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. It is concerned with a Labour Movement that has realigned itself, that is, in fact, the first time that Labour has been able to exploit the first elections following a period of strong opposition. The result has been to secure a majority in Parliament, to secure a majority of the popular vote, and to produce a government that is dedicated to a policy of nationalization. This is the greatest triumph of the Labour Movement in its history. It is a triumph that has been achieved through the hard work of the Party, the dedication of its members, and the support of the people of this country.

After the severe setback of the defeat in 1951, the Party has recovered. It has regained its strength and has once again become the leading force in British politics. The Party has been able to build on its recent successes and to plan for the future. The Party's programme is now focused on the needs of the people and on the challenges of the post-war world. The Party is determined to continue its achievements and to work towards a better future for all the people of this country.
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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 of the Trade Union Movement 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 aspirations.

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 Jay's answer is that Labour should fight its whole basis, no longer represent the working class (who apparently no longer exist) and turn back from a real attack on those who wield power in capitalist society.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 Grindon, 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, if we 'water down' our beliefs we shall win wider support. The Party has already proved that 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 water-down have created. Nowhere is reassessment required more than on the question of nationalization and common ownership. Rejected 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 bureaucratic 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, secondly, has, as a Party refused to admit the genuine mistakes that have been made. We must be honest and admit that we did make 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 nationalizing 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 municipal ownership where possible. However, in doing so we must also work out a system of workers' control and management and recognise that bureaucratic methods are not adopted. The present bureaucracties must be opposed and, even now, proposals made to transform the structure of nationalized industry. All ideas should be explored, but we must beware the pseudo-socialism of Grindon 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 reaffirmed 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...

CRISIS IN INDIA, pages 6-7

contin. on page 8
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 of itself within the party. In the immediate aftermath there has been much discussion of the disintegration of a Lab-Lib union, a big left-right split in the movement, whether we can move next, 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 direct result on the election. It was seen quite clearly that in areas higher than average unemployment such as the Lancashire cotton belt, Scotland and Northern Ireland the Labour Party is almost discredited. In the Midlands, however, the Tories romped home purely on the fact the trade unions lack authority and standard of living.

Also in the new towns around Luton, Harlow, etc., we see age where Labour expected to win on the influx of working class votes. the swing was against them.

Age, according to a poll from the 21-30 age group, who unlike the solid block of ten million supporters haven’t had to struggle against unemployment or the bitter fight even to maintain living standards.

Of course all this 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 alienated and depressed against a party that is trying to moderate reforms when it comes down to bread and butter issues the shop stewards and their rank and file can be just as militant as any of their more experienced workmates.

Then we have then this contradiction of better off, subsidized 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 argue what the victory of 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 and say there is no move yet. 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 go it seems safe to say that they will not openly attack such a thing at the moment. For as much as the Tories would like to name shop stewards even they know that to bring political onto the shop floor in such a way would be in the long run damage them.

Many of them are 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 the 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 consequent response brought this from the "Daily Mail"?) shows a trend. Also the banning of the two unaccustomed stewards at standards meetings by threatened expulsion by the AEU confirms this, although we mustn’t be too read in the tea leaf as this is a completely new trend.

Labour officialdom has always frowned upon its flock with the excuse to go into 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 they 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 middle class reaction at the turn prices as a political strategy to the backwardness and apathy of the movement.

If that leaves the left wit only one alternative—to organizational within the trade 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 industrial issues thus divorcing worker from worker, factory from factory, and they are from reality it has been by being separated from their union officials workers are finally in power. They are the people where local issues can be coordinated into a national policy. This can only be achieved by democratizing the movement.

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 issues. In the most materialistic way it effectively demarcates the area of American affluence and the one which prejudices confine us to outside that area. Moreover, it coincides pinpoints America’s tacit acceptance of implicit apartheid, the ignorance of much of the American public of what is happening on its own doorstep, and the immense commercial opportune if support of racial discrimination that goes right the way up throughout the administration.

In a country which has a population whose physical characteristics are roughly similar, social position of each 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 developing into a crude Nazi theory of racial superiority. Of. In their own way, the Wizard Simmons: "The Anglo-Saxon is the type man of history. To be must prejudiced. His self centred Hebrew, the cultured Greek, the virile Roman, the mystic Oriental. The Pascalist must have had them in a book as he would have him do his housework in the case of the Jews. He foolishly thrown on individual choice. It is significant that the emotion, the psychology, the idealism of the people can only be maintained en masse, in relationship to a community—mainly the white. They keep white people's white when they abuse. More sophisticated arguments arise—such as that of the openly acquiescent unions: "Why risk the organization in the interest of the government, however worthwhile, which is the permanent seal of honour", or the slightly blunter Senator Eastland, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on civil rights 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 eugenics"

And when a morality of this kind can be successfully generated, solitary individuals can do more than conform lest they . . . face far. The fantasy of race obscure all races if the best in Hitler's creed—class lines are lost in race lines (cf. the modern proponents of the Welsh Nationalist right-wing) and the battles are lost in irrelevant details.

Conditions

Sixty years ago, a Poulant leader put forward the point that: "You are kept apart in order that you may separate by fleece of your earnings. Racial prejudice is the keystone of the arch of economic despotism that beggars belief. For ordinary people are unable to do other than driven to make other pronounce then they do make, will the white majority be able to fully throw back on individual choice. It is significant that the emotion, the psychology, the idealism of the people can only be maintained en masse, in relationship to a community—mainly the white. They keep white people's white when they abuse. More sophisticated arguments arise—such as that of the openly acquiescent unions: "Why risk the organization in the interest of the government, however worthwhile, which is the permanent seal of
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MEETING THE PEOPLE

by Shillalay

"I was rather hoping that the 'Meet the People' campaign would be the end of the Prime Minister's visits. I mean, the Prime Minister and the Party Chairman both said that 'Meet the People' was done!' he exclaimed. "Why is it the main plank in our program?"

"I feel it was rather undignified for them to show off their exit while dancing the Wunky with a group of teenagers," the PM replied. "We can't ignore the importance of dignity," replied the Chairman. "Why the National Press called him a martyr who differentiated himself from our Heritage. "Of course", he added, "if you feel usted is the immense tasks before us we will be willing to consider your resignation." "Oh no, indeed no," said the Prime Minister. "I am quite ready to do anything you suggest!"

"Very well," replied the Chairman. "Actually the ANC has arranged a tour, the details of which you will receive in a few days." So I told you. She had just instructed me to send you to Melita's Dancing Academy to learn the Cha-Cha, the 'latest thing in dancing as I am told.' "Thank you," said the Prime Minister courteously, but he could not suppress a small sigh. "I don't think the Pint of M and B Mike" Big Bert. He was sitting in his customary place in the Crossed Rangers' quarters. "Rumors about you are worse 'ere," he remarked to his mate Charlie. The two men glibly contempt the beer on a front, for a moment. Charlie nodded towards a group of men playing solo, "look at old Sam over there. He's just right. Mike finally picked up a quick by nagh. "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 then followed up his position. He 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.

"They want to know about to pocket his winnings," when looking round he saw the two detectives. In the back room Bert "went white. 'Bleenid' raider," 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 it," replied Charlie in a puzzled tone. The bartender was quickly and neatly pouring out whiskies and sodas. "Been a fire mare or," he added more hopefully "a miss," "just read the reply of one of the newspapermen. "Something happened this evening," Mike murmured to the barmaid, "passing on PM. That stands for night time."

"I know 'oo that geezer is nah," said Bert "saw 'im on the telly last night. 'E's the Prime Minister."

"Bill the beer pong was listening. "You mean the Government?" he asked, 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 child. "I've suffered for the cause," he repeated. Bert, being a Bricks and milk-bottles frown at me. "So 'es", muttered Charlie, "but not for the cause," replied Bert.

Then Bella came into the pub. She was usually known to Bert as his mate as she tart out Limbo Street, dim as a candle. "What's going on?" she asked. "Our director," '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 wangled 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.

"Yes, oh course", replied the little man, looking rather uncomfortable. "we particularly want to support the economy. Or leading ladies?" Bella asked archly "come 'one with me and we'll see."

Then Charlie explained that the little man was saved from relying because the door burst open and in came a large plain speaker. "Blee'in well meet' the people is it," he shouted, "let 'im 'meet em up by any means necessary." "See comin' dah, pools of water on the floor, and the bleedin' landyards 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 Rangers had two broken windows. One of the detectives came up to the Prime Minister. "Clear off or you'll be done for," he said. The Prime Minister smiled. "The Prime Minister and the Party are waiting in a public house in the next street. Shall we proceed?" "I'd like to, but how can he murmur the little man rising to his feet and trotting to the door. The two detectives and newspapermen followed him and a deadly silence settled on the Crossed Rangers. "Two pints of M and B Mike," Bert ordered.

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 would produce a sparky"—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."—Below statement from the American 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 gashouse'. 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 Carton School enquiry, November 11.

"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"—E. C. Luraga 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" — Kruschev, to leaders of the CIO-AFL, San Francisco.

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

"For this (getting the housing program restarted in Stepney) is the real solution, not some small revolt"—Colr. 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.
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 journalists horrified. A new page in British political history was written. The common man, it appeared, was now massed against disaster.

Fifteen 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 Labour and 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 believe that Labour’s Montgomery is right all the way that the British working class is, in fact, the greatest thing in a fundamental political explanation?

When the British electorate voted in 1945, the soldiers of the first world war marched into the polling booths side by side with their sons, men of the second world war and their women folk from the bomb-scared 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, not for a deal, but 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 the 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 the ruling class front. 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 20,000 ton bomb in the other. Thus did they dig their own grave and guarantee the return to power of the Tories. That the arch-conservative 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 dominates 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 direct conflict, they say: Britain is no longer a nation of two classes, but one equal society. The real struggle is old-fashioned and out of date. Let us, therefore, drop such terms as “Socialism” and “Working Class”. Let us call it “Labour”. After all, it has such a horrid, common ring that smells of the Old SCM Road. How could any self-respecting millionaire be expected to join such a Party?

The class struggle is old-fashioned 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 Robson 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 Ber- nard 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 united 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.

It’s very name indenitifies 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 Tory Party. The Liberals have never called themselves the Party of the Middle Class or the Shop- keepers’ 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 the differences and 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 identified with Social- list 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. Every fascists use the name (National) Labour. Its main distinctive feature is its closest identification with the trade unions, the organs of
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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 have been emerging 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 union affiliates and delegates to General Management Committees, etc. In the eyes of the great majority of workers, the Labour Party is the 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 characte

Argument

Now, since the election, the issue has been to show that it is time the Labour Party loses its class character. The very name is said to be damaging and the Labour education in the public mind of Labour Party and Trade Unions is said to have lost us a lot of votes last time because 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, 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 characterized 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, so far as against the working class.

Two classes

a working class party.

The lack of a statement of truth in the assertion that people do see what they feel is a higher status. In a society which for centuries has been stratified into classes, whose mainsprings have been ruthless competition between individuals and the preservation of all 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.

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 was ever 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" his worker are the workers collectively.

Besides the extent to which any worker can "get on" under capital

socialist, union experience of the trade union. If there is a feeling among the workers that only their particular struggles and matters that strike in other industries are usually "waste," and a damned nuisance, it must be explained, over and over again, that the common class interest transcends parochial sectional interests and that a victory for any group of workers is the best assurance of victories for others.

M Milliot

Youth

Those 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" goes uneasily together. And possibly equal wages for youth and adult are not a desirable social aim. Given that there should be a progressive elimination of the "time 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 work of adultless 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 mill cards or gluing 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 to extend general education at the ages (seventeen 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 work in every town attention must be paid to the problems of youth and students living away from home.

Utopian

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

A divorce from the trade unions would be a catastrophe for the Labour Party. The possible loss of the militant capitalistic middle class elements and some aspirants to middle class status would be no compensation. It would be a loss to the working class. Some of the workers who 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 procedures 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 of wooing the vague "centre" voter, but to win over once and for all those workers who are now irresolute and must assert and by its actions prove that it is the champion of the workers' interests.
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THE CRISIS IN INDIA

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, in part, used by the corrupt politicians of the republic to divert the masses from the real issues. The fact that since 1947 economic development in India has not only been insufficient but also uneven, even though Indian 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 opportunistic and mendacious policies which have passed for an economic policy. The ruling party, the Congress, is a vast amorphous organization of conflict interests. It has grown fat due to the presence of these interests. The first is the political prestige and organization it acquired as a national party fighting for independence, second is the ebonious prestige which has passed to the Congress. Finally is the failure of any co-operative opposition to emerge during recent years. The Congress Party was too dispersed in the years following independence and recovered too slowly to take advantage of the failure of the Congress. Its recent success has been in marked contrast to 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 the Congress in Indian developments. He has been the Prime Minister since 1946 and with Gandhi's murder on the 30th January, 1948, and Nehru, the health, in 1950, the mantle of leadership has fallen solely upon him. By and large, he has a receptive voice in the country's policies and therefore it is not unfair to praise or blame the major policies of the present government, he is the most liberal and cosmopolitan in outlook of all the personalities who shape the policies of the present government. He is a hybrid one. He has a shrewd eye for the middle position and his policies is a 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 enterprises and nationalized industries. On the great question of agriculture in relation to industrialization, his discussion is ambiguous, on the question of foreign investment in India he is showman for his show. Outside India he has acquired fame as the defender of internationalism, a foreign policy which is unaligned to either bloc in theory. In practice, however, it leans towards either bloc which is convenient for the diplomatic game.

Hatred

Apart from the Communist - the only political party of importance in opposition is the Praja Socialist Party. It originates from a dissident group in the Congress which claim to be democratic socialists. Every two years it splits and joins in all sorts of permutations with other parties. In the name of policy it has two faces, one is the irrational hatred of the Congressists which is unprovoked by the Americans in the form of generous funds and a boost up to 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 hatchet-post of Gandhian-Fabianism, Socialism and their opposition sounds hollow. Their leader is Jaya Prada, Narayan, one Marxist and now a Bhoaden under the influence of Vinoba Bhave and his landgift movement. Domestically, it does not go long to the party but those familiar with Indian politics know that he is a supporter of Nehru’s policies. (For Gandhi also did not belong to the Congress party in his later years). He is the revelation of opportunists who hope to capitalize on his increasing popularity when Mr. Nehru is removed from the scene. In the absence of serious Marx- ist economic thinking and action, it is natural that all political parties in particular are not only in power but also in opposition present government, he is the most liberal and cosmopolitan in outlook of all the personalities who shape the policies of the present government. He is a hybrid one. He has a shrewd eye for the middle position and his policies is a successful exercise in the middle way. Inside the Congress he adopts a neutral position between the warring factions. Economically he wants a mix-
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From the above table, two significant points emerge: One is that most of the benefit from expanding medical services is going to the richer 20% of the population with the rest being too poor to be able to afford to pay the price. Second, as far as the bottom and middle class of professionals is concerned, their share of facilities is not only not expanding but has either remained static or actually declined. In other words, the Praja-Socialists are the beneficiaries in column 4 and 5. 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 agriculturists paints a sobering picture of our failures on this line once again. In 1955, the Indian population was about 480 millions. To feed this population, 110 million tons of food-grains will be required. The rate of increase in food production in the Second Five Year Plan is about 5.5% per cent. The rate of growth of the Indian population in the First Five Year plan was at the rate of 2.3 per cent, and the expectation is that it will claim to achieve the target of 110 million tons will have to produce an increase of 4.4% per cent. for the next 7 years. This does not take into account the lean years of drought or floods which 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 shoulders of the production party. It has failed to carry out the land reforms which will create enthusiasm among the peasantry. Not only that, the government has not shifted the production from non- food crops to food crops, but the provision was made for creation of only 8 million new jobs. Cumulative percentage of medical expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical Services</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom half</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(of population)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lower half)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| N.B. This table and most of the statistical material used in this article is taken from an address by Mr Prabhu Bhumare of the 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 and Political Economy. The tables are my own. (D.M.)

This gives a net figure of 73 million unemployed. A net figure of 73 million unemployed has been freely acknowledged that employment figures were on the rise until 1955, but since then employment figures were generously optimistic. Thus the figure of 73 million unemployed at the end of the Second Plan is not an unreasonable one. This does not take into account the vast numbers of those who are not in the normal working time. If these are included, the figure for the unemployed will rise to over 90 million. For 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 shout 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 anti-communists and some frustrated elements of the Congress Party. Its figurehead is Mr. Rajagopalachari, an old debilitated reactionary. The moving spirit behind this party is M. R. Masani, an Indian version of Macarthy and a leading member of the infamous 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 advertising 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 shipbuilders. But it has started a campaign against land reforms, particularly against cooperative farming.

**Unpopular**

The second is the celebrated affair of Mr. Krishna Menon. Briefly, for the past few years a symposium of newspaper editors has been going on for the removal of Mr. Menon on the alleged ground that he has been a liability to India. Recently he has pursued a wrong policy in the United Nations Organization as leader of the Indian delegation. The net result of all this 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 the way of an 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 the way of an 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 the way of an 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 the way of an 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 the way of an 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 the way of an 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 the way of an argument is that he has become personally unpopular in the United States and thus prevents financial aid in greater measure from that country.

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 establishments of all shades of admittance. The wretched capitalist democracy of India is surrounded by military establishments of all shades of admittance. How could it be assumed that a military dictatorship of Sandhurst trained reactionary officers will help the mass struggle or bring the goal of socialist 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 will be of use to the American policy. Indeed it is no time a huge campaign built up demanding his sack. For the time being the crisis has had some consequences 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 Prajna-Socialist Party. When the row between Mr. Menon and the Army Chief leaked out, except for the
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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 establishments of all shades of admittance. How could it be assumed that a military dictatorship of Sandhurst trained reactionary officers will help the mass struggle or bring the goal of socialist 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 will be of use to the American policy. Indeed it is no time a huge campaign built up demanding his sack. For the time being the crisis has had some consequences 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.

**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 un-American way the Chinese have given a handle to the forces of reaction in India. They have distorted the attitude of the Indian workers from the developing class struggle to futile questions of difference and purely temporary expedience. They have provided a golden opportunity to American propagandists to attract hungry masses of Asia to help the Western bandwagon.

Footnote: The Americans, who are so eager for a quarrel between India and China, have suddenly become cautious. Mr. Hertler’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.
THE WAY AHEAD, from page 1

UNTIL further notice, this notebook will be compiled and published 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 suffer. Another example is the means unnecessary hardship for Donald and Francis Ezzeiro who are esteemed friends of mine.

Donald and Francis both started the CPPA during the race riots of 1958, and like numerous other pivots of small social groups, 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.

The man in the house, called "Blackhouse" by the situated in the slumier 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 Ezzeiro’s have lived there, they have paid over £200 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 show 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 are in 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 organised organisations, left without the tangible evidence of socialist practice, as against preaching, are left with the choice of (a) becoming a nationalistic organisation, or (b) becoming a welfare organisation. 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, we have been 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 "Eezzeiro's of Britain.

The vital question of a Labour Youth Movement. Youth still has passion, high ideals and looks to the future "golden 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 executive, to produce their own pamphlets. liaisons 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 nature (even Tory youth presents such tendencies within their party) can be harnessed on to the 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 have the beginning of 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 of 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 objective must be to make socialism and educational work 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 stop all to some extent, in its ranks. 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 make it happen. 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.
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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 reason 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 this, is being done by 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 and sympathies as working-class peoples.

Have you seen any leopards changing their spots lately? For better or worse, in all societies, people inherit irreplaceable affinities. Those of the class into which they were born. And they all try to move upwards, not necessarily 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 ranks 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 and to keep alive 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 that justice is done. The Labour Party can command the resources and manpower necessary to launch such a scheme; and when “new” arguments are being advanced for the savagery 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 reject any offers. However, ever, 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.