

working people

SELF-RELIANCE • SOCIALISM

PAPER OF THE COMMITTEE FOR A SOCIALIST PROGRAM

Dear Mr. Heffer, the Committee for a Socialist Program sends you congratulations and good wishes on your resignation from the present Labour Government. As you will see from the previous issue of Working People, we cannot support you on the particular issue on which you decided to make the break. We see the question of EEC membership as irrelevant to the main question posed by the present grave crisis of capitalism, the gravest since the 1930s. This main question we see as essentially one of class power.

The capitalist class, represented at present by the Wilson Government and increasingly by Wilson himself, on the whole wishes to stay within the EEC. But this is not the issue on which the working class should make its challenge. The challenge needs to be made on the issue that will unite all who can be united against the main enemy. The main enemy are the directors of this imperialist capitalist system who have brought us all, through this system, into the present mess — which is going to get much worse.

Indeed so far there is only a phony crisis. The capitalists have been successfully forced by the unity and strength of the organised workers, and have so far been able, to go on paying wages that on the whole maintain present living standards. But this cannot continue. British capitalism is living, and has been living for several years, by borrowing abroad on an enormous and increasing scale. The £ sterling has fallen in relation to other currencies, by 22% in the past 4 years and is still falling. The sterling exchange rate is at present assisted by Arab oil money invested in London, but the day of reckoning is bound to come — just as Chamberlain's phony war turned into the real World War II.

THE HEFFER

RESIGNATION

A N O P E N L E T T E R

So the real question is not at all the EEC. The real question is — are the British working people willing both to let their wages fall and also to suffer unemployment in order to maintain the capitalist class system, as the new Budget proposes?

That is the question that socialists need to put to the people, and to keep putting until they get a clear answer.

That is the question that not a single newspaper, not a single telly program has so far put.

That is the question that the political leadership of the working class must dare to put to the whole working people.

Obviously it is not a question that can be answered through a vote in the House of Commons nor through a general election. It is a question of CLASS POWER.

A NATIONAL UNITY OF WORKING PEOPLE

The capitalist class will if necessary do anything short of giving up its power to rule, its power to milk the national economy to the personal profit of those who direct it.

So far it has been prevented from bringing down seriously the wages of the strongest section of the workers — though the real wages of others have fallen — but what we need is a national unity of working people to say to the capitalists and their Government:

"If your system cannot pay all its workers a proper and reasonable wage, then we will take over, and we will pay you a reasonable and proper wage for the organisational work you do. We recognise that this work is in many cases both heavy and responsible. We shall continue to pay all of you who do real work — work necessary for the economy itself and not for profiteering and rakeoffs — a proper wage for this work, while we gradually change the whole system, including ourselves and all who work in it, our whole people, from this profiteering system to a human and social system based on social priorities, not on profits nor on profiteering. We know this will take quite a time.

If your millionaires and their lick-spittles dare to accuse miners or other workers of selfishness if they earn £60 a week, our answer is quite simple. We offer you £60 a week, or even a bit more, for continuing to do your present job — if it is worth that much. But we will no longer allow you, nor any capitalist whatever, to decide how much anyone is to be paid. The working people must decide that, just as they must decide how the whole national economy is to be run.

And the sooner we get down to organising this changeover, the better."

To page 2

CONTENTS

	Page
Do we profit from imperialism?	2
SCOTLAND	3
A prison interview	4/5
Prisons in Britain and in a socialist country	6
Class struggle in China	9
Poem and Letter from India	11
Frelimo	12
Drugs, Doctors and Inquests	13
T.U. Jottings	14
International	15

What is socialism? Socialism is the working people's power to run the national economy and our whole society as the working people want to run it.

What has this to do with restoring profits, which the dominant section of the Wilson Government proclaim as their aim — only claiming that they can do it better than the Tories?

Back in 1966, when there was another crisis, a mere baby of a crisis compared to the present one, the then most powerful member of the Wilson Cabinet — had he but known it! — Frank Cousins, the Jack Jones of that decade, resigned from that Wilson Government because it was caving in — just like today — to the Treasury and the bankers. And then he trumpeted in the Daily Mail that he would launch a socialist campaign! The campaign never got launched and that was the end of Cousins.

THE REAL CHALLENGE

Today a much bigger crisis is ahead of us. Instead of a lead to face that crisis, the TUC, the Labour Left, Tribune and the CPGB all make loud noises about something else.

If only we get out of Europe our British imperialist capitalist system will be much better, say all these diversionists — and maybe some of them have the long term aim that, after the referendum has gone against them, they will once more be able to blame it on the people for "not being ready for socialism".

But objective reality is more important than the tricks of incompetents and traitors. Objective reality is that this imperialist capitalist system is being forced by its own breakdown to try to break working class power as it exists at present, chiefly in the unions. Heath last year tried to do this too soon and with inadequate forces. He failed, and Wilson came in to do the job more subtly. But subtlety cannot replace brute force for ever, to save a class system that is rotting.

Whitehall, and the Home Office, and Defence are all preparing to use whatever brute force may be required when the crunch comes.

Are Tribune and the TUC prepared? Is it not necessary that the working class should prepare, and prepare now, to meet that challenge?

Crossman in the 1960s bewailed the absence of any "contingency plan" to "save the £" if the official Treasury (and Wilson/Callaghan) policy should fail — as of course it later did.

When the "floating" £ finally sinks, what will be the good, Comrade

Heffer, of having defied Wilson if there is still no contingency plan to deal with that situation?

ANOTHER TORY GOVERNMENT?

The result can at the best only be another "national" government "to save our country", whether with or without "National Front" assistance and the army.

Is it not the duty of socialists to preempt such a move by launching now a working class program not to save capitalism, but to save our people and our country by replacing it?

Our "revolutionary" organisations have all failed to put forward any plan whatever to meet the coming crisis. There is maybe still a possibility that the militant wing of our organised workers may develop sufficient political understanding to give such a national lead.

If that happens, then surely not just one Eric Heffer but a whole group of Wilson's Ministers will see that the ship is heading for the rocks and that it is socialist duty as well as plain commonsense to jump off and join up within the main force for socialism and for democracy.

Can anyone believe that the next government, whether under Wilson or a Tory, will be more democratic than were Baldwin and Macdonald in the '30s? Or even as much so?

STATE CAPITALISM

This is not the 1930s crisis. We are in its successor, when capitalism has advanced much further into state capitalism — when the Soviet Union, which in the 1930s appeared to be the bastion of socialism, is now with the increasing collapse of the USA become the very type and symbol of the New Capitalism.

To "fight fascism" now means to fight state capitalism, which inevitably more and more requires a

POLICE STATE to keep wages down, and to keep the people quiet — just like in the Soviet Union.

Far from organising the workers into state capitalism, as the Labour Left has been seeking to do, socialists need to organise them to take over the state itself.

This struggle has to be seen as a People's War, even though it is a war so far mostly without guns. The directors of our imperialist capitalist economy emphatically see it as a war, and have been making numerous preparations to step it up to whatever level is required. Their army being trained in the practice of "low intensity" warfare in Ireland, here at home the repeated rehearsals for the military seizure of London Airport, the police being armed and militarised (as well as an attempt at decorruption) the prison system being developed for scientific demoralisation and mental destruction of prisoners.

Class struggle does not disappear because Labour Ministers become industrial tycoons (Robens, Marsh) nor will it disappear if Tony Benn should be able to persuade the whole TUC to amalgamate with the CBI.

The responsibility for dealing with the coming crisis lies with the organised working class as the only alternative to an increasingly fascist state capitalism. If the organised workers fail to take up this responsibility, that will mean social suicide, and the responsibility and opportunity will fall to a new and worse exploited proletariat in the next and probably last period of capitalist world crisis.

Are we men — or sheep?

Militant fellow-workers, who still think the class struggle is a question of wages whereas it is a question of power, let us ask ourselves this simple question —

IF WE DON'T, WHO WILL?

C.S.P.

cont. from p. 4 DO WE PROFIT FROM IMPERIALISM?

including his own (he judged a few months later that the opportunity had passed). Lloyd George in 1919 as Prime Minister judged that the situation was dangerously revolutionary — for his Government — in the same period, when he invited the "revolutionary" TUC to a talk in Downing Street, and confronted them with the alternative of being prepared to take power or pipe down. They piped down, then as now, as Lloyd George had correctly foreseen.

Let FCA be a little more modestly self-critical and consider whether it

is giving all the revolutionary leadership it could, or whether it is complacently blaming the workers — just like the CPGB in its "revolutionary" days. In this matter is not the FCA doing just what the Birch party does — awaiting a revolutionary movement instead of setting about making one? Marx incorrectly believed for nearly half a century that a revolution was only a few years ahead. But meantime he set about preparing such a revolution and the results of his work are now penetrating the whole world.

From our Scottish correspondent

Significant things are happening north of the Border. The Scottish Labour Party has totally reneged on its commitment to a strong Scottish Assembly — thus sealing its electoral doom. (It would, of course, be open to the Wilson Government to reverse once again the decision of its perverse minions — but too late to save them. The voters aren't that daft!) The Scottish Labour Party Conference underlined its contemptuous treatment of the Assembly question by declining to constitute itself as a separate Labour Party for Scottish and municipal affairs. Rousseau had a point when he spoke of compelling men to be free.

Just prior to this the Labour Government had given yet one more example of its utter cowardice when faced with the giants of international capitalism by imposing — if that is not too strong a word — a truly derisory tax on North Sea Oil. This was buttressed by other valuable concessions. The greedy giants huffed and puffed but found it hard to conceal their satisfaction. Meanwhile, 103,000 Scottish workers were on the 'buroo' (Scots for dole) and many more were on short time and the Social contract was used to defeat the just claims of those still at work. In many cases these claims even if met would not provide parity with English workers in the same or in comparable jobs.

Against this background the Scottish Republican Clubs are holding a series of public meetings which, like all manifestations of Socialist Republicanism, are arousing rather more than the usual degree of interest in the 'second city'. We are a club not a party. Sole qualification for membership is adherence to the idea of an Independent Socialist Scotland. Our Public Meetings are debates wherein a 'hundred flowers' — to say nothing of the occasional noxious weed — contend. Nevertheless the impact has been considerable.

THE MILITARY QUESTION

Among the ideas which received an airing at the February meeting was what one speaker referred to as the 'military question'. 'If we cannot', he asked, 'discuss this in a Scottish Republican club, where can we?'

In the Scottish Republican Club's public debate on the theme "Ireland Today! Scotland Tomorrow?" held in Glasgow on 6th April, it

rapidly became evident that many, perhaps most, of the 70 people present were answering the question affirmatively. So, it seems, were the participants in the much larger Annual General Meeting of the 1320 Club, taking place at the same time some 30 miles away. At any rate the published speeches of the respective Chairmen — run together as a single item in most of the Scottish press — certainly gave the impression that armed struggle for National Liberation had left the realm of the unthinkable.

The Scottish Judiciary in the person of Lord Wheatley, the Lord Justice-Clerk (equivalent of Lord Chief Justice) and son of Wheatley the famous Red Clydeside MP, evidently thought so too, when, two days later, he delivered swinging sentences — and a truly nauseous homily — to three young men who pled guilty to bank robbery for partly political motives. The very fabric of 'our' society had, it appears, been threatened by their activities. So, at heart, opined the learned father-in-law of Tam Dalyell. So, too, the parrot press.

A WAVE OF ARRESTS

The issue of the sentences and of the forthcoming trial of other political prisoners overshadows every other development in Scotland. It might be useful, therefore, to give a brief resume of the facts.

Three separate waves of arrest netted a total of 11 people, all but one of them — ex-soldier Alistair Smith — were kept in custody. The first 7 comprised alleged members of, or sympathisers with a body entitled 'The Army of the Provisional Government' (A.P.G.). Next came the arrest of Mr. Smith. Finally, some weeks later, three others were picked up. One of these is Major Boothby, former editor of the well informed magazine 'Sgian Dubh' and a very considerable figure in Scottish life for many years past. The Major is 65 and has been charged with bank robbery. Liam Bell hails from Inverness and is a leader and parliamentary candidate of the Gaelic speaking Fine Gadheall Party — no connection with the Free State Conservative Party of the same name. The violence of a police search of Mr. Bell's home (the door was split in two by repeated kicks)

was raised in Parliament, where the Lord Advocate declined to apologise to, or compensate, the victim. John Carlyle, arrested at the same time, is Secretary/Treasurer of the Scottish Republican Club. A Marxist and former policeman John was, at the time of his arrest, working to build support for the political prisoners of both this and the earlier Matt Lygate generation. Charges against the prisoners encompass such things as bank robbery, conspiring to cause explosions, offences under the Official Secrets Act and so on.

The three men sentenced by Lord Wheatley were said to have carried out a bank raid in order, partly, to contribute to the funds of the A.P.G. Only one of the three, a Mr. Fairlie, was alleged to have been a member of the A.P.G. Fairlie, brother of an S.N.P. candidate, had been a nationalist since the age of 14. He received a 12 year sentence and his 2 (less political) colleagues 9 years a piece. This prompted a letter to the 'Glasgow Herald', suggesting that future robbers would do well to disavow political intent and claim instead to be motivated by sheer viciousness and greed.

Two facets of the press coverage of their trial deserve mention: the constant references to the A.P.G. as a tartan army, sliding almost imperceptibly into equating it with the Tartan Army (a body whose existence, outside the imagination of its possible creators in some State Intelligence apparatus, one begs leave to doubt) and the even fouler transposition of a corpse from a quite unrelated case. Fairlie is said to have wanted to get out of the A.P.G. He believed, however, that his only exit route consisted of a bullet in the head. The Scottish press reported, as evidence for this assertion, the case of a man found dead in a ditch. Readers of, for example, the 'Daily Record' were thus led to believe that some poor Scot, falling foul of fanatical nationalists, had been gunned down by them. Only 'The Scotsman' made it really clear that Fairlie had been talking about the Lennon case! Thus the Ruling Class makes its own victims work for it several times over, even when dead.

The remaining eight defendants are, of course, pleading Not Guilty. Their

Cont. on p.4

joint trial is expected to come on at the end of April or beginning of May.

A BIG SHOW TRIAL

Some 320 witnesses are expected to give evidence for the Prosecution.

Another date to watch for in the Scottish Legal Calendar is May 7th, when comrade Matt Lygate, serving 26 years in Peterhead Prison is brought to Glasgow to defend a Civil Action.

Analysis of the reasons for the big Show Trial which our masters have in mind suggests two possible motives. First there is the comparatively simple idea of discrediting the S.N.P. The fact that few, if any, of the prisoners have a connection with that Party constitutes absolutely no obstacle to their trial being used in that way. Another, more sophisticated, view is gaining ground in some quarters. This suggests that the Americans would, despite President Ford's public statements to the contrary, be not too unhappy at the prospect of an S.N.P. controlled 'Independent' Scotland. Pressure is therefore exerted on the Westminster Government to launch a sort of pre-emptive strike against anyone wanting a different and more radical, a less accommodating Scotland. Westminster is happy, for its own squalid reasons, to comply. Among these reasons would be the wish to eliminate, in view of the expected renewal of fighting in Northern Ireland, any possibility of a 'Second Front' emerging in another internal colony. The wave of searches etc. in Wales, which occurred at about the same time, might bear this out.

Whatever the explanation, there can be no doubt that the authorities aim at a 'cause celebre' ! This may not have been the original idea. After the Tartan Army pylon bombings — although not, curiously, after the same 'Army's' bombing of an oil pipe line some months previously — the police began to lash out rather wildly, searching and interrogating a great range of folk whose political views spanned a very wide spectrum. A certain disharmony was evident between the C.I.D. and Special Branch, possibly stemming from the replacement, following the Lygate trial, of the latter's Glasgow leadership by one or more Englishmen. When, for example, a Labour Regional councillor in Edinburgh was called on late one night by Special Branch, enquiring about, among others, your correspondent, he rang the local police to protest, only to find that they genuinely knew nothing of the visit. Such

There is much in common in the programs of CSP and of the Finsbury Communist Association. We both see

experiences are quite commonplace. Now, however, the big guns are being trundled out. The eminence of the last three accused makes a quiet trial impossible. True to form news pages, leaders and correspondence columns alike thunder out their condemnations; a Scottish Liberal apparatchik goes so far as to accuse some unspecified folk (in reality the Scottish Republican Club) of using 'the language of the jackboot and the thug'. In another part of the forest, our aspiring Melford-Stevensons are probably polishing their well stocked armoury of minatory phrases. True, Wheatley L.J.C. did not actually tell Fairlie that he'd be 'none the worse for a hanging' but we may confidently expect the reappearance of this felicitous expression, made so justly famous by his predecessors on the Bench, somewhere in the course of this affair.

Your correspondent apologises for the length of this dispatch. He feels, though, that English readers deserve the full facts about events North of the Border — facts they will not get through the media.

The affirmative answer which some comrades gave to the Republican Club's question 'Ireland Today ! Scotland Tomorrow ?' was not reached lightly. It followed most careful analysis of the situations in which various people, e.g. the Left of the S.N.P. and the North British Left would contemplate the use of force. All such scenarios have one common element: if they are seriously meant they all necessitate prior preparation — political, psychological and physical. Otherwise they amount to an invitation to a mass suicide party. These are not, however, the only possibilities. Against the present background of political impasse, deep alienation of the Scottish workers, freedom denied, rampant exploitation, high unemployment — a background in which the gathering economic storm seems to lead inexorably to State Repression, it would not be surprising if there were some who agreed with the speaker who said: "it is not so much a case of 'whether' — but of 'when'".

ALL HAIL THE SCOTTISH WORKERS
REPUBLIC !

imperialism as the main enemy. We both see the anti-Common Market campaign as a diversion of the Labour movement from its necessary class aim of developing the understanding of the need for socialism. We both see the second super power, the Soviet Union, as a reactionary influence and also as a main danger to the world revolution. We both thoroughly and critically support the CPC as the international leadership for world revolution as against both its enemies and its false friends. All the more reason for CSP to make perfectly clear our complete rejection of the formulation on which FCA specially prides itself, of having discovered that "the British people benefit from imperialism ... and therefore the British workers ... are not revolutionary".

On the contrary, the British people have been deceived by imperialism, and to some extent demoralised by it, but to say that they benefit by it is like saying that a man reduced to having to sell his labour power to a millionaire benefits from the wages the millionaire allows the man for working for him. The profiteers ruling Britain for the past century have consistently and progressively ruined the British people by consistently and progressively under-investing in British industry and sending their capital abroad — as they continue to do, and increasingly so, until at present there is almost no capital investment in British industry, as is bewailed by Healey, Lever and all the profiteer system's paid economists. Have sugar, tea and cocoa imported far below what would be their price in a just exchange, benefited working people as against the unemployment of the '30s and this ever-rising crisis of the '70s ? to say nothing of a World War between the two.

As to the British workers therefore not being revolutionary, this is altogether too much of a simplification. The British workers have not been revolutionary since the days of Chartism — when they were revolutionary but were let down by their non-revolutionary leaders. And their leaders have remained incompetent and non-revolutionary ever since. John Maclean judged that the Scottish workers at least were revolutionary in January 1919, but again the leadership was inadequate, even

cont. on p.2

PRISON

INTERVIEW

A prisoner's ideas — not his rehabilitation — are what the prison authorities are interested in, as in the following interview between a prisoner and his wing governor:

Are you married ?

No.

But you have a special relationship ?

Yes, I have a lot of them.

That's not what I mean. I mean one special one.

All my relationships are special to me.

The woman you write to as ... She seems to be very special. Is she a coloured girl ?

Yes, she's coloured white.

Really ?

Yes, but I'm not prepared to discuss my purely personal life. I've given the welfare officer an address for parole purposes and beyond that I don't see it as anybody's concern.

You seem to get a lot of coloured visitors.

Not particularly.

That's what I'm told. Why do you think that is ?

If you lived in Brixton you would have black friends. Well, perhaps you wouldn't, but to me it's perfectly natural and none of my friends, black or white, would even notice it let alone think it worth mentioning.

You seem to be very interested in coloured people's problems.

No, again you are noticing something that isn't worth noticing.

People are just people. If you see them as something different that's your attitude, not mine.

But you are interested in their problems aren't you ?

I happen to be a social sort of animal. I've worked in adventure playgrounds and play-centres and as an education officer in the Labour Party and at the time I came in here I was a school governor for two schools. So I'm naturally interested in society and in people's problems — including my own.

You know a lot about Ghana don't you ?

No, I don't know the first thing about it.

Really ? Really ?

Yes, I'm shamefully ignorant except in a very general way.

But you know people from there ?

No. I don't think I do.

Really, you surprise me. Are you a communist ?

I don't belong to any party.

But you're interested in politics.

Yes, of course.

Your ... file is very interesting.

I've never read it.

You don't think much of prison do you ?

No, I think it's very silly.

What do you think about prison officers ?

I see them as victims of society — like the rest of us.

I don't see myself as a victim of society. I don't feel a victim of anything.

(Then followed quite a lot of unmemorable waffle)

What is your opinion of the police ?

It's impossible to live in Brixton and have a high opinion of them.

So you think they're prejudiced.

Yes.

What do you think about the I.R.A. ?

If I was an Irishman I would be doing what they are doing.

Murdering women and children ?

Civil wars kill people. The onus is on the oppressors.

Do you like it better here than at ... ?

I think all prisons are silly, but open ones are particularly so because the words 'open' and 'prison' are contradictions and the screws don't know whether they are warders or scoutmasters or park attendants.

I seem to have seen that before somewhere.

Yes, if you are in the habit of photocopying prisoners' mail you will find it in my ... file.

Do you think prisoners are different here ?

Well, because open prisoners are selected prisoners there is obviously a better cross section here.

You mean the pickings are better ?

I'm sorry I don't understand you.

You have strong political views, don't you ?

I've been around a long time and I have fairly matured views, yes.

Do you think you are a good influence on people ?

I think I'm a responsible person.

I don't like to see people getting into unnecessary trouble. I'm not a trouble maker if that's what you mean. Quite the opposite really.

Do you find that people gravitate towards you ?

No, I should have thought that I was more of a loner than a lot of other people.

Do you think you have a duty to guide people ?

No, I'm more interested in learning myself.

Really ? Surely you help other people wherever you think you have special knowledge. I should have thought it was part of your philosophy to help people.

It's a give and take situation.

I notice you haven't been calling me 'Sir'.

No, it's not a habit of mine but I wouldn't make an issue of it if you want to be called 'Sir'.

You don't think it matters ?

Not to me it doesn't, but if it does to you I'm quite prepared to humour you.

So you're a conformist really ?

Some things in some situations aren't worth bothering about — and that's one of them.

Don't you believe in respect ?

Yes, but 'Sir' is a sign of non-respect. I respect a lot of people but I've never called any of them 'Sir'.

I'm not bothered about it myself. I was just interested in your views.

▪ Guyana. The prisoner has many Guyanese friends. To a racist a wog is a wog and Guyana/Ghana — all the same.

PRISONERS OF LIBERATION

a review

by Allyn and Adele Rickett
Monthly Review Press £

"Prisoners of Liberation" is an account by a young American couple of four years spent in Chinese communist prisons during and just after the Korean War. First published in its present form in 1973 it is nevertheless likely to be new to many people in this country — or could that be because that was the year in which I was myself removed from the world of bookshops and placed in an English prison? In any case this seems to be a highly appropriate situation in which to encounter this book for the first time.

Coming into an English prison for the first time at the age of 48 one had certain preconceptions of what it would be like — not, in my case, the preconceptions of a political innocent but of one who had, or thought he had, some understanding of the nature of our society. One initial expectation was that there would be some attempt to ascertain why I was in prison at all. I expected some sort of concern, if not for myself, then at least on behalf of the society which had sent me here and would eventually receive me back again. I envisaged a succession of interviews and questionnaires by probation officers, sociologists, psychiatrists and other members of the specialist welfare circus, and I saw ahead of me a period of years in which alongside all the punitive and time-wasting aspects of prison life, there would be attempts to refurbish me in the image required by the society which placed me here.

Such expectations have not been realised. Nobody has shown the slightest interest in how I came to be here, in how my ideas are developing while I have been here, nor in the frame of mind in which I shall be released. The realisation that my presence inside was a matter of complete indifference came as a relief rather than as a shock. I had neither the desire nor the intention of being refashioned in this society's chosen image but I was curious at the seeming negligence of a society which makes no attempt at the (on its terms) constructive rehabilitation of the people it consigns to institutions such as these. Now, with two years of my imprisonment behind me I wonder how I could have held such expectations in the first place and how it was, that with my theoretical understanding of the nature of our society, I did not recognise the impossibility of

meaningful rehabilitation under these conditions.

In this country the pressure for penal reform is very much a manifestation of the liberal conscience. It sees in our treatment of prisoners, as in our treatment of, say, immigrants, a blot on the character of our 'democratic society'. It is the pressure, in fact, of people who want it both ways — who, with the very best intentions, can protest, from the security of their middle class bases, at the ugliness and oppression in a class society without which their own middle class status would not even exist.

PRISON REFORM ?

It is easy, but incorrect, to write off all such reformist pressures as hypocritical. Some undoubtedly are, but it is these attempts to assert human rights which inadvertently, and quite incidentally to their original purpose, do much to expose the fundamental contradictions within capitalist society. They are not the stuff by which society will be changed but they reflect a disillusionment which is by no means confined to the revolutionary Left, nor even to the broader Left. It pervades the vast majority of the people in this country who recognise that society is breaking down around them and that they are seemingly at the mercy of economic forces which are beyond anyone's capacity to control.

By and large they accept the declared values of our christian and 'democratic' society, and they correctly see that there is nothing in these declared values which requires that old people should live in poverty, that families should be denied homes, children be miseducated, hundreds of thousands of men and women be unemployed, or that prisoners should be locked away in Victorian goals with no thought for rehabilitation or even basic human rights.

The contradictions which are exposed as soon as these reformist pressures are brought to bear are by no means confined to the prison situation, nor is it suggested that this situation is of particular importance. Undoubtedly society exerts pressures which are of greater significance, which involve greater injustices, and which call for greater immediate concern and protest. However, in relation to this book it is the prison situation which is of partic-

ular relevance. Furthermore, there are certain features of prison life which serve to focus very strongly the divisive structuring of life which exists within our society as a whole.

The prison environment is far more complex than at first appears — certainly far more complex than any mere "us and them" situation. It is an environment of continual underlying tension, and in many ways the tensions amongst the prisoners are the least of these, though it is the prisoners, ultimately, who are the victims of all the tensions, wherever in the system they originate. The environment, like that of society itself, is overwhelmingly working-class — on both sides of the bars. Potentially, the closest relationships, other than those between prisoners themselves, are those between prisoners and the uniformed screws who fulfil the custodial roles. The language, the life-styles, and certainly the underlying class-interests (however unrecognised) are largely interchangeable.

Conversely, the 'civilian' staff, the governor, the welfare officers, psychiatrists and others concerned with the overall welfare of the prisoners are separated from them by a gulf which inhibits real understanding. They are specialists, performing their fundamentally elitist roles in a manner which inevitably tends to set them apart from the prisoners it is their responsibility to help — in much the same way as a doctor stands apart and aloof from his patients. But the status differentiation does not end there. The doctor not only stands aloof from his patients, but also from his fellow-workers in the health services — the nurses, ambulance men, porters. Likewise the prison specialist stands apart from prisoners and uniformed staff alike.

WHY SCREWS GET WORSE

With the trend towards greater and greater specialisation the uniformed prison officer finds himself increasingly relegated to the routine locking and unlocking of doors. Whatever the newspaper advertisements for prison officers suggest in the way of job satisfaction and social involvement, and however much the new recruit may have been motivated by such considerations, he is quickly brought face to face with a wholly different reality. Very understandably, the prison officers' collective response to this situation is to assert their own status in the only direction available to them, and thus to

cont. on page 7

cont. from page 6

set themselves even further apart from the prisoners than the job itself necessitates. (A parallel within the broader spectrum of society would be the manner in which preoccupation with status and with economic differentials finds its ultimate satisfaction in racialism, as the section of society which suffers most from the lack of housing, job security, or even job prospects, discovers within its midst an identifiable group of people who can be relegated to a still lower rung of the ladder.)

Before leaving the question of status in a prison environment it is important to recognise yet another contradiction within the contradictions; again one with obvious parallels outside. The status itself is very largely a sham. Authority — real authority, and responsibility — real responsibility do not exist within the prison walls at all. The really meaningful decisions are made in much more central organs of the state. One sometimes hears arguments amongst prisoners as to whether it is the governor or the chief officer who really controls this or that prison. Only on a very superficial level is this an argument at all; it is naive to see the wide variations among prison regimes as emanating from local decisions. Whatever policies are adopted they can only reflect decisions taken within the Home Office itself.

STATUS

So, within the prison system generally, we have a staff acutely conscious about status, jealously preserving its petty rights, resentful of any erosions. This, then, is the divided instrument which, in the words of the prison regulations, is to fit us to lead "a good and useful life". Under such circumstances it is scarcely surprising that the old time-consuming and socially useless prisoner-occupations linger on. We no longer break rocks, pick oakum or walk treadmills, but most work within prisons remains utterly senseless. How can it be otherwise when the prisoner has to be kept at the bottom of a pecking order which already plumbs the depths? Hence also the resentment at the introduction of educational facilities for prisoners — a double blow which brings into the prisons yet another elite group of specialists, and involves the recognition that prisoners are something more than mindless villains, mere objects at the bottom of the pile.

There are examples of dedication and social purpose in every branch of the prison service but it is in the largely transient teaching staff that social commitment is most consistently displayed — partly because of idealism amongst the younger members of that profession who form the bulk of those accepting prison jobs, partly because the sessional basis of their prison employment safeguards them from the institutionalisation which quickly overtakes most other prison workers. There are mere time-servers, but they are mainly to be found in the permanent administrative grades. In fact it is difficult to reconcile permanency in any type of prison employment with the retention of ideas about social purpose, and great respect is due to the few who do manage to hold on to their ideals, walking a tightrope of compromise while they struggle to work helpfully and constructively in an inherently negative environment.

THE MOST FREE

Here it is necessary to demonstrate a basic difference between a prison environment and life in society as a whole. The parallels which have been drawn about divisiveness and preoccupation with status assert themselves in a very unequal manner inside a prison. The prisoner himself is insulated from the necessity to compete, to a degree which he is unlikely to have experienced outside. The ideological controls which pressurised his daily activity as a worker, a husband, a consumer, are either absent or greatly weakened by his isolations from 'free' society. Ironically it is this very lack of 'freedom' which releases, or at least slackens, the shackles on his mind. Mentally he is, of all the people inside a prison, the most free.

However, let us forget the time-servers and those who choose prison teaching as a soft-option alternative to coping with overlarge classes of unruly children. Let us ponder the question of prison education in its most favourable light by considering what can be achieved by responsible, dedicated teachers under one of the more enlightened prison regimes — in other words in the situation envisaged by the penal reformers who press for a purposeful policy of rehabilitation of offenders. Just what are these teachers supposed to inculcate in their students — the myths or the realities of our society?

Myth or reality? This is really the nub of the problem, for we live in a society which does not mean what it says, and which frequently means the very opposite of what it says. Yet we are so conditioned that we accept these 'basic truths' without question. When Sir Keith Joseph speaks of western democracy as the guardian of spiritual values against the threat of communist materialism, how many people even start to ask themselves what on earth he is talking about? Could any society be more geared to materialism than this one, where the only values that anyone bothers about are those that carry price tags? Even those occupations which are paraded as 'vocations' are as geared to price tags as any others. Why does a doctor assume, and his patients quietly accept, that he should be paid a share of the national wealth many times greater than that of the average worker? Or take Sir Keith Joseph's passionate call for self-reliance — the same word that is blazoned across the front of this paper! Are we talking about the same thing? Of course not. Sir Keith Joseph's self-reliance, capitalism's self-reliance, does not mean standing up on your own two feet: it means standing up on somebody else's. The way to success (and Heath once said that no man of thirty on less than £8,000 could consider himself a success) is by exploiting other people's labour, either by direct employment or by backstage financial wizardry.

Words, words, words — and until we are prepared to think for ourselves we shall continue to soak them all up and fail to confront the real issues, leaving society free to continue its exploitation of the working people who really do produce the nation's wealth. Amongst the most misused — purposely misused — words are 'communism' and 'socialism'. Communism is equated with the Soviet Union where a bureaucratic technocratic elite now rules the people. Socialism is identified with (of all things) the Labour Party, which neither is nor ever has been committed, except in the ambiguous rhetoric of Clause IV, to the creation of a radically different social order. We need to disown such standard bearers if we are not to be tarnished with their image.

WELFARE ?

The Welfare State provides another example of misused words. Under communism people will not of course go homeless or hungry, but to equate communism or socialism with the

cont. on page 8

type of welfare state we have in this country is again to misunderstand completely what communism is all about. Our own vast social security network is essentially a crutch for a sick society. Cure the sickness and people will stand on their own feet.

Before we start talking about curing a sick society we must understand why it is sick and what is our own relationship to that society. In other words we have got to start thinking for ourselves, and prison is as good a place as any to begin our education. The importance of education within prison (apart from its vital role in starting people on the road to read and write and understand basic arithmetic) is not that it brings any great fount of wisdom to the prisoner. To the extent that the prison teacher has already supped from the well of bourgeois knowledge he is likely to be more, not less, contaminated by its untruths than are the students in his class. Nor is the value of education to be assessed in terms of O-levels, A-levels or university degrees, though predictably it is such pieces of paper which represent the yardstick by which its effectiveness is measured by the education officers, the governors, and the penal reformers whose pressures forced it into the prisons in the first place. No matter: the value of prison education does not lie in those directions at all. The important thing is that contact is taking place and that teachers are coming up against a challenging situation and both educating and being educated in the process. It is quite impossible, for example, for a teacher to prattle on about democratic rights or legal rights under the British constitution and expect to be taken seriously in a prison classroom. And there are many other facets of life in this society which are equally unlikely to pass unchallenged. Prisoners, relieved of many of society's pressures, have all the time in the world to think and, because of their situation, they have a natural, healthy inclination to question anything that comes to them in the name of authority.

The really good prison teacher, precious beyond words, is the one who can stoke these fires of questioning, challenging and criticising, and can help these fires to spread inwards to self-questioning and self-criticism, because the poisons within society are also deep inside us all as individuals. That is what rehabilitation, real rehabilitation, is all about, and the good teacher will of course be actively,

consciously rehabilitating himself or herself at the same time, for emphatically education is a two-way process.

That such a prison teacher will be quickly shown the door is not important, for the search for truth is infectious and will long outlast any individual's physical presence. The truly important lesson that he or she will have left behind is that we don't have to wait for teachers: we are all teachers ourselves. Every man has plenty to learn; every man has something to teach. Some don't even need such a lesson, for a prison experience is its own catalyst to knowledge, and one of the most exciting and humbling experiences of my life has been to meet and get to know my fellow-prisoners. I think particularly of youngsters serving life sentences, who have scarcely known any other existence since early manhood and who have spent their formative years, often from infancy, face to face with the indifference, and ultimately the ruthlessness, of the state; men who, lacking formal education and fumbling perhaps for words, have nevertheless developed their own ideas and come to understand with a simple clarity the true nature of our society, and our responsibilities, as men, to change it. From such men we have much to learn.

AN EVIL SOCIETY

To reinforce the contention that meaningful rehabilitation within this society's guidelines is impossible, two further parallels can be drawn, the first relating to christian principles, the second to democratic ones. The penal reformers who plead for rehabilitation are in many instances the same people who plead for a return to christian morality. So for that matter does Sir Keith Joseph and most of the other leaders of our society! Yet capitalism's very existence demands the breaking of many of the ten commandments. If everyone, overnight, decided to obey 'thou shalt not steal', what future could there be for capitalist enterprise which must rob its workers in order to make profits at their expense? Or if we all started to love our neighbour instead of competing with each other for jobs, for wages, for status symbols, how then would the wheels of this greed-driven society continue to turn? All prisons overflow with chaplains but the one thing they cannot inculcate is practical Christianity. Nor can they even demonstrate it by example. Show me a chaplain who has retained a prison position for any length of

time and I will show you a man who will have had to "walk by on the other side" on so many occasions that he will have compromised his faith over and over again.

As for democratic principles one would think, if one were naive enough to believe this particular myth in our society, that the authorities would be anxious that prisoners should ultimately be released as knowledgeable participants in our 'free' democratic society. But instead what do we find? We find that the two words 'politically motivated', written in red on a prison record, single out that man for special attention and accompany him throughout his prison career like plague crosses.

The previous reference to Christianity needs a brief clarification lest it be seen as implying a belief that it offers a means to change society. It is true that Christianity is a new revolutionary doctrine, in the sense that if it were implemented it would change the face of mankind. Indeed, many of the christian tenets are those that a communist could hold without qualification. Furthermore it is only under communism that they are ever likely to come to pass, because the new man and the new society are indivisible. A religion that seeks to change the hearts of men within an unchanged society is preaching moonshine. The two must go hand-in-hand, socialist man building a socialist society, socialist society producing a socialist man. Man does have to struggle with himself as an individual, but the conditions for the collective evolution of mankind demand that he takes control of his destiny, uniting with his brothers and sisters and wresting power so that the working people can organise their own economy and their own lives.

A DIFFERENT SOCIETY

In People's China this is understood very well. The struggle there is both individual and collective, and rehabilitation is a national occupation — not just something applicable to offenders but something that all must engage in in order to sweep away the ideological dross from the old society. Allyn and Adele Rickett, in the preface to the book on their prison experiences in People's China are surprisingly coy about the use of the actual word 'brainwashing'. If it conjures up visions of 1984 that is the fault of the emotive use of words in the western press. The word itself seems to be highly appropriate and not one that calls for any apologies. What we do all need is a mental

1. Cultural Revolution and Industrial Organisation in China. Changes in Management and the Division of Labour. Charles Bettelheim (MRP 1974 128 pp. £3).

2. Les Luttes de Classes en URSS. Periode 1 1917-1923. Charles Bettelheim (Seuil/Maspero 1974 NP).

3. 50 Years of Soviet Power. Monthly Review Press. £1.95

What brings on a revolution or makes it successful? Of course there must be objectively a social need for revolution. But there must also be the subjective factor — a political leadership that has correctly assessed that objective situation and drawn up and popularised a plan or mass line to achieve the necessary initial change in class power, popularly called revolution. In England a change of class power from capitalists to workers has obviously been an objective possibility or need for over a century, yet no revolutionary leadership has developed, though in Ireland and Scotland — both of them old English colonies — such a leadership did develop but was physically destroyed. It is the primary task of English socialists to develop a revolutionary leadership.

It is little consolation to us backward English socialists that the failure has been the same in the rest of western Europe. In November 1918 the German working class with the world's largest and best organised party claiming to be Marxist, had power thrust upon them. For a week or more there was no central government, then the right wing social democratic party leadership, the civil servants and the capitalist class in general joined up with the army generals to restore a capitalist class government and to crush the small socialist left wing that wanted a revolution. The story is no more cheerful in France, Italy, Spain, Greece. The issue is very doubtful at the moment in Portugal. In none of these countries at any time has there been an adequate revolutionary plan comparable to Lenin's "April Theses", that, with the 20 years preceding development of the Bolshevik party to give them a working base, changed the outcome later that year from a reactionary military seizure of power — as would certainly have occurred without the Bolshevik party and Lenin — to the first seizure of power by a socialist party (the leadership of the Paris Commune was not socialist but lower middle class libertarian) and maintenance of that power against attack both from within the

CLASS STRUGGLE

country and by most of the world's imperialist powers. What happened after that and why is the theme of the second of these books, that will certainly become a Marxist classic. Unfortunately it is not yet available in English, though MRP promises a translation soon. The other book by the same author deals with another aspect of the same problem — how can a revolution that aims to develop socialism in fact do so? In Russia that aim was not achieved, in China it has so far succeeded and in doing so has taken an entirely new step in human social development. This development in China towards a classless, i.e. communist society will not necessarily continue successfully, as its leader Mao Tsetung has warned China and the world. That will be decided in practice over the next century or so. But in any case it has been shown in practice how a great step can be taken into such a development — something that the Soviet revolution, enormous as its world impact and significance have been, did not achieve.

TO UNDERSTAND REVOLUTION

It is essential for socialists in the politically backward countries such as those of western Europe to grasp what has been happening in China since 1966, and how it has happened. It is essential for them if they wish to be socialists, which means revolutionaries, and not merely talkers, writers and dabblers, whether in or out of the capitalist machine of higher education. (Marx, Lenin and Mao Tsetung, whose intellectual abilities are now no longer questioned by their enemies, were none of them considered fit to hold an academic post). Those who have grasped the political/social dialectics of the Cultural Revolution will be in a position to grasp those of the similar but different situation in Russia after 1917, and why the Soviet revolution failed to develop into socialism. Without such an understanding of success — so far — in China, and of failure in Russia, it is impossible to develop a revolutionary party in Europe. The only western European of this century who began such a development was Gramsci — since Connolly and Maclean, unlike Lenin, were unable to reach

the stage of building an effective revolutionary party. Gramsci was certainly beginning such a development. Perhaps if he had lived and been able to resume his leadership of the Italian communist party —

So we have to make use of what Gramsci has left us and to note how one European Marxist of the post-Lenin generation grasped already in the 1920s that "economism" — so denounced by Lenin — was the main anti-socialist force within the ranks of those claiming to be socialists but in fact representing the capitalist class within the socialist movement. As of course it still is today.

TO BE PRACTICAL REVOLUTIONARIES

Bettelheim was already leading the analysis of socialist economic development as the author of "Calcul économique et formes de propriété" (1970 and much overdue for an English translation). His book on the Cultural Revolution (1973) gives a class analysis of that revolution and in doing so compares its development to that in Russia under Lenin. Bettelheim can be justly described as a fierce Leninist. Because of that he is able to submit Lenin's post-October policy to a ruthless analysis, and contrasts it to that of Mao Tsetung in the 1960s. He does this not to discredit Lenin, but on the one hand to remind us how different the circumstances were in every respect except the taking of state power by a revolutionary party of the working class. (Remember Mao's dictum in 1949 "We have taken the first step in a 10,000 li march to socialism"). Different above all in experience and in timing. Bettelheim shows in his book on Russia how Lenin was in 1923 from his sick bed finding his way towards the solution that was put into practice in 1966 in China. As we have said, unless we understand the problem that Lenin was unable to solve in 1922-23 and that we shall inevitably meet here in western Europe when we do at last face up to the need for a revolution, then that problem will defeat us as it defeated the Bolshevik party after the death of Lenin. Indeed unless we face that problem without either timidity or rigidity of mind, we shall probably never get a revolution at all. And maybe that impossibility is a good thing. What is worse than a revolution under the wrong leadership?

In his class analysis of the Cultural Revolution Bettelheim stresses above all how Mao has thoroughly understood that nothing can be usefully given to the working class by a benevolent
cont. on p. 10

government, whether it calls itself communist or social democratic. The task of socialists, whether in power or still seeking it, must always be to mobilise the people to take things for themselves. Only then does such a move become effective and politically a step forward.

For such a short book the ground covered is astonishing. The first section gives a detailed picture of a medium size factory in Peking built in 1952 employing 3,400 people, 60% women, run since 1969 by a revolutionary committee that includes only two women, one of whom was the author's principal informant. Only since 1969, i.e. from the third year of the Cultural Revolution, has workers' participation in management been generalised in that factory, but already it has resulted not only in "everybody is now political" but in a lot of technical improvements in production introduced by the workers' initiative.

Ultimately the question capitalism or socialism? will be decided by the relative social strength of the two systems. There are two main factors that will decide such relative strength. The first and obvious one is social solidarity. Socialism brings people together, capitalism drives them apart. But hardly less important will be productivity. Which system will enable its people to equip itself best? We should not under-estimate the strength of a system that has been able to put men on the moon and bring them back again — as well as to destroy about half a million people with two small bombs. But before very long it will become clear that China is not only leading humanity in social cohesion and human development, but also in sheer productivity — ahead of the US, ahead even of Japan which is itself, on a capitalist basis, near overtaking the US. How will this be? Because "unified planning" (see below) and "socialist co-operation" will move technically as well as socially ahead of capitalism even at its strongest — the period since 1945 that is just coming to an end.

Then Bettelheim outlines the extreme contrast between Soviet and Chinese economic planning. The Soviet Union and its satellites are now being forced more and more openly to return to capitalist practice — to profit as the measure of efficiency, to greed or compulsion as the stimulus to work. In the Soviet Union as in the west, produc-

tion plants are an ever vaster scale and the cities continue to grow bigger and bigger while the countryside perishes.

In China it is medium and small factories that are growing fastest and population is moving from the large towns into the country — not just to work in agriculture but to spread city industry and city culture everywhere. If we were a socialist country, there would be no question of closing steel works at Ebbw Vale and Shelton Bar. On the contrary there would be a demand for experienced workers to be lent out from Port Talbot and the largest works to help develop smaller local works wherever there would be social benefit from such a development. The Soviet Union has capitalist state planning — centralised and authoritarian. China has "unified planning" both decentralised and centralised but never authoritarian, always ensuring agreement, consensus, obtained by free and thorough discussion as much or more from the bottom up as from the top down.

Prices and the market.

In the Soviet Union they tried to do without the market and found they couldn't, just as they found they couldn't control prices unless they could effectively control production. Wise after the event, China fostered the market instead of trying to abolish it, and so the market there is prosperous as never before, has become an entirely socialist market with prices under perfect control and not rising at all. In fact prices have on the whole possibly fallen since 1949. A curious contrast to our system of post-Keynesian capitalism (should we suggest a visit to China for our "socialist" Chancellor of the Exchequer?)

All this has been achieved not by clever manipulation by the central government, but by mobilising the people to fight for the "socialist road," for a policy which they themselves understand and will fight for — not merely obey, still less be forced to obey. Class struggle remains as decisive in China on the road to socialism as it is in England on the road of capitalist crisis. In both countries progress can only be made by class struggle on a socialist mass line — in both countries a revolutionary struggle.

Finally, analysis of the actual course of the revolution. The first stage, the removal of the right wing that controlled the party apparatus under Liu Shaochi has already been well described and is by now fairly

well understood. The second stage after the fall of Liu, the January revolution in Shanghai and the temporary disorganisation of the party apparatus down to the lower levels, is still much misunderstood. Many saw the fall of Lin Piao in 1971 as a turn to the right. On the whole there is still among Maoists in England little understanding of the struggle waged from 1967-1971 by the Maoists in the CPC to save the revolution from what could have become a disastrous deviation led at the middle levels by many with good intention but at the top by Lin Piao and a handful of his generals in alliance with a group of "theoreticians" — an alliance that finally fell to crude plotting and ended with Lin Piao on his way to seek refuge out of China in the north. Bettelheim gives the first analysis — at least the first published in a European language — of this period, showing how this pseudo leftism was in fact anti-revolutionary, anti-proletarian, just like the leftist period in 1931-34 that also tried to eliminate Mao. Pseudo leftism provides a cover for personal ambition and all the deviations — national and class chauvinism being amongst the most blatant.

Yes, what in France was called "ouvrierisme" is correctly described as class chauvinism because the communist movement exists not to provide the working class with what some of the workers or even sometimes most of the workers want at the moment. The working class also has developed under the dominant influence of a capitalist society and a capitalist culture and ideology. For it to develop the ideology required for and by a classless society, i.e. a communist society, takes time and effort — revolutionary effort. This effort cannot be left to develop spontaneously. That is indeed the "natural" method — that of biological evolution, "survival of the fittest". It is an exceedingly slow process over thousands or millions of years of blind trial and error. What Marxism has done at its most revolutionary level is to enable mankind to take conscious charge of its own destiny and so to leave for ever the natural condition of spontaneous evolution that is so inhuman. In fact to substitute humanity for "nature". The final removal of both gods and devils, emergence into the full dominance of reason. That is of course also why it is necessary for all workers, not just a self-selected elite, to study and understand dialectics. Because without dialectics reason itself is blinded. cont. on p. 11 Col. 2

THAT DAY WILL SURELY DAWN

A poem by Sahir Ludhyanavi
Translated from Hindi by Gautam Appa

That day will dawn, that day will surely dawn .
When the Veil of night lifts from these dark centuries
When the clouds of sorrow melt and a sea of happiness swells
When the skies dance with joy and the earth sings happy songs
That day will surely dawn !

That day for which for ages we have been dying all our lives
And waiting for whose elixir we now drink cups of poison
Time will take mercy one day on these hungry, thirsty veins
That day will surely dawn !

Yearnings of yours and mine are worthless today
Even sand has a price but a man can be cast away
When a man's worth is not measured in fake coins
That day will surely dawn !

When a woman's body won't be sold
Her love not crushed, her honour restored
When this world will feel sorry for its dark deeds
That day will surely dawn !

These days of hunger and unemployment will surely pass some day
Monuments to the monopoly of wealth will surely break one day
When the foundations of a different order will be laid
That day will surely dawn !

When helpless old won't wander on deserted roads
When innocent children won't beg in dirty lanes
When freedom fighters won't be hanged by the neck
That day will surely dawn !

The day when human lives won't be cremated on the pyre of hunger
When a man's yearnings won't be burnt with his heart
When heaven will be made out of this hell of a world
That day will surely dawn !

That dawn for which for ages we have been dying all our lives
And waiting for whose elixir we now drink cups of poison
That dawn may not break today, but it will some day
That day will surely dawn !

cont. from p. 8

spring clean and we should not underestimate the extent of its thoroughness if we in the West are ever to shake off the far heavier load of our own ideological conditioning. Contradictions between myths and realities abound at every turn and, unlike the Ricketts, prisoners in this country who try to reform themselves do so with the entire weight of society against them. It will be difficult enough even when we have begun to change society.

The book is in many ways deeply disturbing to the English reader. This is no criticism: we need to be deeply disturbed. Several of us read this book together in what is perhaps the most disagreeable, most negative, most destructive of English prisons. Reading it we found ourselves, as did the Ricketts, shocked, even outraged, by methods so foreign, so strange. But as we read on we shared the Ricketts' experience of yielding to the obvious commonsense of it all. This reaction was common to all of us. So

This Marxist analysis of the Cultural Revolution summarises and points out its lessons for us here in western Europe as no one else has done so far. It

too was the wholly constructive manner in which we then began to question our own society and ourselves.

This is why in discussing this book it seems natural to see the struggle as our struggle and to relate it to our conditions and our needs, rather than to dwell overmuch on the details of the Chinese experience. The Chinese did not make a Russian revolution; they made, and are making, a Chinese one. We have to make revolution in England and however much we learn from the experience of others, we have got to start thinking and acting for ourselves. One day our highly sophisticated technology will stand us in good stead. At the moment it is our highly sophisticated and horribly confused minds that stand in our way.

A LETTER FROM INDIA Calcutta, 27.2.75

Well here I am in the biggest hell hole on earth. It's really horrific — quite beyond the imagination. There are thousands of emaciated rickshaw pullers running on bare feet and pulling the fat and idle rich; cart haulers pulling the most enormous loads (here human labour is cheaper than animal labour) through the most horrific traffic conditions I have ever seen. In cities throughout the world it is reckoned that motor vehicle circulation is at the rate of 1 500-1,800 per hour; here it's more than 2,200. And they drive on both sides of the road and in the middle too! Porters carry on average 120 kilos on their heads — approx. twice their body weight.

The slums, which are everywhere, are a sight worse than anything in Dante's Inferno. Huge piles of shit, just cleaned from the drains, line the sides of the lanes, millions of flies cover everything, the 'houses' are the size of dog kennels and are fit to fall apart at a moment's notice. When the rains come these lanes are covered in water knee high. The children carry huge bellies on spindly legs and are often covered in running sores. There are hundreds of thousands of beggars lying everywhere, etc. etc.

The countryside is as bad. Walked about 20 miles yesterday and 15 the day before through the villages of W. Bengal. People have one meal a day and that's often a handful of fried rice. Average yearly wage of landless labourers is approx. 300 rupees — less than £20. A decent meal here costs about 2 rupees....

should be a big step towards a contemporary basis for our own ever more dangerously delayed first stage of revolution — the seizure of national power by the working class organised and led by its own revolutionary Marxist party.

Finally the Monthly Review Press has published a reprint of the special number of Monthly Review of 1967 to celebrate the half-century since October 1917. It includes a piece by the late Marxist Maurice Dobb (uncritical) and the non-Marxist Joan Robinson (critical, comparing China). But by far the most interesting contribution is the introduction by Paul Sweezy and the late Leo Huberman. Sweezy and Monthly Review have been moving ever further into understanding the correctness of Mao Tsetung as the leader of contemporary Marxism! May they continue to do so!

A.T.H.

frelimo

At a Frelimo camp at Nachingweya in Tanzania near the Mozambique border 360 prisoners of Frelimo were paraded before 3,000 Mozambican youths receiving political and military training. All the prisoners were black.

"We want to show that black people can be as reactionary or as revolutionary as anyone else. It is a difficult lesson to learn for people who have been subjected to 500 years of white Portuguese colonialism."

The ceremony was conducted by the Frelimo president, Samora Machel. He called the prisoners forward in groups and selected individuals to be paraded before the crowd. As they were marched around, Machel went into detail about each individual's crimes. Most had been agents for the former Portuguese secret police organisation, PIDE.

At one point, Machel asked one prisoner, Venancio Joa Guambe, aged 22, to open his shirt. On his chest was a tattoo of a human head. Machel said Guambe was a member of a Portuguese parachutist unit whose trademark it was to behead their victims.

The star prisoner was Miss Juana Simiao, a leader of various small parties that opposed Frelimo after the Portuguese coup a year ago. Machel asked Miss Simiao why she travelled in Mozambique with Portuguese army protection and a letter of introduction from the former Portuguese President, Antonio de Spínola.

She said she had been led to believe there would be multi-party preindependence elections in Mozambique and that Spínola had urged her to organise a party to oppose Frelimo.

Machel countered by saying that Spínola wanted to cause disruption in Mozambique so as to have an excuse to continue Portuguese rule. He accused Miss Simiao of having ties with South Africa and Rhodesia and said she had "a Portuguese capitalist mentality."

Miss Simiao had arrived at the camp only three days ago. More than any other prisoner, she remained defiant and often spoke back to Machel.

Machel said there are 360 prisoners being held at the camp in Tanzania. He said that this represented less than half of the total number of prisoners held by Frelimo, and that the rest are in Mozambique.

As for the prisoners' fate, Machel said: "We will never consider the possibility of killing them." Instead they will be sent to cooperative villages where Machel says they will learn from the peasants. If the people they are living with decide that they have genuinely reformed, they will be allowed to go free.

He invited the few journalists present to come back in three years. "I'll introduce you again to Miss Simiao and she will give you political lessons," he said.

We introduce this report from The Guardian (slightly abridged) because it gives a picture of victorious Frelimo and of its leader Samora Machel that at once enables anyone who has understood what has been and is developing in China, to see that Mozambique is heading for a genuinely democratic development. From whatever economic and social base development starts, the socialist road is the only one that is genuinely and increasingly democratic. Mozambique seems likely to set an example for the more difficult situation in Angola, and possibly also for other African countries that have achieved self-government of sorts but certainly not socialism nor very much democracy. It is with such countries that a socialist Britain could develop both trade and cultural relations of benefit to both — real internationalism, not sham "aid". Fraternal exchange replacing commerce.

■ ■
■ ■

"The Times" still gets some interesting items from abroad. Recently one of its correspondents has been able to lift a corner of the blanket that covers the relations between Gadafi's Lybia and the British colony of Northern Ireland. Not with its Government of course — if one can call it a government with Lt. Gen. King blowing down Mr. Rees' civilian neck — but its rebels. And not only its green rebels, but also its orange ones. If

an Irishman in Lybia's foreign ministry is able to make and keep contact with both kinds of rebels in Belfast, should not the English working class political leadership be able to do as well? As Marx said — not just to help the Irish but for our own sakes.

In Angola alas things are not so good as they promise to become in Mozambique. The US, whether State Department or CIA or possibly both, so far from having learned the lesson of Vietnam, have been and still are busy preparing for themselves another disguised colonial war. They have been looking after Zaire for some years, and Zaire in turn has been looking after a supposedly "national" leadership for Angola as a rival to the MPLA supported by the Soviet Union and led by Dr. Neto. The business man cum political adventurer Holden Roberto (brother-in-law to Zaire's dictator) is now reported to be sending both troops and arms to Angola on a massive scale from Zaire and slaughtering supporters of MPLA chiefly in the "native" suburbs of the capital. The third Liberation Army UNITA led by Dr. Savimbi is attempting to get a united front. As everywhere in black Africa tribal loyalties are important and are made use of by the imperialists and their hired adventurer supporters. Maybe UNITA will achieve the political clarity of Frelimo and on such a basis make an alliance with MPLA and so be able to force the FNLA from its present role of hired fascists. In any case we can expect that Smith will not last very long in Zimbabwe. When will British workers realise that the liberation of southern Africa is important for us, not only for the Africans — just as in Ireland. In fact everything that weakens British imperialism is also helping us who are both beneficiaries of that imperialism — as the Finsbury Communist Association is so fond of saying to us — and also its bribed victims.

The sensational collapse of US imperialism in South-East Asia has finally brought some change of line in the leading articles of the capitalist press. "The Times" even displayed some shock over the massive baby snatch proposed by Ford/Kissinger (Wilson didn't, of course) and reminded its readers that it is no longer effective to describe communists as cannibals and baby killers. Is it not heartening to read of the Montagnards of the central highlands of Vietnam, who were bribed by the CIA to form an anti-Vietnamese army, having in recent months joined up with the Vietnamese people and their army to throw out the invaders and their paid gangsters? ■■

drugs, doctors and inquests

To: The British Medical Association
On behalf of a number of prisoners whom we propose to represent in petitions before the Commission on Human Rights, we make the following complaint.

It would appear that under Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights, you have an obligation (both moral and professional) to investigate the conduct of doctors practicing in prisons, who are directly responsible for the systematic violation of Article 3, i.e. "subjecting prisoners to torture and to inhuman and degrading treatment."

1) Prison cells that were designed and built 100 years ago as the minimum dimensions essential for health for one prisoner are being used to incarcerate three prisoners, who are often kept locked up in this minute space for 23 hours a day, and in which they are forced to eat, sleep, urinate and defecate. It should not be necessary for us to convince you of the psychological and physical damage these conditions wreck on the health of prisoners. But in the event that you require evidence; — Dr. Thomas Cleghorn of the North London Blood Transfusion Centre, reported in the press on 26/8/74, that after taking samples of blood from prisoners at Pentonville and Wormwood Scrubs prisons, he had found that 90% were suffering from hepatitis resulting from bad diet and overcrowding.

2) That segregation, isolation and control unit facilities are designed to inflict permanent psychological damage on the victims, by the process of sensory deprivation which is inflicted for periods of months.

Both these methods of destructive treatment violate Article 3 of the Convention, and both can only be implemented with the active co-operation of the prison doctors who must first sanction the process by declaring that the victim is fit to endure it.

We would appreciate your advice about what action you propose to take about this complaint.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) W. Probyn
Walter Probyn

Prisoners Human Rights Committee
Representative,
29a, Hornsey Rise,
London, N.19.

25/2/75

The leading advocate in Britain for the use of drugs on offenders in general and on sex offenders in particular is Doctor Leonard Field, visiting psychiatrist at Wormwood Scrubs prison. In 1973 he published an article in the journal 'Medical Science and Law' about his experiments with a particular new drug Benperidol. This is not a hormone drug — like most given to sex offenders — but a neuroleptic which acts directly on the brain, changing established behaviour patterns. The drug completely abolishes sexual desire, the 'patient is unable to obtain an erection'. Field reported the use of the drug on 28 men, 14 of whom were serving sentences of imprisonment.

When the report of these trials was given publicly in *The Times*, Stan Cohen wrote a letter pointing out the ethical problems in the use of prisoners as human guinea pigs. Field completely denied that there were any problems involved — for example he does not see the absurdity in saying that a prisoner can give full consent to such drugs and that there is no pressure put upon him.

What Dr. Field also did not reveal to the readers of *The Times*, was the dangerous side effects that the drug might have — such as Parkinson's Disease, the risk of which had to be counteracted by special treatment. What he also kept hidden is that in the technical brochure about Benperidol (trade name: Anquil) produced by its manufacturers Janssen Pharmaceutical, there appears the following entry in the list of experiments on the drug: Field L.H. "Report to the Department of Clinical Investigation, Janssen Pharmaceutical Ltd."

Was Field paid for this work? Was he simply doing the drug company a good turn in trying out their product on a very special group of "volunteers"? How many other new drugs are being tried like this in British prisons?

The above statement was received through the Prisoners' Human Rights Committee.
Ed. Bd.

From a medical correspondent.

13

The inquest on the Moorgate train tragedy reminds me of a much smaller one that took place in 1932 when I was a house physician and resident anaesthetist (a very junior post) at the Hampstead General Hospital. I had to give an anaesthetic to a 2-year old boy for an oesophagoscopy — an internal examination of the gullet — by the consultant ear nose and throat surgeon. The child had swallowed a halfpenny which was thought still to be in his gullet. It wasn't found — it had of course by then passed into the stomach — but a few days later the child died in the hospital. The hospital pathologist refused to do the post mortem, which was therefore done instead by the house surgeon (who I believe is still alive). The examination showed that the boy had died from perforation into the mediastinum (the tissues lying between the lungs, through which the gullet passes) and that a swab had even been left behind in the tissues. At the inquest held by a medical coroner — as was the Moorgate inquest — very well known at the time (many years later he committed suicide) the real cause of death was most carefully left unmentioned by collusion between the house surgeon — whose future career would otherwise have been in grave danger — and the coroner. The surgeon who had operated was not even called, nor was it asked why the hospital pathologist had not conducted the post mortem. Instead the natural grief and anger of the parents — the father was a policeman — was used to divert attention to a young casualty officer who was entirely blameless. The out patient department of the hospital, situated in Camden Town, was held responsible for the fact that there had been a considerable wait before the child had an X-ray and that the parents had not been warned that the child had been in any danger — and of course he wasn't except from the malpractice of a grossly incompetent and negligent surgeon. The inquest was adjourned so that the young casualty officer could be called, and at the resumed inquest she was grilled about the delay, and next day the case was reported in all the papers as if she had been in some way responsible for the child's death. The surgeon who had in fact killed the child was still not called (he later became President of the Ear Nose & Throat Section of the Royal Society of Medicine).

• cont. on p.15

t u j o t t i n g s

Since our open letter to him was written, Eric Heffer has had a whole page article in the Financial Guardian to explain his plans. Alas they advance not a single step beyond the Benn/Ryder plan for half state capitalism as against the Lever/Healey/Wilson plan for quarter state capitalism. But anyway such hodge podges do not deserve the name of plan. Both completely ignore the fact that it is capitalism itself that is in crisis and not just some remediable aspect of it. These plans are so ridiculous that they are comparable to current intrigues in Saigon to avoid admitting the plain fact of defeat. If we want a healthy economy it simply cannot any longer be based on profits for a class of ruling profiteers. The whole problem is not technical at all but political. In the simplest possible words, it is a class problem, which the profiteer class cannot solve because the solution would remove them. Failure to recognise this makes it impossible to approach a solution to the problem.

Yet Benn/Heffer and the whole militant Left, well meaning or otherwise, go on proposing and talking as if the problem were one to be solved within the capitalist framework — just like Lever and Co. The situation would be funny if it were not tragic.

A third London airport — which we didn't need — was put off because of cost. The Channel tunnel — which we could well do with — was put off because of cost. Both these proposals involved less capital investment than is now proposed so that we may continue to clutter our roads with more unsaleable saloon cars in competition with the world's other capitalist car makers. That capitalists blinded by the religion of profit should be unable to see this absurdity is not surprising. But is it believable that the political and trade union movement of the British working class is unable to produce a single leader to stop the train and change the line before the crash comes? (The crash, though not into a Moorgate wall, will be into a capitalist police state.)

Benn/Heffer and the trade union Left could still — if they could get their heads clear — lead a campaign for working class power and win against the demoralised capitalist Right. Whether they are capable of it

It was interesting to hear A.J.P. Taylor the Oxford historian talk of the 1926 General Strike to the North St. Pancras Young Socialists last month. Mr. Taylor felt that the General Strike had had one positive effect — it had cured him of communism. (He was at that time a member of the CPGB together with Tom Driberg and, at various times, a very large proportion of now well known names including for instance Mr. Healey.) The strike seems to have had no positive lessons either for Mr. Taylor or for the North St. Pancras Young Socialists. Which is a pity. Labour Party Young Socialists will surely have an important part to play in the future general strike which seems, on present evidence, the most likely strategy for the class transfer of power without which no forward step whatever can be taken on the way out of imperialism and slumps and colonial wars and the constant liability to another world war, which could be atomic. The experience not only of 1926 but of France in 1936 and even more in 1968 suggests that a general strike can effectively paralyse the capitalist state machine and so make a bloodless or nearly bloodless takeover possible. The alternative is civil war. Do our capitalists really prefer the fate of Lon Nol and Thieu, or for that matter of Mussolini and Hitler? The last emperor of China died in the 1960s as an elderly and respectable citizen who had written a most interesting autobiography. Let us hope that the working class will be strong enough to save its enemies as well as itself from needless bloodshed and that Mr. Taylor will be able to go on writing history books in peace. Only, that will require that young socialists shall seek better advice than Mr. Taylor can give them.

is another question.

Possibly we shall have to wait for a new generation and another world crisis. But history does not repeat itself ever exactly. If we want history to be on our side, we had better set about making it. It is no good at all to follow would-be improvers of capitalism, whether Left or Right. We must think for ourselves, as Marx and Gramsci advised us to do.

The London Trade Union Committee for Cypriot Freedom, Democracy and Independence at the beginning of March held a Conference on Freedom for Cyprus at which a call was made for support for the United Nations Resolution of November 1974. This resolution demanded:

- (a) The withdrawal of all foreign armed forces and military personnel from Cyprus.
- (b) Cessation of all acts and interventions directed against Cyprus.
- (c) For respect of the sovereignty of Cyprus.

The limitations of this resolution are evident. British imperialist troops are excluded from this resolution because the British bases are said to be sovereign bases. This has given and will continue to give British governments scope to maintain a divisive role and create mischief between the Turkish and Greek Cypriots. The elimination of these bases may not be on the agenda at the present but must be kept in sight by all who wish to see Cypriot independence.

Working People welcomes the initiative of the London Trade Union Committee in agreeing to do everything possible to develop specific forms of action to assist our Cypriot brothers in their struggle. In particular we support the National Conference on May 10/11 to be held at Unity Hall, H.C. of the N.U.R. However we do not see why trade unionists should restrict their activities to their fellow trade unionists and just lobby the Trades Union Congress in September as is being proposed. These trade unionists we assume are also socialists, and since when have socialists restricted their activities to their fellow workers? It is always necessary TO UNITE ALL WHO CAN BE UNITED, it is always necessary to call other sections of the people into alliance if one is to defeat the enemy, in this case American imperialism aided and abetted by other NATO powers, including Britain. Working People says that the London Trade Unionists should also attempt to gain the support of students and any other sections of the working people who may not usually think of themselves as having anything in common with the T.U.C.

TU Jottings International

The situation in Portugal shows how useless it is to go on thinking in terms of the 1930s in politics. The young officers of the Armed Forces Movement, who a year ago got rid of Caetano's dictatorship, have since been directing political development in co-operation with Alvaro Cunhal, General Secretary of the Portuguese Communist Party. They remain in power apparently in close alliance with Cunhal. Faced by such an alliance of army officers and political policemen, the Portuguese people voted for "free socialism". What else could they do? Unfortunately the "socialist" party they voted for is about as socialist as our Mr. Wilson — or at least its leader is, — according to the informed verdict of Antonio de Figureido. In time, the Portuguese people, peasants as much as town workers, will develop their own democratic socialist revolutionary party, just as we have to do here in England. Does anyone jib at the word democratic? Then "democratic socialism" can be defined as the opposite of "social democracy", of which the most oppressive and most anti-political form is in the Soviet Union, while we have here — for the present — a less oppressive form, but one which will become increasingly oppressive as the political crisis worsens, and as the Benn/Ryder capitalist reforms begin to take effect, with the capitalist state available to suppress any workers' rebellion.

Non-Marxist generals prepare to fight the next war assuming that it will be like the last one, and of course it never is. So also non-Marxist governments assume that the depression — a banned word that journalists are now daring to use again — that is coming upon the capitalist world, will be like the last one of the early '30s,

The financial editor of the Sunday Times, who has nothing even pink about him, recently pointed out (15.12.74) that in the '30s "Britain had a rather good depression". Good of course, or at least relatively good, for the capitalists. Mr. Wilsher prays that it will be as good next time.

Should not socialists in contrast not pray but act to make the outcome different from the last one? Even if it was good for Mr. Wilsher, for the rest of us world war was a heavy

price. Still it is useful to be reminded how successful, or at least relatively successful, was Prime Minister Baldwin's policy of avoiding a challenge while doing all he could to strengthen his class. Is that not exactly what Wilson Healey Jenkins are doing — tying the unions firmly to the capitalist police state? And has that famous Tribune parliamentary group or its Morning Star supporters any alternative to offer? It was not only the state apparatus, Germany's "Whitehall", that put Hitler in power. It was also all those socialists including the German CP, who allowed this to happen because they misjudged what would follow. An expensive misjudgment.

At the moment the main enemy is not the National Front — not yet at any rate — but simply Mr. Roy Jenkins with his legal apparatus his judges and his prisons. Representing of course the policy of Wilson Healey etc. The name "social fascist", used for a time around 1930, was later denounced in left circles. But does it not describe very accurately what is beginning to happen today? Is it not also an accurate description of the Soviet Union? Comrades McGahey and Scargill and all militants should consider carefully the need to think now how to avoid police state development. To say nothing of another world war.

The risk of such a major war seems at present slight. But then so it also seemed in 1932. At present the risk of a concerted capitalist attack on the socialist world base is practically nil. They all want trade not war. Even the Soviet Union seems less likely to attack now than it did a few years ago. But of course wars of liberation go on and the major imperialists take part vigorously, even if less blatantly than they did and still do in Indo-China. (In Cambodia the U.S. Air Force merely gives "air support" — with bombs.) There is a war in Dhofar with British forces "seconded" to the feudal ruler. There is southern Africa now going well for the anti-imperialists. And there is always Palestine, always expected to blow up into another war, and doing it at fairly regular intervals. The two background forces, the US and the SU, do not want to allow their clients to go too far for capitalist world safety. But then neither did Chamberlain in 1938-39 want to allow Hitler to attack in the west. But he did.

Socialists in the imperialist countries in Europe will need to consider carefully where they stand if, as the

result of the capitalist world situation worsening, one of the two super powers decides to act suddenly. There is little risk at present, but who can say what will be happening in 1976 or 1977 or even sooner?

Meantime Heath Wilson & Co. go on doing what they can for white South Africa, even if there is little more they can do to help our imperial kith and kin in Rhodesia. Naturally this is no social fascism. The South African Prime Minister supported Hitler but that was a long time ago and now there are all those hundreds of millions of capital exports to be protected. If Chamberlain could help Hitler and still be buried in Westminster Abbey, it is surely right for a Heath Wilson — or just plain Wilson Callaghan Jenkins — government to do all it not too publicly can to help Hitler's South African disciple to protect those imperial investments.

It is a tragic fact that there are few British socialists who see that what is needed is not better observance of liberal maskerade but a real change of policy. We shall begin to fight effectively for ourselves when we understand that it must also be a fight for others. Marx and Engels were dead serious when they wrote "proletarians of all countries, unite!"

cont. from p.13

There is no reason at all to think that this sort of thing doesn't continue to happen at inquests. Remember the inquest on Stephen Smith at Wormwood Scrubs in 1974, and what vigorous efforts were made to silence the barrister who vigorously cross-examined on behalf of the victim's father. One wonders why all this fuss about whether Driver Newsom may or may not have had some alcohol in his blood before death rather than after, when the absence of effective buffers at Moorgate was not even mentioned — several minor accidents at Tooting Broadway had apparently been ignored by the London Passenger Transport Board so far as Moorgate was concerned. So either Dr. Paul is quite astonishingly stupid, or like the late St. Pancras coroner (Dr. Bentley Purchase) —

And what has our "free" press had to say about those buffers, or rather their absence? I have not made a study of the press but in The Guardian there was one mention just after the crash, in a news report, and there has been complete silence ever since. Perhaps the editors have decided that this question, liable to lead to awkward complications, should not be noticed — like the coroner.

STOP PRESS

Several hundred men and women have so far been arrested and held without charge in this country under Jenkins' "anti-terrorist" Act. Of these, fewer than 50 have been deported (to Ireland) while the others have been successfully prevented by the police from making complaints about wrongful arrest. The police have been encouraging the potential complainers to wait until their release. Complaints however must be lodged, under the Act, within 48 hours of arrest.



21 Iranian students were arrested for entering their London Embassy to complain about the execution of 9 fellow students in Teheran. Charged with conspiracy to trespass the students were arrested by the Special Diplomatic Police Squad — armed of course. The squad was reported to have arrived at the Embassy within 30 seconds of the students' entry.



The Guardian is enough to make a man subversive these days — if he happens to be a prisoner at Wormwood Scrubs.

A young prisoner recently quizzed about his opinion of that newspaper retorted that the governor might be satisfied with reading the Daily Telegraph and the prison rules but he wasn't. But it's the rules themselves that are likely soon to be on the list of banned books. The European Court in Strasbourg ruled last March that interference with a prisoner's correspondence and his efforts to obtain legal representation — normal practice under our prison rules — are violations of the Human Rights Charter of the EEC.

So Jenkins, who's making quite a lot of noise about Europe at the moment, is keeping quiet on this aspect of his job. Naturally.

I came away from Africa thinking that the Chinese have given the Africans more than a railway, they have given them an altogether new concept of how one country can help another. The example of the way the Chinese lived and related to each other, and to the Africans, may in the long run be even more important

than the railway itself. You can instruct 14,000 Chinese to behave well to the Africans, but unless it is already deeply embedded in their consciousness and become part of their nature it simply won't work. To see how the Chinese worked under extreme conditions, and to witness their relations with the African workers was further confirmation to me that they are indeed producing in China a new kind of man.

Let's stop looking to the past. Did we really expect the capitalist era to end quietly and in an orderly way? How could it? We should not be surprised or frightened by the steady economic decline and the social tensions that emerge as each capitalist country fights to defend itself. The disorder has only just begun. But I don't find this a daunting prospect. Do you remember the New Year message of the Chinese Government to the people of China? It contained a phrase that exactly expresses what I feel: 'Everywhere in the world there is great disorder — and everything is excellent.'

felix greene

TO UNITE ALL WHO CAN BE UNITED AGAINST THE MAIN ENEMY

WORKING PEOPLE subscription
£1 for 12 months post free.

Please send WORKING PEOPLE
to (Name)
(Address)
.....

for months
Cheque or P.O. for
enclosed.

Fairly soon — maybe in a few years, may be in a few months — the capitalist crisis will become acute. If we are by then not strong enough, and indeed not clever enough, to provide a revolutionary lead, we shall deserve defeat and will certainly get it. This crisis of the 1970s is probably Britain's and western Europe's last chance to move forward instead of backward in this century.

But we must dare to think in order to dare to speak and act so as to win the class victory that Marx so long ago showed to be necessary.

Read the MANIFESTO FOR A PEOPLE'S SOCIALIST ALLIANCE and WHAT IS SOCIALISM ?

Both available from CSP
price 10p each (post free).

CSP welcomes help with sales of WORKING PEOPLE.

WORKING PEOPLE will be sent free of charge to anyone in HM prisons.

Donations to PRISONERS BOOK FUND to be sent to Treasurer (CSP) at address below.

Published by
C.S.P.,
133, Gillespie Road, London, N.5

BEFORE YOU CAN MAKE REVOLUTION YOU MUST FIRST CREATE PUBLIC OPINION