The Guardian** cannot be over emphasised.

**Cynical**

Taken in the context of internal Indian situation, the external significance of Sino-Indian clash is not so important. But by behaving in a cynical and utterly unscrupulous manner, the Chinese have given a handle to the forces of reaction in India. They have diverted the attention of the Indian workers from the developing class struggle to futile questions of defence and military expenditure. They have provided a golden opportunity to American propagandists to attract hungry peoples of Asia to climb the Western band wagon.

Footnote: The Americans, who are so eager for a quarrel between India and China, have suddenly become cautious. Mr. Herter's remarks at his recent press conference have made it clear that America is not willing to risk any participation in any conflict between India and China.

**WHAT WE STAND FOR**

The SOCIALIST REVIEW stands for international Socialist democracy. Only the mass mobilisation of the working class in the industrial and political arena can lead to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

The SOCIALIST REVIEW believes that a really consistent Labour Government must be brought to power on the basis of the following programme:

- The complete nationalisation of heavy industry, the banks, insurance and the land with compensation payments based on a means test. Renationalisation of all denationalised industries without compensation. — The nationalised industries to form an integral part of an overall economic plan and not to be used in the interests of private profit.
- Workers' control in all nationalised industries ie, a majority of workers' representatives on all national and area boards, subject to frequent election, immediate recall and receiving the average skilled wage ruling in the industry.
- The establishment of workers' committees to control all private enterprises within the framework of a planned economy. In all instances representatives must be subject to frequent election, immediate recall, and receive the average skilled wage in the industry.
- The establishment of workers' committees in all concerns to control hiring, firing and working conditions.
- The establishment of the principle of work or full maintenance.
- The extension of the social services by the payment of adequate pensions, the abolition of all payments for the National Health Service and the development of an industrial health service.
- The expansion of the housing programme by granting interest free loans to local authorities and the right to requisition privately held land.
- Free State education up to 18. Abolition of fee paying schools. For comprehensive schools and adequate maintenance grants — without a means test—for all university students.
- Opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. Equal rights and trade union protection to all workers whatever their country of origin. Freedom of migration for all workers to and from Britain.
- Freedom from political and economic oppression to all colonies. The offer of technical and economic assistance to the people of the underdeveloped countries.
- The abolition of conscription and the withdrawal of all British troops from overseas.
- The abolition of the H-bomb and all weapons of mass destruction. Britain to pave the way with unilateral renunciation of the H-bomb.
- A Socialist foreign policy subservient to neither Washington nor Moscow.

**S R BOOK SERVICE**

35b  
Priory Terrace  
London  
N.W.6

# Notting Hill Notebook

UNTIL further notice, this notebook will be compiled and presented by the above-mentioned person. This gives me no great satisfaction, because it marks yet another defeat for the conscious will, in its fight against emotional rule. It is also another example of the crying injustices under which we human beings live our existence. What's more, it's an example that means unnecessary hardship for Donald and Francis Ezzreco who are esteemed friends of mine.

Donald and Francis Ezzreco started the CPPA during the race riots of 1958, and like numerous other pivots of small social groupings, they had to use their own home as office and meeting-place. Now their landlord has decided to give them notice. Why? Because they are unable to continue paying the six pounds ten shillings being charged for their two basement rooms, kitchen and bath.

This house, called "Bleak House" by the way, is situated in the slummier part of North Kensington, and must have been built at least 50 years ago. It has nine rooms, and in the one year and seven months that the Ezzreco's have lived there, they have paid over £500 for two of these nine rooms, and yet, they still have no rights!

Simply because this man possesses a piece of paper, he can legally shove them into the streets to freeze. At the same time, he has deprived the members of the CPPA, and the community at large, of a useful and badly needed meeting-place and training-ground.

Could the immorality of capitalism be made clearer?



EVEN before the landlord dealt the coup de grace to the CPPA, the signs were that it was being slowly smothered to death by apathy. This indifference is not without some moral (or should it be immoral) significance.

Opinions in a society—or the absence of it—is conditioned by the leaders of that society, and the couldn't-care-less attitude of the people can be traced back to the same attitude amongst the leaders.

It is now being said that people don't want to attend meetings; all they want, it is said, is somewhere to go to, if and when, they are in trouble. We in CPPA have found this to be true. Is this another manifestation of the something for nothing creed?

The solution stands out a mile. We should take the initiative and go to the people. But what will we take to them? The gospel of socialism? Yes, say all who would have heaven on earth. But here, we in the CPPA, come up against human feelings. The majority of coloured peoples see, not the political demarcations, but the national ones. Socialism is fine, but independence from discrimination comes first. This leads to a tendency to accept or reject socialism according to who preaches it.

The leaders of coloured organizations, left without the tangible evidence of socialist practice, as against preaching, are left with the choice of (a) becoming a nationalistic organization, or (b) becoming a welfare organization. Nationalism we reject as a retrograde step, and the coloured peoples feel no anxiety about their welfare or security.

Having no resources with which to launch the kind of sustained campaign necessary to rouse the coloured peoples for socialism, the CPPA is now forced to play the dormant role of keeping itself in readiness for those in need, and of encouraging those who are amenable, to join the Labour movement.

For its part, the Labour movement must again concern itself with the problems of "Ezzreco's" of Britain.



THE OTHER DAY, I heard a churchman saying, that the reason for empty churches was that in the departments into which people divided their lives, they left no room for the church.

It seems that the same remoteness that lost the church its right of tenure in peoples lives, is losing the politicians theirs; and being themselves the victims of apathy, the circle is complete.

All the re-thinking in the world won't bring one spark of creative energy into the Labour movement. Down amongst the masses, that's where the remedy is to be found. This of course calls for more humility than can be commanded by those from outside the working-classes, but then, the Labour Party should be led by people from the working-classes, with the same aims

## • THE WAY AHEAD, from page 1

the vital question of a Labour Youth Movement. Youth still has passion, high ideals and looks to the future "good society". This is proved by its participation in the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, and even, to some extent, in the young Liberals. Labour must build its own youth movement, it must be tolerant in its approach and not care if at times the Youth movement sometimes conflicts with the leadership of the adult party. **Young people must be allowed to have their own national conference and executive committee, their own papers and produce their own pamphlets. Liaison should be a two-way process with representatives of the youth movement on adult committees and adults on the youth committees.** Youth which is naturally revolutionary in approach (even Tory youth presents such tendencies within their party) can be harnessed only to a party which intends to change society in earnest and not be allowed to drift or be caught up in movements which have a basically reactionary conception.

Equally with a youth movement, we must again begin a large program of socialist education. All existing vehicles must be used, but it must also be recognised that existing facilities are totally inadequate. We must overhaul the entire educational system in the Movement. Syllabuses for basic socialist education must be produced. Similarly with cheap discussion pamphlets and books, etc. Schools of all types must be developed as never before. Our object must be to make socialists. **Educational work must stop being the poor relation looked after by a few "cranks" but an integral part of the Party's activities.**

There are many other questions one could raise, among them the need for greater freedom of action and thought in both the

Parliamentary Party and Local Council Groups, the need to maintain the alliance with the Trade Unions yet secure changes in their constitutions to allow for a more genuine reflection of opinion in the union vote, and so on.

### Defeated

**The essential lesson, I feel, is that in future, Labour must be a genuine opposition. In Parliament it must stop shadow boxing and get down to some real punching. It must stop being ashamed of representing the working class.** The point here is that if you really want a classless society, only the working class can achieve it. One cannot expect those on their backs to get off voluntarily. That is why they spend their millions to "prove" to the workers that they are no longer working class.

The debate in the Party must proceed on the basis of fundamental socialist principles. At one time the debate was between those who believed that socialism could only be achieved by revolution and those who accepted the fight for reforms as the only way forward. At least, both parties agreed then on ultimates. Today, one section within the Party wants us to cease being socialists. That section must be defeated, because although an election might conceivably be won on such a basis (and even then, probably not), socialism would be lost.

**SOCIALIST REVIEW** is published twice a month by Socialist Review Publishing Co. Ltd. Subscriptions, post paid: 1 year: 16s. 6 months: 8s. 3 months: 4s. Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of **Socialist Review** which are given in editorial statement.

All communications to be addressed to 35b Priory Terrace, NW6. Printed by H. Palmer (Harlow) Ltd. TU, Bush Fair, Harlow, Essex.

and sympathies as working-class peoples.

Have you seen any leopards changing their spots lately? For better or worse, in all societies, people inherit irradicable affinities. Those of the class into which they were born. And they all try to move upwards. This usually means surrendering to the dictates of the class above. It is this combination of nature and society that makes it essential that the leaders of the working-class should come from the bowels of the working-class, and not, as is all too frequent, from amongst those who've lost all sympathy with the working-class.

Those in touch with the real working-class, are in no doubt as to what should be done to regain the confidence and love of the working-class. There are, in Britain, thousands, and maybe millions of victims of society's inhumanity, and the Labour Party, through its MPs and Councillors, should seek out these victims of capitalism and see to it that justice is done. Only the Labour Party can command the resources and manpower necessary to launch such a scheme; and when "new" arguments are being advanced for the saving of the Labour Party, I hope someone will have enough humanitarian insight to suggest something along these lines.

The cost? To hell with the cost; the money is there and it is these victims who earned it.



I WOULD LIKE to take this opportunity to express the thanks of the members of the CPPA to the members of the Romford Constituency Labour Party for their offer of a book each month. We regret the necessity of having to postpone acceptance. However, we hope to be in a position, in the near future, to take advantage of your most welcome offer should it still be open.

Once again, thanks to all of you.