

Notes of the Month

RACIALISM AND REACTION

‘Every industrial and commercial centre in England now possesses a working class *divided into two hostile camps*, English proletarians and Irish proletarians. The ordinary English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers his standard of living . . . ‘This antagonism is artificially kept alive and intensified by the press, the pulpit, the comic papers, in short by all the means at the disposal of the ruling classes. This *antagonism is the secret of the impotence of the English working class, despite its organisation. It is the secret by which the capitalist class maintains its power.*’

MARX, letter to S. Meyer and A. Vogt, April 9, 1870.

May 20, 1968

The present crisis in Labour Party policy, with the rout at the local elections and the battle over the Incomes Bill; the militant response of three million engineers for the token stoppage on May 15; and the carefully timed explosion of racialism as the grand issue put over from above to confuse and disrupt the popular forces—these are not unconnected phenomena. All are expressions of the present unstable economic-political situation in Britain.

Roots of Racialism

Racialism is the symptom of a sick society. ‘Illness’, Samuel Johnson said, ‘makes a man a scoundrel’. Tsarism, tottering on the verge of revolution, fostered the Black Hundreds and its anti-semitic pogroms, until the victory of the Bolshevik revolution ended the pogroms. In the regions controlled by the White Guards Governments, financed and armed by the West, the pogroms continued, until the victory of the Red Armies finally wiped them out for ever. Hindus and Moslems lived peaceably together in India for centuries until in the era of the advance of the national movement imperialism devised elaborate means for fostering their antagonism to blaze out finally in mutual massacre and partition of the country. Arabs and Jews lived peaceably together in Palestine for centuries until imperialism intervened to create the present cauldron of hell for the whole Arab East. Connolly, the centenary of whose birth we salute this month, and Larkin led the Irish workers in unity from

North to South; imperialism, which had already inserted the Plantation, imposed partition. Hitler and Nazism, backed by the millionaires and the General Staff, soared in the era of inflation after the first war, sank again in the era of partial stabilisation, advanced anew in the midst of the world economic crisis, and were hastily placed in power from above after the electoral defeat of November 1932, when the loss of two million Nazi votes and the advance of the socialist-communist vote to exceed the Nazi vote warned the ruling class of the urgency of speedy action. So now in Britain, when the worsening situation of capitalism in crisis is leading to the most ferocious offensive against the standards of the people, when Labour right-wing leadership is discredited, and the organised working class in industry is showing militant resistance, the Powell match is dropped among the tinder, with the formal disavowal and practical aid of Heath, Wilson and the megaphone press, to put across racialism as the great issue before the British people.

Two-Handed Engine

It is important to recognise the dual mechanism by which the ruling class or imperialist ruling power puts over racialism while appearing to deprecate it. On the one hand, limelight with every device of publicity is provided for the top-level 'daring' 'outspoken' 'extremist', who openly voices racialist doctrines or kindles the flames of racialism. On the other hand, all the 'respectable' top figures of the social and political world, who make a great show of disavowing this spokesman with shocked disapproval, in practice protect and facilitate his path, and in their actual measures pursue a parallel policy. The British Raj deplored and wrung its hands over the growth of Hindu-Moslem antagonism. At the same time in practice it fostered the division by the introduction of communal electorates, and behind the scenes had directly inspired the formation of the Moslem League. The Balfour Declaration pledged Britain to protect the rights of the Arabs living in Palestine. Practice exiled them from their country. Most significant for the present situation in Britain is the method of the organisation of the advance of Hitler and Nazism in Germany between the wars, and of Neo-Nazism in West Germany today.

From Hindenburg-Hitler to Kiesinger-Von Thadden

The significance of the German warning signal is not that the conditions in Britain are similar, but that the method of the pro-

motion of the advance, equally of Nazism in Germany after the 1918 revolution to the accession of Hitler to power, or of Neo-Nazism in West Germany today, demonstrates this duplex mechanism with classic clarity. Hindenburg was elected President by the German people in 1932 as the candidate against Hitler. Hindenburg was presented to the electorate by the parties supporting him, by the Social Democrats, the Centre and other parties, as the candidate to represent the opposition to Hitler. The German electorate accordingly chose Hindenburg and rejected Hitler. Hindenburg got 19 million votes. Hitler got 13 million votes. Hindenburg then placed Hitler in power. Today the 'great election victory' of the Neo-Nazis or NPD in Baden-Württemberg has swept the front page banner headlines of the world's press. Of course, if it had been the British electoral system, they would only have got two lines at the bottom of a column to mention that they 'lost their deposit', since their 9.8 per cent vote fell below the $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent required by the British system to save a deposit, let alone win any seat, which requires an absolute top vote. So Kiesinger has begun to talk of changing over to the British electoral system designed to exclude representation of minorities. Under the existing system it is estimated that the NPD would get 50 seats in the next West German Parliament; under the British system, none. But Kiesinger has hastened to make clear that he is not thinking of changing to the British system until after the next election. In other words, first let the Neo-Nazis get firmly established in the West German Parliament with 50 seats; then bring in the British system to exclude the developing left wing political formation which is manifestly gathering despite the ban on the Communist Party. Ex-Nazi Kiesinger plays bat and ball with ex-Nazi Von Thadden.

Powell-Heath-Wilson Syndrome

In the eruption of racist poison in this country all the attention has been focused on Enoch Powell and his notorious Birmingham speech of April 20 ('in this country in 15 or 20 years the black man will have the whip hand over the white man', 'we must be mad, literally mad . . . a nation building up its own funeral pyre', 'river foaming with blood', etc.). Heath rebukes Powell for his 'racialist' speech and dismisses him from his Shadow Cabinet. Wilson answers Powell with his Birmingham speech on May 5. Powell gloats over a bulging postbag in his support. Some misled workers demonstrate in support of the diehard anti-union Tory. Gallup reports 74 per

cent supporting Powell ('agree with what Mr. Powell said in his speech on coloured immigrants'), and shows Powell leaping up from bottom preference for successor to Heath with 1 per cent in April to top with 24 per cent in May. A sufficiently dangerous picture of an explosive situation.

Whose Guilt?

But what of the role of Heath and the Tory Front Bench and Wilson and the Labour Front Bench? It was they who by their action and legislation over the preceding years prepared the climate for a Powell to exploit. It was the Tory Cabinet which in 1962 put through the first colour bar legislation with the Commonwealth Immigrants Act ('Commonwealth' being used, as everyone recognised at the time, and as practice has since abundantly proved, as the polite synonym for 'coloured'). Labour at the time under Gaitskell denounced the Act. But it was Wilson and the Labour Cabinet who in 1965 not only carried forward the Commonwealth Immigrants Act, but issued the new White Paper to intensify the colour bar restrictions. And it was the Labour Government and the Tory Front Bench combined who put through this year the new Commonwealth Immigrants Act which for the first time placed on the statute book the notorious Nazi racial formula of measuring qualifications in terms of grandparents, and thus, in the words of Lord Brockway's article in the April issue of this journal, made 'Racialism Now a Part of British Law'. Thus the guilt is a combined guilt of Heath, Wilson and Powell.

Prince Philip? The Queen? Nabarro?

Of course, if the test of British citizenship is going to follow the Nazi 'Aryan' pattern and become the possession of British grandparents, Prince Philip may soon become due for exclusion. As Lady Gaitskell said in the debate on the Bill in the House of Lords on February 29:

Lady Gaitskell said she had not been born in Britain, nor had her father although he had lived here for sixty years. Her grandfather had never known this country. When reading Clause 1, she said, it made me feel a little alien. The talk about grandfathers and now grandmothers in Clause 1 has a slight smell of apartheid about it.

The Bill might mean twenty years of queuing. The Duke of Edinburgh would not have a dog's chance of becoming a 'belonger' and jumping the queue, because he had not got the right grandfather. (*The Times* report, March 1, 1968.)

Indeed, since children born in Britain, who have never seen a foreign country, are now solemnly classified as 'immigrants', the Royal Family will no doubt presently be due to be classified as alien immigrants. And, for that matter, as soon as the genealogical tree is carried a little further, Sir Gerald Nabarro, too. After all, the cry against 'immigrants' is a very old Tory cry. It was a vintage Wodehouse of 1910 (*Psmith in the City*, if memory is not at fault), where the young blades working in a City office under a pompous stuffy bore of an employer, who is of course a Tory candidate, decide to get their revenge by going down to his constituency to heckle him at a public meeting, and find him delivering a fervid address on (Wodehouse is certainly no left propagandist, but an observant chronicler of the current conventional scene) 'The Menace of the Alien Immigrant'. Sixty years ago. And today colour is added to spice the dish.

Kenya Asian Victims and Pawns

Most revealing was the scare about an influx of Kenya Asians threatening to flood the country, which was artificially worked up as a pretext for the hasty consensus of the two Front Benches to rush through Parliament in three days the enactment establishing the Nazi racial formula about grandparents. But what was the truth about the Kenya Asians? When the British rulers decided to build up Kenya as a 'White Man's Paradise' for ex-officers and aristocratic scions to become settlers in the beautiful 'White Highlands' robbed from the Africans, they were faced with the problem that there was no African middle class or suitable religious division to provide a social basis to support the rule of the White handful against the African population. So they decided to import one. Churchill as Colonial Secretary arranged in March, 1922, for Indian migrants to come to Kenya on condition they could produce 300 rupees (an unattainable fortune for the overwhelming majority of Indians) on arrival. 'This', Churchill told the Cabinet, as recorded in the Cabinet Minutes now made available, 'would have the effect of excluding all Indians except those of a certain social standing.' Accordingly the Indians with the requisite financial basis arrived, and occupied the lower administrative and professional and some skilled manual positions, alongside the Indian traders already there. The majority fulfilled their allotted role and gave loyal support to the British rulers against the African national revolt. But with the victory of the African national struggle, and the establishment of independence, what was to happen to the 190,000 Kenya Asians, who had so faith-

fully served their imperialist masters? Sandys, Colonial Secretary at the time of the transfer in 1963, assured them that, if they did not wish to become Kenya citizens, they could have British passports and enjoy all the rights of British citizenship. The Indian Government recommended them to take Kenya citizenship; and 70,000 did so. But 120,000 preferred the British passport, evidently considering it a safer and more stable basis than the uncertain future in Kenya, where their record had placed them in a somewhat invidious position in relation to the national movement, like the Anglo-Indian community in India after independence.

'Wretched that Hangs on Princes' Favours'

Unfortunately for them, they had backed the wrong horse and lost both ways. When the Kenya Government in December last year brought into force its Immigration Act, requiring those who were not Kenya citizens to apply for work permits (this was not racist legislation, as has been falsely stated here, for it did not apply to the 70,000 Kenya Asians who had chosen Kenya citizenship), some among the 120,000 Kenya Asians who had chosen British passports felt uncertainty for their future, and sought to avail themselves of their rights, as promised them, to come to Britain. The influx never totalled more than a few thousands (7,000 from all East African territories, according to the British Government's statistics, during the three months from December 1967 when the Kenya Act came into force, to the end of February 1968 when the British Act was put through). But this was used as the pretext by the British imperialists to welsh on their pledges and put through the racist legislation to keep them out. The Kenya Asians had become a football of British politics. 'This is a British national crisis, not a Kenya crisis', as the Kenya High Commissioner in London said on February 19. The unhappy Kenya Asians affected had lost all round. They were uncertain of their future in Kenya. The Indian Government, which had advised them to take Kenya citizenship, made clear that it had no intention of receiving ex-Indians who had preferred British citizenship. British imperialism, which had used them for its purposes and buoyed them up with empty promises, now gave them the boot. 'I feel mine eyes new-open'd: O how wretched is that poor man that hangs on princes' favours!' The whole lesson of the strategy of imperialism, how its pawns become its victims, is epitomised in the parable of the Kenya Asians. And to add the crowning irony, during the two months after the passing of the Act to restrict their entry to a

limited quota, up to the end of April the allotted quota had not been taken up; there had been only 350 applications for permits to enter, 80 had been granted, but only 5 had been used. The whole scare, on the basis of which the racialist Act had been passed, was thus shown to have been, as *The Guardian* pointed out on April 29, 'artificial'.

Nemesis of Empire

Colour bar racialism is the hallmark of the empire tradition, and especially of Anglo-American imperialism. If American democracy was built on the foundation of Negro slavery, the great British fortunes were built on the African slave trade to supply the United States and the West Indies. It is true that the Arab slave traders were already busy in Africa before the Europeans took over. It is true that the African tribal and feudal chiefs captured and sold their fellow Africans to the European traders. These facts should correct any over-simplified colour picture. But it was only the limitless appetite and dynamism of capitalist production which multiplied the slave trade to such a monstrous scale and desolated Africa. The British Empire was the supreme colour bar empire of the world. 'Whites Only' and 'Chinese and Dogs Not Allowed' were its inspiring slogans wherever the Union Jack flew. But the same memsahibs who would shudder at the proximity of a brown skin would fall over themselves to win the condescending smile of a maharajah, and would have no hesitation in entrusting their babies to a coloured ayah. In other words, the colour bar is not the expression of some supposed instinctive natural prejudice based on colour (colour prejudice is notoriously unknown to children until inculcated into them), but a social phenomenon of capitalist imperialism, the physical expression of colonialist servitude. Similarly 'apartheid' in South Africa is explained by its advocates as a benevolent system to enable two races to develop, each according to its own culture. In fact the principle of relegation of the African majority to limited inferior 'reserves' on which it is impossible for them to live is a technique to compel them to seek employment without rights in the 'white' areas as wage labourers at one-twentieth the white wage or as domestic servants. Thus 'apartheid' is a decorative euphemism for colonial slavery.

Poison of Racialist Theories

The horrors of the slave trade led the pious English slave traders who sang hymns on deck while their African captives rotted and

died in the holds, to salve their consciences with the theory that the Africans were not really human beings, but a kind of sub-human animal. The American slave owners and exterminators of the Red Indians preached the same doctrine. Their Negro slaves were explicitly excluded by legal decision from their Declaration of Independence that 'all men are created equal'. The European overlords, whose Tory descendants today express such horror at the menace of being overrun by coloured immigrants, had no compunction in overrunning without entry visas the homelands of these coloured peoples, not as immigrants to seek employment, but as violent invaders and conquerors to subjugate them and make them slaves. This overrunning, plunder and subjugation of the Asian, American and African continents was declared to be justified on the grounds of the 'divine mission' of the 'superior white race' to rule the 'lesser breeds'. In vain all serious scientists have exploded the fallacies of these racial theories of supposed 'higher' and 'lower' races. The poison of racialism will not be eliminated simply by intellectual argument, because it is the reflection and expression of an entire social system of special national, economic and social exploitation made visible in terms of colour, derived from the days of direct slavery and colonial subjection, and persisting still in the existing social structure and traditional consciousness in the foremost imperialist countries, especially in the United States and in Britain. Against this the battle is now rising, with the advance of the fight for human liberation and for the final ending of colonialism. This fight is an integral part of the whole common battle for democracy and socialism, and for the destruction of the social system which rests on the triple foundation of wage slavery, the inequality of women, and, on the lowest rung of the ladder, colour bar oppression and super-exploitation.

Ernest Bevin and Labour Imperialism

With this social background for generations, there should be no ground for surprise that the poison of racialism, or support of divisions and antagonisms based on colour, should also infect sections, and even considerable sections, of the working class and popular opinion in the metropolitan countries of imperialism, especially where the right-wing leadership has fostered imperialist illusions, or in the present era of imperialist break-up has brought a sense of frustration. Typical embodiment of the outlook of Labour Imperialism in the leading circles of the movement was Ernest Bevin.

When he became Foreign Secretary he said: 'The most important objective of my foreign policy is just to be able to go down to Victoria Station and take a ticket to where the hell I like without a passport'. This was actually applauded as a remarkably 'enlightened' 'progressive' viewpoint. Of course it was the opposite. If he had said that the objective of his foreign policy would be to ensure that any black, brown or yellow person could enter Britain freely without any passport control, it might have been remarkable. But he said the opposite. He demanded that he, the lord of creation, should be able to march into anybody else's country ('where the hell I like') without any interference by damned foreigners inhabiting that country—a characteristic expression of the colossal egoism of the imperialist outlook. His actual foreign policy fully corresponded to his imperialist outlook.

Black Marks on the Record

Assumptions of Empire have been inextricably intertwined in the so-called 'British School of Socialism'. Not only the Fabian Society produced the theory of Fabian Imperialism with its *Fabianism and the Empire* to support the predatory South African war at the turn of the century. Blatchford and Hyndman were ultra-chauvinists. Across the water Jack London, the inspiring epic novelist of socialist revolution, could also write:

Negroes have a very strong and disagreeable odour . . . In reason they are much inferior to whites; in imagination they are dull, tasteless and anomalous. Their griefs are transient.

H. G. Wells, with all his brilliant socialist-inspired predictions of the future, could in his *When the Sleeper Wakes*, where he imagines a future revolution of the working people against the ruling monopoly oligarchy, predict its suppression by the arrival of fleets of aeroplanes carrying hordes of gleaming black faces to carry out the work of suppression—a revealing reversal of the true course of history. In 1926 at the World Migration Conference organised by the Labour and Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions the ILP vainly sought to move an amendment that 'immigrants should not be excluded purely on grounds of race or colour'. This was opposed by the Labour Party and the delegates from the British Dominions. At this Conference Lajpat Rai from India said:

By your present attitude you are throwing the whole of the coloured peoples of the world in the scales against you in the struggle against capitalism (*Daily Herald*, June 25, 1926).

In 1964 a Gallup poll showed 20 per cent of the population demanding a complete ban on coloured immigrants; but the highest proportion supporting this demand was among Labour Party supporters, with 25 per cent, as against 18 per cent among Liberals and 14 per cent among Conservatives. With knowledge of this background we should by no means discount the current Gallup poll immediately after the Powell speech showing 74 per cent of those questioned supporting his remarks on coloured immigrants.

Bull At a Gate

When a number of London dockers, with records of militancy and solidarity, or of Smithfield meat porters demonstrated and even came out on strike in support of the arch-enemy of the trade unions and the working class, Powell, for his racist remarks on coloured immigrants, it is necessary first to understand the feelings of those thus temporarily misled into the wrong camp. The English nation was the first nation to be sacrificed to the Empire. In order to incorporate the conquest of Scotland and Wales the English nation had to disappear in official language and be replaced by an imaginary 'British' nation of synthetic 'Britons'.* In compensation they were given the privilege to invade and conquer other people's countries all over the world; they were exhorted to cease to be 'Little Englanders' and to 'think imperially'. In those conquered countries of Asia and Africa they became little lords, with the coloured inhabitants as scum and dirt beneath their feet. Today it is daily dinned into them in every newspaper that they have lost their empire; that Britain has come down in the world. The old hard-won strongholds of father-to-son monopolies in the docks or Smithfield are being razed by the bulldozer of rationalisation (it is notable that the leader of the dockers' march for Powell had been the leader of an opposition group to the London Port Liaison Committee and the champion of the Devlin reorganisation scheme, while the leader in Smithfield had stood as a Mosleyite candidate). The Labour Government's failure has spread disillusionment. And now these coloured former subject peoples, that had been dirt under their feet, have come swarming into Britain—well, not actually into the docks or Smithfield, but the pictures of a huge flood of coloured immigrants overrunning Britain has been plentifully given them by the press and Mr. Powell, while solemn Front Bench spokesmen

* Except in poetry. The poet could not sing: 'Oh to be in Great Britain now that April's there!' or 'If I should die, think only this of me: that there's some corner of a foreign field that is forever Great Britain.'

dilate upon 'the problem'. Thereby all the primitive instincts of national distrust of the incursion of foreigners with strange habits, together with the trade unionist traditions of resistance to any invasion of jobs monopolies, are now reinforced and dramatised in terms of colour. Everything that has been familiar and secure seems shaking. The bull is angry.

Picador and Matador

At this point the astute Mr. Powell waves a red rag in front of the bull—it is these coloured immigrants that are the cause of all his troubles, that threaten his jobs, that overcrowd the housing, that burden the social services. The bull charges. We can be sure that there will be another picador and another to wave red rag after red rag for the bull to charge and exhaust his strength. And when the bull has exhausted his strength, the matador will step in to deliver the death-blow. To prevent this outcome it is not enough to lecture the bull and say: 'Dear beloved bull, let us reason this matter together on an intellectual plane. Let me give you some statistics.' It is necessary to turn the anger of the bull against the real enemy.

'Black Power'

But if it is essential to understand the feelings of those white workers who are misled into a camp of antagonism to the coloured immigrant workers, how much more is it essential to understand the feelings, and approach with full sympathy every expression, however wild and violent and reckless, of the most oppressed and exploited section in Britain today, the coloured immigrant workers? Did they leave their beautiful sunny homelands, all the ties of their own people and language and culture, for love of the cold and grime and hostility of an alien Britain? It was imperialism that plundered the wealth and throttled the economy of their own countries. Poverty drives them to emigrate in the desperate search for employment. And here they find themselves held down to the worst, the most menial and least paid jobs, subjected to the worst housing conditions, pent up in 'black ghettos', regarded by many with suspicion and even hostility, and turned into a football of local political animosities, or made the scapegoat for national and local misgovernment, to cover the real sins of the big landlords, money-lenders and monopolists who exploit them and all the workers. Against these conditions they are in revolt; and their struggle against these conditions is the just struggle of the most heavily exploited

section of the working class, and the common interest of the whole working class. If some of their spokesmen seek to express this struggle in terms of the slogan 'Black Power', originating in the very different conditions of the United States and adapted by these spokesmen for use here, it is necessary, before rushing into controversy on the variety of interpretations of this slogan or censoriously condemning it as an alleged 'black racialism', to understand first the emotional feeling and positive content which wins support among significant sections for such a slogan: the desire for independence, self-respect, strength of organisation and positive militant action in place of dependence on the generosity and benevolence of the ruling authorities. All this is characteristic of the initial stage of struggle of every heavily exploited section of the working class, and can play its full part in the common struggle. There is need for independent strong representative associations of coloured workers in Britain, to assist their organisations and voice their claims, alongside joint bodies of coloured and white workers and of inter-racial co-operation to promote the common struggle against racialism.

Solidarity

The battle against racialism requires unity and strength, both nationally and internationally. While surrender on the part of some sections of white workers to Powellism represents the most dangerous breach of working class solidarity, it is also necessary to be on guard against interpretations of the slogan 'Black Power' in terms that could divide the common fight of the workers. A programme document 'Black Power in Britain', published by the Universal Coloured People's Association, has said: 'Coloured peoples all over the world, wherever they live, wherever they are born, wherever they go, drink the same waters of affliction from the same man. The White Man.' This is an over-simplification. The horizon of the writers of this document is confined to the United States, the West Indies, Britain and Africa, and here they see only the identity of Ian Smith and Wilson or 'Anglo-Saxon fascism' as the enemy. They ignore the militant workers, the rest of the world, especially the socialist world, yet present their picture as applying 'all over the world'. How does their picture apply to the Uzbeks? Tajiks? Mongolians? Chinese? Was Stalin, the Georgian Asiatic, 'oppressed'? The classless antithesis of all 'Coloured' against all 'Whites' conceals class relations and the realities of capitalism and imperialism. The rich oil sheikhs or the Tata and Birla multi-millionaires are treated

as oppressed, and the starving white in a slum as an oppressor. Victory in the fight against racialism requires the strongest working class solidarity. It requires internationally the united action of all the forces opposed to racialism: the socialist world, the newly independent countries, the national liberation movement and the working class in the imperialist countries, alongside the broadest range of democratic supporters. Whatever hinders such unity or promotes division plays into the hands of racialism and imperialism.

Responsibility of the Labour Movement

The greatest responsibility in the fight against racialism in this country rests on the entire labour movement. In face of all the dangerous currents of racialist and chauvinist illusions and conceptions in the climate of an imperialist country, it is an achievement of the class-conscious workers, socialists, communists and militant trade unionists, to have established recognition of the principles of internationalism and opposition to racialism in the working class organisations, in the trade unions and political bodies, drawing together white and non-white workers in the common working class struggle. But there is still a great deal to be done in the fight against the special subjection and discrimination which victimises coloured workers; and the present Race Relations Bill, while a significant step forward, is still an incomplete step in the legal field. There is still much to be done in combating the infection of racialist poison among white workers, especially where this is concealed inside issues of job protection, demarcation or promotion; nor can we forget that at last year's Trades Union Congress, alongside all the progressive resolutions adopted, the resolution on this issue was brushed under the carpet by the chairman's ruling. There is a battle to be fought; and it is bound up with the whole present critical battle for the future of the labour movement and of socialism.

R.P.D.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

- Reminiscences of the Cuban Revolutionary War*, Che Guevara. Allen & Unwin, 288 pp., 42s.
- Again Korea*, Wilfred B. Burchett. International Publishers, New York, 188 pp., 18s. 6d.
- Black Skin White Masks*, Frantz Fanon. MacGibbon & Kee, 232 pp., 25s.
- Commitment to Welfare*, Richard M. Titmuss. Allen & Unwin, 272 pp., 30s.
- Western Capitalism Since the War*, Michael Kidron. Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 166 pp., 36s.
- Elections in Britain*, R. L. Leonard. Van Nostrand & Co., 192 pp., 35s.