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The Labour Party reaffirms its belief in the necessity for achieving total victory over our enemies.

**RECONSTRUCTION**

There must be no return to the unplanned competitive world of the inter-War years, in which a privileged few were maintained at the expense of the common good.

The basis of our Democracy must be planned production for community use.

To secure the fulfilment of "the Four Freedoms"—freedom of speech and expression, religious freedom, freedom from want, and freedom from fear, we must organise now

- to provide full employment;
- to rebuild a better Britain;
- to provide social services to secure adequate health, nutrition, and care in old age, for everybody;
- to provide full educational opportunities for all.

As a necessary prerequisite to the reorganisation of society, the main War-time controls in industry and agriculture should be maintained to avoid the scramble for profits which followed the last War.

To avoid dislocation in the change-over from War to Peace, plans should be prepared now—

- for the rapid transfer of labour and materials to Peace-time requirements;
- to extend the social services to make generous provision for workers and their families who await reabsorption into industry and agriculture;
- to retire older workers from industry on the basis of adequate pensions;
- to raise the school-leaving age to 15 immediately and to 16 within three years of the end of the War, maintenance allowances to be paid to parents of the children retained at school.
A PLANNED DEMOCRACY

A planned society must replace the old competitive system.
The workers must be given the opportunity to develop their capacities, and
to share in the making of the rules under which they work.
The future economic and social well-being of British citizens is bound up
with the prosperity of all peoples, therefore we must endeavour to
promote a higher international standard of living.
Our machinery of central and local government must be adapted to fit the
purposes of the New World.
The machinery of justice in Great Britain must be thoroughly overhauled.

IMPERIAL QUESTIONS

The Labour Party is absolutely opposed to the colour bar in every shape or
form.
The Labour Party is opposed to the exploitation of mineral resources by
white settlers or companies; they should be operated as Government
concerns in trusteeship for the native community.
There should be a greater extension of the use of the Colonial Development
Fund.
There should be a Labour Department in the Colonial Office and in each
Colony together with an adequate inspectorate to facilitate reforms.
While the Labour Party agrees that the full settlement of the complex issues
of Indian self-government must await the close of the War, it believes
that both at the centre and in the Provinces, Indians must be given full
responsibility now, and that Indians must take their full place alongside
Dominion statesmen in the direction of the War effort.
The considerations which apply to India apply to Burma and Ceylon also.

THE PEACE

The Peace which follows victory must have two objectives:—
To make it impossible for the aggressor nations to be able to use
War as an instrument of national policy.
To build the ground-plan of an enduring Peace.
We must agree with our Allies, particularly the Soviet Union and the United
States, upon a united strategy in the conduct of the War, and common
purposes in the making of the Peace.
Aggressor nations must be disarmed and kept disarmed.
The principle of collective security against aggression must be given its
appropriate methods and institutions. An international organisation
must therefore be rebuilt.
Each nation must be entitled to determine its own form of government,
subject only to its respect of "the Four Freedoms."
There must be rapid Socialisation in each country of the main instruments
of production, with their co-ordinated planning for common ends,
which alone can maintain International Peace.
INTRODUCTORY NOTE

THE National Executive of the British Labour Party pledged its word to the Annual Conference of 1941 to examine the problems of reconstruction and report upon them to the Conference of 1942. The Conference approved this decision; immediately after its election, therefore, the new Executive set up a Central Committee on Reconstruction to examine into these matters and report upon them.

This Committee, with its appropriate sub-committees, has now been at work for some six months. It has seemed to the National Executive desirable, on the basis of the analysis so far made, to present to the Movement an interim report that the Committee may learn, through criticism and comment, the views held by local parties and affiliated bodies of the principles which, in its judgment, begin to emerge. At a later stage the National Executive will be in a position to publish fuller and more concrete plans. But it has seemed wise at this stage to elicit the fullest discussion of general principles as a guide to the next stage of its work.

I

LABOUR STANDS FOR VICTORY

1. The war of 1914-18 convinced the overwhelming mass of the British people that war is an evil method of settling the differences between States; and it was only with reluctance and regret that it was brought, after 1933, to the grim understanding that it had no option but to accept the challenge of Hitlerism. What has occurred since September 3, 1939, has left it adamant in its resolution to destroy its ruthless enemy and, with it, those other governments, European and Asiatic alike, which share its foul purposes. For the grim months that have passed since Hitler embarked upon his self-chosen task of dominating the whole world have made it clear that any peace with him, or his associates in infamy, would be meaningless.
2. He rejects both in end and in method the traditional principles of civilised life. He seeks power for the sake of power. To attain it, there is no barbarity from which he shrinks, no savagery he will not employ. He has imposed a brutal slavery upon historic nations which had, over long centuries, struggled nobly to attain their freedom. For the obligation even of those treaties he has himself made he shows not one atom of regard. Racial persecution, religious intolerance, forced labour, organised rapine, the suppression of all freedom of the mind, these have been the characteristic methods by which he has hacked his way to the victories he has won. It is not accident that the Gestapo and the concentration camp are the symbols of his authority. It is not accident, either, that he has enlarged the area of conflict until it makes all civilians and the five continents of the world the victims of the insatiable ambition of himself and his fellow outlaws. Either civilisation must break them in pieces or it must be broken by them. Between these immense alternatives there is now no middle course.

3. The British Labour Party, therefore, stands for the policy of total victory over our enemies, victory complete, victory unmistakable, victory upon which there can be no going back. It welcomes with pride the great alliance that has been built to win this victory. It salutes the superb determination manifest everywhere among its members to fight on, whatever the cost, until it has been attained. It is glad to think that, as a partner in the British Government, it has played its part in maintaining the resolution, and organising the resources, of our people for that supreme effort in which, in the months when Britain stood alone, the forces of evil were held at bay. The Labour Party pledges all the strength of the great movement over which it presides to the fulfilment of the common task.

4. The British Labour Party will refuse all negotiations with the Hitler Government or those satellite governments with which it is in so ugly an association. It will insist upon the decisive destruction alike of the power of German militarism and those kindred instruments upon which it has relied, both in the East and the West, for the accomplishment of world domination. It will insist upon those necessary and permanent guarantees which assure the victims of this war against any repetition of its tragedies. The peoples of Germany, Italy and Japan must be brought finally to realise that the power which the peace-loving nations can mobilise against aggression is overwhelming in its strength and absolute in its assurance of success. The Labour Party will, moreover, insist that those who have been responsible for the barbarities which a hundred years will remember with shame shall not escape the punishment their commission involved. Those who remorselessly break the rules of civilised life must be made to feel the weight of their power.

5. The British Labour Party is aware that there is no easy road to victory. It recognises that great sacrifices will still be demanded and that the price of triumph will be high. The long years of preparation which our enemies have devoted to their assault make this inevitable. But the Labour Party is convinced that the common peoples are ready to make these sacrifices provided always that the great ends of freedom and democracy are kept steadily and persistently in view. It is to these ends that the Government of Great Britain, and those now in partnership with it, are pledged. The Labour Party would do less than its duty if it did not say with emphasis that it will judge their conduct, alike before and after victory, by the way in which these ends are fulfilled.
II

THE "APPEASEMENT" PERIOD

6. For no party is more fully aware than the British Labour Party that this war marks a crisis in our civilisation as profound as that of the Reformation and the French Revolution. The first act was the war of 1914; and men hoped when peace came that the lesson of its sufferings had been learned. The hope proved vain; and this tragedy has swept over mankind because in the years between 1918 and 1939 the forces of privilege refused, where they could, to admit the need for vital change. They sought to meet the social and economic problems of the twentieth century with ideas which were already obsolete. They refused to recognise that a democratic civilisation is incompatible, under the conditions of modern technology, with either the parochialism of national sovereignty, on the one hand, or the limitation of freedom, on the other, to those whose possession of property gave them, and them only, economic security. That refusal meant a civilisation which, for most, was careless of equity and justice. There was no organic relation between effort and reward. Poverty and riches were the outcome not of ability and character but of the blind forces of the market. The power of knowledge was overwhelmingly denied to those who had most need of it. While the basis of political power was constantly widened, as the case for universal suffrage became increasingly unanswerable, economic power was increasingly concentrated in fewer hands, and these became elements in international life so imperial in their authority that they could hope to break popularly elected governments which sought to control them. At the end of a century of more rapid and more profound progress than in any previous epoch, a small number of men enjoyed greater wealth than ever before; but the insecurity of the masses and their poverty were still the main features of their life. Even in the presence of this grave contrast, it was still as necessary as in the past to fight with passionate determination for every measure of social reform.

7. The inequity of the system was plainly demonstrated in the years of the Great Depression. All over the world millions of men and women were unemployed, vast areas of production were left to waste, poverty was widespread, while every device that could restrict the potential wealth at our disposal was called into play. An unplanned economic order went into a frenzy of unreasoning nationalism; everywhere the state-power was mobilised to maintain the interest of those who owned the instruments of production. Yet throughout the period those who dominated the system refused to consider the need for planned production in the service of the abundance that was open to us. They were not willing to sacrifice their private well-being to the public good. Whether in coal or in electric power, whether in agriculture or in transport, whether in textiles or in banking, their object was to safeguard that private well-being against those claims of equity which political democracy sought to enforce. It was fear for their privileges that made them destroy democracy in Italy and in Germany. It was fear for privilege which, in the epoch of "appeasement," led so many of the corresponding classes in Britain, France and the United States to sympathise with the habits and the purposes of the Fascist and Nazi dictators. It was that same fear which led them to close their eyes to the dictators' lust of conquest. They preferred to break the League of Nations rather than risk the overthrow of the forces of privilege in Germany and Italy.
They refused an understanding with the Soviet Union for the same reason. Austria, Spain, Albania, Czecho-Slovakia, China, each of these was sacrificed to their fear that war with the Dictators would mean the end of a society in which it was increasingly obvious that privileges were maintained at the expense of the common good. No leadership in modern history has been more blind than that of the capitalist forces in our civilisation.

8. Our rulers were warned; they refused, until the eleventh hour, to heed the warning. They were prepared to stake the freedom of the common peoples of the world on the gambler's chance of an accommodation with Hitlerism. It was not until it had become obvious that Hitler regarded their eagerness for peace as the proof that his hour had come that they were driven to stand up to his challenge. He and his like had been bred because the forces of privilege had for so long refused to see that men are only free when the State uses its power to make economic security and mass well-being its primary purposes. They would not admit the moral degradation of Hitlerism until their own power was in jeopardy. They not only denounced the Labour Party for war-mongering when it insisted that the end of " appeasement " was slavery; they even excluded from power those of their own leaders who, like Mr. Churchill, were warning them that a new imperialism had arisen, reckless of past traditions, and arrogant in its aggressive determination to alter the balance of power in the world. They did not want war, but they refused to build that common interest in the maintenance of peace which was its essential condition. In the result, they got the war they did not want at the hour chosen by the enemies of civilisation at their moment of highest preparation. " Appeasement " almost sacrificed the liberties of the world to those vested interests which had for so long been careless either of equity or of justice.

Important Lessons

9. The British Labour Party is bound to lay emphasis upon the period of the inter-war years because its analysis leads to certain important lessons.

(a) An unplanned society is unable to maintain a reasonable standard of life for a large number of its citizens. The consequences of unregulated capitalism, even when tempered by political democracy, are low wages, long hours of labour, economic insecurity, bad housing and defective nutrition.

(b) An unplanned society, in which the essential instruments of production are privately owned, is compelled to think overwhelmingly in terms of private profit. In the inter-war years this meant a policy of restriction instead of a policy of expansion. It meant mass-unemployment. It meant distressed areas. It meant an inability to use the full resources of the nation for the benefit of the nation. It meant the wastage of skilled man-power. Not least, it meant an inability to use the achievements of scientific and technological discovery to advance the standard of life.

(c) Because the ability of privately owned capital to earn profit for its owners was the main motive to accumulation and investment, an unplanned society developed a vested interest, on the part of the owners of capital, in maintaining systems which, like those of Hitler and Mussolini, destroyed democracy in the service of German and Italian privilege. This alone explains the failure of the British Government to put its authority behind the League
of Nations and the principle of collective security. Fearful of the results of overthrowing aggressive privilege abroad, it was tempted into its "appeasement." All the major evils of the "appeasement period" are directly traceable to the unregulated operation of our economic system. Its failure at home to discover the conditions of expanding welfare bred lack of confidence in democracy; its fear of dealing firmly with aggressors abroad took it straight into the war which its timidity made possible.

(d) The Labour Party is bound, moreover, to note that as soon as the nation became involved in war, it became imperative to plan the national life, and to subordinate private interests to the overriding claim of victory. To do so, it was necessary to take power to control the mechanism of credit, the major national industries, the direction of investment; and to set standards of attainment to which the owners of industry must seek to conform. It is important that only in the degree that these controls have been effective has the community been able fairly to mobilise its resources for the war effort.

III

RECONSTRUCTION PROBLEMS

10. Given victory, the approach of the Labour Party to the problems of reconstruction is set by the significance it attaches to these plain lessons. They have validity in the sphere both of national and of international relations. Our victory will leave us facing an emergency not less profound than the prospect we have been set by the struggle with Hitlerism. We must confront that emergency in the spirit which alone makes victory possible, the spirit which recognised that no private interest has the right to set limits to the claims of the nation, that no single nation can pit its claims against the overriding rights of all mankind. There can be no return to the world which existed on September 3, 1939; its habits and its spirit belong already to antiquity. The new age demands planned production for community consumption; that is the condition on which the essential freedoms become effective in the lives of ordinary citizens. The new age demands, in the international sphere, the organisation of such power behind the rule of law that no state is tempted to think of aggression as a means of advancing its interests. Without security, whether in domestic or international affairs, there cannot be freedom; for without security men are the victims of that fear which makes reason itself an enemy.

11. There is one general remark in the preamble which the Labour Party is bound to make. It is aware of the large promises that were made during the war of 1914-18 and the massive disillusion which followed when they were not implemented after its close. In the Labour Party's judgment the same disillusion will follow the present struggle unless we begin, during its course, to organise the conditions which make it certain the promises this time will be implemented. There are two sufficient reasons why this is necessary. The demands of the war have accustomed people to new habits. It is elementary prudence to take advantage of this mood. To do so is an assurance that, when victory has been won, the citizens of this country will be able to keep the great ends of life in common. That is the condition on which the preservation of democracy depends.

12. The Labour Party affirms this for no party advantage. As a partner in a national coalition whose sole purpose is victory, it does not regard itself as entitled—any more than its partners are entitled—to press for any measures
on party grounds. Their sole justification must be (1) their contribution to victory and (2) their contribution to the fulfilment of the ends victory is to serve. But in assessing these contributions proper regard must be paid to the factor of morale. It is of the highest importance in maintaining the necessary will and resolution which victory requires to assure our citizens that no experiment relevant to victory and its purposes is rejected because it is objectionable to some powerful vested interest. It is precisely to the degree that this spirit permeates the war effort, that it will permeate the era of reconstruction. Unless the Government, and the parties of which it is composed, approach their task in this frame of mind, they will never evoke at its fullest strength that dynamic of democracy which is the chief motive power of all the weapons in their armoury.

Four Essentials

13. We have, therefore, in the judgment of the Labour Party to set out now, as a deliberate part of our war effort, to organise for four things. We have to provide full employment; we have to rebuild a Britain to standards worthy of the men and women who have preserved it; we have to organise social services at a level which secures adequate health, nutrition, and care in old age, for all citizens; and we have to provide educational opportunities for all which ensure that our cultural heritage is denied to none. Unless we do these things, there will be, after the war, a repetition of mass-unemployment, the re-emergence of distressed areas, a rebuilding of Britain made mean and inadequate by the surrender of public good to private interest. The Labour Party does not believe that the nation will accept peacefully a return to these conditions. They would endanger the whole purpose for which we are fighting.

14. The Labour Party does not underestimate the gravity of this conclusion. It is fully aware that the choice we now make in the period of conflict is decisive for the future. It is fully aware, also, that the choice we now make will largely determine the future of democracy upon the Continent of Europe. For only the proof that the outstanding fortress of democracy can use its political institutions to solve its economic and social problems by the methods of democracy will maintain faith and hope in its creative power. Here, and not elsewhere, is the secret of our capacity not only to maintain our three centuries of Government by consent, but to use it as an example of momentous significance in the recovery of stricken Europe. No answer to the boasted “new order” of Hitler could be more inspiring than that of a democracy in arms, even amid the clamour of conflict, renewing its foundations by the methods of democracy. It is an answer which has in it at once the urgency and audacity which corresponds to the mood this war has bred in our people. Its effectiveness depends upon the speed with which we apply it.

15. The Labour Party asks that we register now, as a nation, our recognition that this war has already, socially and economically, effected a revolution in the world as vast, in its ultimate implications, as that which marked the replacement of Feudalism by Capitalism. All over the world, the evidence is abundant that this revolution has deeply affected men’s minds; our central problem is to discover its appropriate institutions, above all, if we can, to discover them by consent. The world is now aware, as the President of the United States has insisted, that the foundations of a strong and healthy
democracy have nothing mysterious about them. "The basic things," he
has said, "expected by our people of their political and economic systems are
simple. They are:—

Equality of opportunity for youth and for others.
Jobs for those who can work.
Security for those who need it.
The ending of special privileges for the few.
The preservation of civil liberties for all.
The enjoyment of the fruits of scientific progress in a wider and con-
stantly rising standard of living."

16. The Labour Party accepts these objectives; it observes that, by
implication, the British Government accepted them when it endorsed the
Atlantic Charter. It agrees with President Roosevelt that "the inner and
abiding strength of our economic and political systems is dependent upon the
degree to which they fulfil these expectations." It accepts his plea for the
necessity of the four essential human freedoms—"freedom of speech and
expression, religious freedom, freedom from want and freedom from fear,
 everywhere in the world." It agrees with him, also, that "this is no vision
of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable
in our time and generation."

17. The Labour Party is bound to remark that the pre-war economic and
social system denied these things, not merely to the mass of mankind, but also
to the great majority of our own citizens, in this the second richest nation in
the world. It denied them because they could not be attained by a system
in which private profit and not public need was the motive power upon which
it rested. We are only able to plan for victory because we have limited
the right of private profit to direct our war-effort. If, when hostilities cease, it is
allowed to resume its previous authority, it will deny these things once more.
In the view of the Labour Party, therefore, we have arrived at a stage where
fundamental economic and social transformation must begin. We say this
not in deference to party principle but in recognition of our entrance into a
new phase of history. We say that any attempt to restore traditional Britain
will deny our power to fulfil the purposes for which we fight and, sooner or
later, recreate all the grave problems of the inter-war years in a more acute
and profound form. Such an attempt would be a tragic frustration of the
heroism and endurance which will have gone to the accomplishment of our
victory.

Pre-War System Failed

18. The Labour Party, therefore, starts from the assumption that there
can be no return to the pre-war system. It states its view quite simply
when it insists that the pre-war system had its chance, and that the evidence
of its failure is decisive and overwhelming. The Labour Party can contem-
plate no effort at reconstruction in which considerations of equity are not
paramount. It would not be equity to ask our soldiers and sailors, our airmen
and the men of the mercantile marine, the men and women who have done
such heroic work in civilian defence, the tireless workers in field and factory,
to go back to a world in which there are mass unemployment and distressed
areas, in which the ground-landlord and the speculative builder can profiteer

*Message to Congress on the State of the Nation, January 6, 1941, and "The
Atlantic Charter," August 14, 1941. (See pages 29 and 30.)
from the rebuilding of Britain. Equity means that the principles of ownership responsible for such conditions are no longer permissible in a democratic society. Equity means that there is a reasonable standard of life for all. The basis of democracy, as we reaffirm, is planned production for community consumption; on no other basis is it safe from the attacks, open or secret, of vested interests. Our fellow citizens have made it plain that they expect the Government of Great Britain to make the foundations of democracy sure, and to no less than this are they entitled.

19. The Labour Party does not ask for some sudden and overnight transformation of our society. It proposes here only the basis upon which the nation can begin forthwith to build. But the acceptance of this basis entails, at once, certain consequences; for it is clear that there are certain instruments of production without the ownership and control of which by the community no planned production for the ends we seek can be seriously attempted.

The Labour Party therefore seeks to adapt our society to the full possibilities of democratic life. We have learned in the war that the anarchy of private competition must give way to ordered planning under national control. That lesson is not less applicable to peace. The Labour Party therefore urges that the nation must own and operate the essential instruments of production; their power over our lives is too great for them to be left in private hands. This common ownership does not commit us to a regimented bureaucracy. It means, on the one hand, that the technical expert has his proper place in the direction of economic affairs, and, on the other, that the skill and experience of the workers are fully utilised in all branches of administration and management.

20. The Labour Party is aware that this makes a beginning only in planned production, and that it will be some time before its benefits are fully available. But it must emphasise its conviction that common ownership will alone secure that priority of national over private need which assures the community the power over its economic future. Upon this policy depends the fulfilment of the four freedoms; without it, privilege will remain in control of the national destiny.

21. Given the acceptance of this policy, the community has in its hands the essential instruments of successful planning. It is clear, however, that alongside it we must pursue a programme which aims at full employment during the change-over from a war-time to a peace-time economy. Central to the success of any such programme is the necessity of retaining the main wartime controls in industry and agriculture. The vital lesson of the last war is that, without them, the post-war scene becomes an ugly scramble for profit in which there is no serious attempt to assess, in any coherent way, the priorities of national need. The necessity of establishing these priorities, in the building industry, for example, will be very great. That will determine the manner and rate of transformation of the heavy industries, of the furniture trade, of the new and important science of plastics. It will enable the reorganisation of our export trade to proceed in an orderly and balanced way. It will prevent—as it is urgent to prevent—the exploitation in certain industries of the smaller, but often efficient, manufacturers by the great monopolies. It will secure a more equitable distribution of commodities, and enable the necessary costings and price controls to be maintained in a period in which, without them, the danger, as in 1920, of a soaring market and, accordingly, of reckless speculation will be very great. The Labour
Party believes that it is a vital matter to secure from the Government without delay an explicit pledge that these main controls will be maintained. It would be fatal to allow business men to prepare now for the post-war period on the assumption that the experience of the last war and its immediate aftermath is to be repeated.

**From War to Peace**

22. Granted the maintenance of these controls, positive and bold steps are possible to minimise the dislocation otherwise inherent in the change-over from War to Peace.

(1) The appropriate Ministries must prepare, in conjunction with local authorities and public utility services, the plans which enable the rapid transfer of labour and material to peace-time requirements. Above all, it should be emphasised to local authorities that the replanning and rebuilding of urban areas must be a matter requiring their attention now. Where this requires the co-operation of local authorities with one another the Ministry of Health should take steps to see that the necessary agreement is swiftly reached.

(2) The social services must be adjusted so as to make more generous provision for those workers and their families who await reabsorption into industry and agriculture.

(3) The older workers should be permitted to retire from industry on the basis of adequate pensions.

(4) As a transition measure on the road to fully democratic education, the school-leaving age should be raised to fifteen immediately hostilities cease, and to sixteen within three years from that date. Appropriate maintenance allowances should be paid to the parents of the children thus retained at school.

(5) With the raising of the school-leaving age, there must be established a system of obligatory part-time education for all workers in industry and agriculture between the ages of sixteen and eighteen years. We stress the importance of this period as permitting the organisation of a training in citizenship of great significance to a democratic society.

(6) There must be a generous endowment at universities and technical colleges of scholarships for those boys and girls likely to profit from such opportunities. In particular, we are anxious that these scholarships shall be made amply available to those of appropriate age who, during the war, have engaged in the different forms of national service.

23. We regard it as vital to any serious plan for reconstruction that it should directly and consciously aim at protecting and raising the workers' standard of life. For this reason, the Labour Party takes the view that there should be a fuller application of the Factory Acts; similarly, it is essential to insist on the full and unfettered recognition, in every field of employment, of the right of trade unions to bargain collectively on behalf of the workers. Steps must be taken by the State to see to it that provision for children is not a contributory cause of poverty among the workers; the Labour Party believes that the child must be regarded as a national asset.

24. This raises the question of the future of the social services, and especially of their impact upon the health and education of the community.
Here we can deal only with general principles, leaving the detailed schemes for later discussion. But we must point out, first, that every element in well-being with which the social services deal is largely their concern because of the low income of the masses; we therefore accept the principle that a minimum living wage for every employed person is essential. Obviously, an industry which pays less than this minimum is parasitic upon the labour of its employees. It is, in fact, permitted to penalise them and to tax the community for no purpose but its private advantage.

25. A democratic society must express itself through a social service state. The Labour Party believes that this must be organised so that all members of the community have full access to its benefits. On the basis of the immediate educational changes it demands, the Labour Party seeks to build a unified educational system founded on the common school and related to the capacity of the child instead of to the means of its parents. It desires to create a national medical service in which the threefold function of prevention, cure and research are equally performed for all citizens; it is convinced that the days of medical individualism are over, and that the socialisation of medicine is the end deliberately to be kept in view. It believes, further, that the socialisation of all services of insurance would make its benefits more available, and at far lower cost, than is the case in the present competitive system. It believes that there are public amenities, both of culture and of recreation, which must be consciously undertaken by the community on behalf of its citizens, instead of remaining, as so largely now, the accident of private generosity. Not least, in the Labour Party's view, we must wipe out, swiftly and generously, as the war ends, the fears which still, despite a real measure of advance, hang over the lives of innumerable citizens through the insecurity of old age, of widowhood, or of incurable disease. A State which assumes the title to the lives of its citizens owes them the obligation to offer them security while they live. Particularly is this the case with the dependants of those who have died on behalf of their country. We cannot, after this war, leave to the cold mercies of voluntary effort any responsibility for those whose care is a national obligation.

The Costs of Distribution

26. We must look closely to the costs of distribution, both in domestic and in international trade. It is well known that these have increased greatly and disproportionately in the last generation, with loss both to the consumer here and to the position of Great Britain in the export market. For this reason, the Labour Party strongly favours both the organised import of staple commodities and their orderly marketing. Especially in the field of commodities of mass-consumption, the potentialities of the Co-operative Movement present a wide field for useful exploration. The Labour Party views with considerable alarm the growth of a horde of middlemen, who charge excessively for their services, between manufacturer and consumer. It believes that the organisation of our exports is highly anarchic and thereby charged with an unfavourable burden of additional cost much of which could be removed. With the coming of peace, the investigation of the whole mechanism of distribution, its incoherence, its wasteful competition, its massive costs of advertising, is of great importance. Economies of cost of considerable magnitude are possible by the discovery of the knowledge that enables action to be taken on behalf of the consumer.
The Labour Party draws attention to the need, in any serious plans for reconstruction, for a more creative attitude on the part both of Government and of industry to science and scientific research. There are few industries in this country not directly connected with war in which either the place of the scientist or the endowment of research is even remotely adequate. Compared with either Russia or the United States the position is profoundly unsatisfactory. The situation demands the conscious and deliberate endowment of scientific research, both pure and applied, the financial responsibility for which shall be shared by industry and the State. This would be amply justified by the achievements and experience of existing organisations. There is no field of economic life in which the possibilities of scientific advance are not immense. Many of them are arrested, or withheld from enjoyment by the community, by the motives inherent in a profit-making society. As we confine its power as the main stimulus to production, so we liberate the potentialities of science from their present restrictions. This transformation, no doubt, will take time to accomplish. But, meanwhile, there is no reason why the necessary endowment of scientific research should be jeopardised by habits it is in the power of the State to overcome.

Attention must be drawn to the need to apply in the work of reconstruction some of the important lessons of management and industrial welfare that have been learned, or reinforced, during the war. The possibilities of communal feeding in factories; the organisation of medical inspection and care as part of the normal process of rational management; the growth of factory discipline built upon consultation from below rather than on coercion from above; the full use of industrial psychology, under proper control, and with effective safeguards for the workers, in testing fitness for the job; the importance of rest periods and of holidays with pay in securing the full effort of the worker; the provision of fuller opportunities for advanced training; the selection for executive posts in terms of tested competence rather than of nepotism; the proper planning of factory accommodation both as to site and internal organisation; the importance of relating managerial discretion to the trade union function of protecting the workers’ interest; on all these, a mass of important experience has accumulated which the nation will neglect at its peril.

A planned society can be a far more free society than the competitive laissez-faire order it has come to replace. Its greater freedom lies in its ability to offer those who work in it the sense, on the one hand, of continuous opportunity for the expression of capacity, and the power, on the other, to share fully in the making of the rules under which they work. The failure of the pre-war order was in the degree to which, in the daily economic life of the worker, it made freedom and security dependent on privilege. Men feel that a social order is just only when their hopes are not frustrated and their future not in constant danger; justice is the parent of freedom. The capitalist society whose authority appears now to be drawing to a close could not, save for a brief moment in its history, give this sense of hope and justice to the masses. It is the business of the planned society whose outline is now beginning to take shape to succeed where its predecessor failed.

To do so, the Labour Party adds, it must ceaselessly bear in mind that the future economic and social well-being of British citizens is bound up with the prosperity of all other peoples. The possibility of its advance is directly dependent on their standard of life; their poverty is necessarily reflected in our own lives. It is, therefore, elementary commonsense to relate the
direction of British effort to the promotion of a higher international standard of living. For this reason, the Labour Party welcomes the recognition of this need in the Atlantic Charter. It applauds the determination of the International Labour Office to go on with its work; for the more fully it fulfils its purpose, the more swift, both here and abroad, will be recovery and reform. No effort at reconstruction can pretend to adequacy which does not constantly remind itself of the interdependence of peoples.

IV

A PLANNED DEMOCRACY

30. A planned democracy involves a State organised to undertake positive functions; no one can examine our machinery of government without the sense that it will require considerable adaptation to fit the purposes of the new world. The Labour Party will, at a later date, have detailed proposals to submit to the electorate on this head. Meanwhile it is anxious to draw public attention to certain paramount questions of general principle which require close scrutiny.

(1) Government by Departmental Orders and Regulations has come to play an increasing part in our lives. While they arise from powers conferred on the Executive by Parliament, there is no coherent way in which the use of these powers can be scrutinised. The desirability of creating a committee for this purpose, as recommended by the Committee on Ministers' Powers in 1932, deserves examination.

(2) The principles of civil service administration require reconsideration in the light of the new functions to which it will be increasingly called. In particular, questions of post-entry training, of the desirability of interchange between the personnel of central and local government, of the separation of the financial functions of the Treasury from its present Establishment duties of the provision of an adequately equipped central statistical office, of means whereby foreign experience may be made more swiftly and fully available by the interchange between officials with experience in the field and those engaged in executive work in the Departments, of means of re-appraising the present relation between the administrator and the scientific expert, all call for reassessment. The Labour Party desires especially to emphasise two things: its general confidence in the principle of appointment to the service by competitive examination, and its belief that the opportunities for promotion among able officials in the lower ranks of the service shall be wider in the future than they have been in the past.

(3) One of the results of the war will be a need for the redefinition of the areas of local government. On this issue, the Labour Party makes two preliminary observations. However the boundaries of these areas may be drawn, it is important that the powers conferred upon their authorities shall be exercised by elected persons; and it is vital that the control at the centre in Whitehall shall never be so excessive as to diminish interest in, and the sense of responsibility for, the result. The areas may well, in many cases, coincide with traditional boundaries; in others they may need to be redrawn so as to permit the functions involved to be properly performed; while the Central Government may reasonably exact a minimum standard of performance for all authorities, it is essential that wide room shall be left for local initiative and experiment. It recommends that more attention should be paid to the quality of recruitment and training of local officials. It believes,
further, that if the elected personnel of local authorities is to be in the widest sense representative, remuneration for expenses and time lost is an urgent matter. The present position excludes important elements in the population from the opportunity to contribute their experience to the public good. In effect, this is an unjustifiable form of disfranchisement.

(4) The growing field of publicly owned concerns is likely in the near future to raise interesting and important questions about the most suitable form of control and management. The Labour Party does not believe that any single model will serve; method must be adapted to function. But it thinks it important that any method shall admit three principles: (i) the obligation to relate the publicly owned concern to a Minister who shall be responsible to Parliament for its general direction; (ii) safeguards against the evils of patronage in appointment and promotion of personnel; (iii) proper provision for the rapid amortisation of the funds paid to the previous owners and for carrying on any necessary research; (iv) the full use of the knowledge and experience of the workers in these concerns and the development of an adequate relation between them and the direction of the industry in all its aspects. The Labour Party lays emphasis upon the importance of developing independent audit and full publicity in this sector of industry; and it recommends the fullest possible consultation with the workers concerned, and their trade unions, subject only to the necessary maintenance of executive efficiency.

(5) The Labour Party is anxious that interest in the processes of democracy shall extend to the largest possible number of citizens; it believes that the safety of democratic institutions is proportionate to the width of this interest. While, in the first instance, the creation of this interest depends upon the quality of our educational system, its maintenance and development depend upon the conference of some actual responsibility in government upon a far larger number of citizens than now share in it. The Labour Party is convinced that the wider use of advisory committees, especially in the sphere of local government, is a device of high value for this purpose. The office of school manager, the juvenile employment committees, the hospital committees of bodies like the London County Council, have all been important factors in arousing interest in civic issues. The Labour Party is confident that the wider perspectives opened by the problems of reconstruction offer new opportunities in this regard of which it is important that full advantage be taken.

**The Machinery of Justice**

(6) The time is ripe, in the judgment of the Labour Party, for a thorough overhaul of the machinery of justice in Great Britain. The incorruptibility and independence of our judiciary is unquestioned anywhere in the world. But British justice is expensive and it is slow; and the permitted hierarchy of appeals, not less in Crown proceedings than in private legislation, weights the scales in favour of the wealthy litigant. Nor is the Labour Party satisfied that the Poor Person’s Rules provide anything like adequate representation for the poor litigant, whether on the civil or on the criminal side. It is, further, profoundly concerned at the present position of the lay Magistracy, and the need for a far more adequate representation of the working-class on the Bench. It believes, also, that prison reform has been long overdue in this country, and that the systematic study of criminology is an urgent need. Not since the Judicature Act of 1873 has any thoroughgoing attempt been made to examine our legal system both in the doctrines it applies and in the
functions it performs. The condition of the law about Workmen's Compensation is evidence that no small part of the law requires revision; and a number of recent investigations into the Courts have suggested that their modernisation is a matter of considerable importance. No democracy can afford to allow suspicion to arise about the quality of its legal system. The Labour Party therefore urges that inquiries be undertaken by the Government as a necessary part of the general process of reconstruction.

(7) The present Parliament is already over six years old, but under war-time conditions it appears unlikely that a general election will take place before the cessation of hostilities except in circumstances of grave crisis. The Labour Party is confident that it voices the will of the nation in insisting that the general election, when it does come, shall avoid a repetition of the conditions which surrounded the "coupon election" of 1918. Evacuation has meant great changes in the present distribution of population; and the boundaries of constituencies need to be revised in this light. The present register is hopelessly out of date; and no results based upon its use could claim validity. There are, moreover, important respects in which the present franchise and the Corrupt Practices Act require revision. The Labour Party stands by the principle of the single-member constituency as the basis of our system; and it believes that both Continental and Dominion experience remains decisive against proportional representation. But it does not think that the grave decision of choosing a new Parliament should be taken until the anomalies of the present situation have been corrected. Above all, it insists that, when the time arrives, our fighting men in all theatres of war shall have a full opportunity to take their share in helping to shape the will of the people on whose behalf they will have risked their lives.

31. The war will leave a legacy of financial problems more complicated and profound than any we have so far confronted in our history, problems both local and national in their incidence. The Executive of the Labour Party has already appointed a special committee of experts to inquire into these matters, and it does not propose, at this stage, to anticipate its recommendations. But it is important thus early for the Labour Party to affirm its views:

(i) that the burden of debt we shall inherit from the war shall not be permitted to prevent embarkation upon those social reforms of which the nation approves;
(ii) that the principle of graduated taxation on the basis of ability to pay, rising steeply in the higher levels of income, and imposed with rigour on large estates, must continue to be a necessary feature of the financial landscape;
(iii) that the differentiation of taxes upon earned and unearned income is a proper means of dealing with some of the problems of functionless ownership;
(iv) that the basis of local taxation is in urgent need of revision; and
(v) that the Party accepts the principle of reasonable compensation to the owners of such industries as may be socialised.

Above all, the Labour Party insists that no post-war financial arrangements shall exclude the certainty of generous treatment for disabled persons who have served their country, and their dependants, and for the families of the men who will have lost their lives. Equity, it must be added, demands that the same consideration shall apply to women as to men where injury or death is the result of national service.
32. So far, in this war, none of the imperial questions faced by this country has been lifted to a new plane of discussion; the urgency of conflict has made it always difficult, and often impossible, to embark upon new developments in any vital way. The Labour Party, at the moment, can therefore do little more in this realm than reaffirm the historic principles to which it is committed, and to note the special emphasis which, in the present situation, certain of these principles require.

The Labour Party continues to affirm that in all colonial territories the primary object of the administration must be the well-being, education, and development of the native inhabitants and their training in every possible way so that they may be able in the shortest possible time to govern themselves. In other words, the interests of those inhabitants are and must remain paramount, and of those interests Parliament is the trustee.

The negation of this policy for which the Party stands is the policy of the colour bar, the object and effect of which are to ensure by law, administration, and every other available means that the native inhabitant is given a different and subordinate status, civil and social, from that of the European. It is in Africa that the colour bar as a "native policy" can be seen in its most undisguised form, but it does, less evilly but more insidiously, affect British colonial policy in other continents. The Labour Party is absolutely opposed to the colour bar in every shape and form. It maintains therefore that in territories for which Parliament is responsible the laws and administrative practices upon which the colour bar rests should be abolished and colonial administrations should see that every kind of legal or administrative discrimination (whether by disabilities or privileges), on the ground of race, colour, or religion, should cease.

It follows that in all colonial territories in which white settlers are in a minority, Parliament must remain trustee of the native interests, and the Labour Party cannot therefore agree to any conferment of responsible government upon any territory or union of territories which would involve the delegation of its duties to a local legislative body in which the native races were in a minority. It is not prepared to see any further alienation of their lands to white settlers, to agree to any restriction upon the right of natives to acquire lands, or to consent to any legislation which, directly or indirectly, forces natives to work for white settlers. It is opposed to compulsory labour in those territories and holds that the international convention on forced labour should be strictly adhered to. It is opposed further to the exploitation of mineral or similar resources by white settlers or companies; in its judgment they should be operated as government concerns in trusteeship for the native community.

The Labour Party welcomes the establishment of the Colonial Development and Welfare Fund and looks forward to a great extension of its use and scope. Expenditure should be directed to the promotion of the education and health of the native inhabitants and of their economic prosperity by improving communications and developing native industries and agriculture. It notes with satisfaction the establishment of the post of Labour Adviser in the Colonial Service, but holds that the creation of an energetic Labour Department, both in the Colonial Office and each colony, together with an adequate inspectorate, lies at the root of all reform. It asks for active development of
institutions calculated to widen and deepen the opportunity of self-govern-
ment, and that every occasion be taken to associate educated natives with
every aspect of government work, central and local. While the Labour Party
admits that for a long time to come the effective control of these territories
must remain; under Parliament, in the hands of the Colonial Office, it must
demand that the whole process of government be geared to the supreme
purpose of fitting the native races to determine their own destiny.

VI

THE PROBLEM OF INDIA

33. The Labour Party is deeply concerned that, in a war for freedom and
democracy, a settlement shall be arrived at with India which enables all its
citizens to devote their full energies to the common struggle. It has noted
with satisfaction that all Indian parties are united in their condemnation of
Hitlerism. The British Government has announced that it will not itself
be a bar in the way of Indian self-government once agreement is reached
between the different interests in India. But the Labour Party believes that it
is also the duty of the British Government to take every possible step to pro-
mote that agreement. While it agrees that the full settlement of the complex
issues of Indian self-government must await the close of the war, it believes
that both at the centre and in the Provinces Indians must be given full
responsibility now, and that Indians must take their full place alongside
Dominion statesmen in the direction of the war effort. An Indian Govern-
ment can then initiate the discussions necessary to a permanent solution;
where agreement cannot be reached settlement should be made by reference
to agreed arbitrators. After being drafted, the settlement so made should,
in the view of the Labour Party, be discussed with the British Government
on the model of the similar negotiations with Australia in 1900; the result
should then be embodied in an Act of Parliament.

34. In the submission of the Labour Party, this approach to the problem of
India is both the duty of Great Britain and its interest. It is its duty; for an
India which requires continuous coercion and repression as the price of its
control is a reproach to our good name and a danger to our future. The
British Government ought to have learned from the history of the Common-
wealth, from its failure in America and Ireland not less than from its success
in South Africa, that it maintains friendship where it experiments in freedom
and enforces separation where it relies upon repression. Indian self-govern-
ment is in the interest also of Great Britain; it transforms, at a critical
moment in the history of both countries, a sullen subordinate into a willing
partner. Sooner or later, in the Labour Party's view, Great Britain will have
to concede the Indian demand; it is more honourable and more just to
act now with magnanimity than to wait until our admission of the Indian
claim has lost all character of grace and generosity.

35. The Labour Party believes that the considerations which apply to
India apply to Burma and Ceylon also. The invasion of Burma by Japan has
already begun; Japanese aeroplanes have already bombed Rangoon.
There is no better way, whether in Burma or in India, of steeling their resist-
ance against the common aggressor. Our self-governing Dominions have
already proved supremely how much more unbreakable are the links of
freedom than the chains of slavery. At this solemn hour, to stand by the
principle of national emancipation would rank in British history among the
most splendid of its achievements.
OBJECTIVES OF THE PEACE

36. The peace which follows our victory must have two objectives. It must make it impossible for the aggressor nations, for any period against which we can make provision, either to be able or to be willing to use war as an instrument of national policy; and it must at least begin to build the ground-plan of an enduring peace.

37. Just as the issues of domestic reconstruction are bound up with our actual ways of waging the war, so international peace very largely depends on the understanding we reach, before victory, with our allies, and, above all, with the Soviet Union and the United States. The Labour Party regards it as imperative that we should agree with them upon a united strategy in the conduct of the war, and common ends in the making of the peace. Neither will be possible unless we see that common action is the outcome of common interests, and that their full defence requires common decisions. Our partnership in war can, if properly organised, be the basis of an international experiment from the experience of which a creative peace may emerge.

38. The Labour Party believes that our partnership can only fulfil its immense potentialities if we take pains to learn the real meaning of the inter-war years and their grim sequel.

(1) A shrinking world economy, in which monopoly-capitalism lives by the techniques of restriction, is dangerous to democracy, threatens the workers' standard of life everywhere, and provokes excessive nationalism. Each of these threatens the principle of the good neighbour between States. The channels of international trade are blocked. Tariff conflicts, and every sort of protective device, are used in the ugly scramble for markets. Mutual suspicions are sharpened, and an aggressive temper replaces the spirit of co-operation. Democracy is undermined by the growth of economic insecurity; and privilege is tempted to destroy the right of the masses to use their political power to mitigate their sufferings. Hence arises dictatorship; and the dictator is compelled to aggression abroad that conquest may compensate for the loss of freedom at home. This means the politics of bluster and threat, contempt for treaties, defiance of international law; and to support this policy rearmament becomes necessary. As this, in its turn, is a source of suspicion and provocation, it becomes the inevitable prelude of conflict; granted dictatorship, no method of appeasing the dictator can be found; for he assumes that every attempt at accommodation is evidence of weakness and builds further demands upon the effort to conciliate him. The characteristics of a period in which the power of monopoly-capitalism grows ever greater are, therefore, doubt of democracy, a lowering of the standard of life, the inflammation of national ill-feeling, and a rapid drift, through re-armament, to war. States once again stand, in Hobbes' famous phrase, "in the posture of armed gladiators to one another." Conflict is the necessary consequence of dictatorship, and dictatorship is the logical outcome of a capitalist economy which has lost its power to promote expanding welfare.

The Labour Party recognises that other and powerful political forces played their full part in building up the dictatorships of the inter-war period. Both Mussolini and Hitler were given important support by the arms-producing interests of their respective countries. Hitler, from the very beginning of his movement, was protected and helped by the German General
Staff. Elsewhere the main driving force to Fascism was militarism, and its principal supporters were drawn from the officer class. Nor is it accident that, in all countries, the militarists were actively and bitterly hostile to the League of Nations.

**Why the League Failed**

(2) The inter-war years saw dictatorship wreck the first great experiment in international government. It failed less because of any inherent error in the objects at which it aimed, or in the rules of law it established and the institutions through which it worked, than because selfish national interest deprived it of the conditions precedent to success. America refused to join it at the start; the Soviet Union did not join it until Italy, Germany and Japan had already embarked on its betrayal. The unwillingness of France and Britain, when the supreme tests came, to organise and apply that collective security which was the living principle of the covenant by which they were bound meant the resumption of that international anarchy the League of Nations had sought to terminate. The hoped-for world order became a chaos once more. Each nation-state went its own sovereign way. Each sought to stand alone, in the vain hope that the tempest would pass it by. When the war came, it took less time than in 1914-1918 to engulf practically the whole world. It demonstrated beyond discussion that only the principle of collective security can restrain a powerful aggressor whose scale of armament permits it to believe that it may strike successfully before its victims are ready.

(3) Granted the technological basis of modern war, the small nation, while, as our allies have nobly shown it, can make an important contribution to collective security, cannot hope to defend itself against a powerful nation bent on aggression. Its hopes of maintaining neutrality are no longer, therefore, a matter of its own choice.

(4) Modern dictatorship is totalitarian dictatorship; it is determined, by its methods, to break any opposition it may encounter. Since it is usually born of the contradictions of capitalist democracy in a period of economic crisis, it destroys all organisations which, like the trade unions, seek to protect the workers' standard of life, or aim at the development of freedom. Because it has no philosophy of its own, it discovers an enemy, internal or external, to which it can attribute the miseries of its subjects. When it has broken its enemies within, it directs national emotion against some foreign state whose possessions are an object of envy. The result is the creation of an atmosphere of hostility which it uses to justify embarkation on a programme of rearmament. It is then led to make claims in the satisfaction of which its prestige becomes involved. To maintain that prestige, it is driven to bully its weaker and to cajole its powerful neighbours. Its methods become a mixture of force and fraud which poison any prospect of international confidence. Having forced upon its neighbours the choice between surrender and war, it is bound to break the peace in order to justify to its subjects the claims it has made.

(5) The totalitarian dictator makes totalitarian war. The whole nation is harnessed to its inexorable requirements. It subordinates the whole economy of the nation to its necessities. Having imposed its power on its own people by terror, it seeks by terror also to break the will of those who resist it. It recognises no obligations to mercy, justice or good faith. Its
sole criterion of right or wrong is success. There is no treachery before which it will hesitate; that is shown by the Nazi invasion of Holland and Belgium. There is no lie too vast for it to shrink from telling; that is shown in Hitler's pose as a crusader for peace. It seeks for power for the sake of power merely. It has no respect for human personality. It rejects every recognised principle in the civilised tradition of more than two thousand years.

(6) Totalitarian war, under modern technological conditions, is therefore revolutionary in its impact. Since it requires the planned co-ordination of each item of the national life in the service of the war effort, it brings to a final close the epoch of free capitalism in every state affected by its claims. It has already compelled adjustments in habit and behaviour hardly conceivable in any comparable period of history. It proffers to every nation it touches the choice—as the experience of France has shown—between victory and slavery. It reshapes, either way, the future of the whole world by presenting to it at a single stroke massive problems which even the victorious nations can only solve by wholesale adaptation of the basis of their lives.

(7) The explicit lesson, therefore, that the world has to learn from this grim experience is the simple, but vital one that its civilisation will literally perish unless this time it can, beyond the possibility of mistake, make the world truly safe for democracy. On any showing, the world it has thus to make safe will be a maimed and scarred world, full of bitter memories, deep hates, profound wrongs brutally inflicted upon innocent men and women. It is clearly an immense task; and it is one which compels everywhere the subordination of special privilege to common needs. The task can be fulfilled only if it is approached in a spirit worthy of the sacrifices evoked by the passion of free men and women for democracy.

Collective Security

39. These are the conditions of the problem as the Labour Party sees them. They involve certain obvious conclusions.

(1) Aggressor nations, after military defeat, must be disarmed and kept disarmed. This involves the destruction of the social and economic relationships which make possible the alliance between military castes and economic privilege. But the prevention of aggression can only be permanently secured by a general international system which organises collective security against all acts of lawless violence, from whatever quarter they may come.

(2) The principle of collective security against aggression must be given its appropriate methods and institutions. This involves the rebuilding of an international organisation. This organisation must have the necessary instruments, judicial, executive and legislative: (a) to complete the peaceful solution of international disputes; (b) to impose sanctions, both economic and military, against any nation-state which rejects such a peaceful solution; (c) to promote common action upon matters of common concern, and especially, in this realm, to protect the interests of minorities, both racial and religious, and of those peoples not yet able to stand alone; (d) to organise positive and continuous co-operation between states for the purpose of raising the international standard of economic life, and, particularly, of assisting, materially and technically, the less developed nations to a higher level of well-being; (e) to promote intellectual co-operation and understanding between states with a view at once of raising international cultural standards and of placing the latest results of scientific knowledge at the common disposal of
(3) The Labour Party expresses the strong view that no principle of collective security, in its full and proper sense, can hope for permanent acceptance unless it is based on the recognition of the interdependence of nations. This will mean the control of armaments and armed forces by the direct power of the international authority. As a stage to this end, the Labour Party believes that the obligation of economic sanctions against an aggressor must be assumed by all states; and that steps be taken, within the framework of the international organisation, to create defence zones for mutual protection of the states within those zones against the possible action of an aggressor. In creating the mutual security pacts which the building of these defence zones will require, the Labour Party draws particular attention to the need of utilising fully the war-time experience of the Lend-Lease System, and of the arrangements for the common defence of reciprocal interests arrived at between the Governments of Great Britain and the United States. The Labour Party believes that the full use of these developments is of the first importance in establishing the new international organisation on a firm foundation.

(4) The Labour Party is convinced that no experiment in peace can have the prospect of success which does not recognise the due rights of nations to security and independence; but it denies that this recognition can imply any nation's right to sovereignty in the sense that this was claimed and exercised by states in the inter-war years. It believes that all the authority the nations, great and small alike, require for their self-respect and freedom is fully compatible with their full participation in, and acceptance of, the making of international standards in matters of international concern. It particularly emphasises the urgency of these standards in the field now covered by the work of the International Labour Organisation; and it records its view that the wider its authority and the swifter its acceptance the more assured is the interest of the nations in peace. For the Labour Party is certain that the masses of men and women in all lands have no interest in, nor desire for, war; and it does not believe that they can be persuaded to be accessories in its making save as economic suffering has driven them to despair.

(5) The Labour Party further emphasises the importance, in building a new international authority for peace and justice between states, of using to the full the experience in collaboration gained in the various organs of the League of Nations. Many of them, when used to apply the principles for which the League was founded, produced practical results which represented a real advance in international government. Through their operation, there was a rapid development of international law; the foundations of a genuine international civil service were laid; important and difficult administrative functions were successfully undertaken; and, not least, the technique of public discussion was successfully applied to international affairs. It is important not to forget, in these grim years of international anarchy, that both the Assembly of the League and the Permanent Court of International Justice had, when they were properly used, striking achievements to their credit. This great body of practical experience, alike in its successes and failures, must provide us with invaluable guidance to future action.
(6) The Labour Party emphasises the importance, in the building of peace, of utilising to the full the special experience of international collaboration which has emerged in this war. Common action for defence; common planning in investment and distribution; for the utilisation of raw materials; for the full interchange of scientific knowledge and personnel; all of this has proved fruitful and important. To retain the institutions they have necessitated, and to extend their appropriate fields of operations, is, in the Labour view, the clear lesson of common sense. Only in the degree that it is learned will the new international organisation start in the circumstances that are likely to favour its prospects.

(7) The Labour Party insists that the new international institutions must be founded upon the full application of democratic principles. Experience has decisively proved that the most powerful instrument in securing social justice and social progress is the citizens' knowledge of how their representatives exercise their powers; thereby they can understand and control what is done in their name. That control protects their rights, and it is only effective where there is full public debate in the national legislature. The more complete the guarantees that (as in the Parliament of Great Britain) any question may be raised in public at any time, the more effective democratic government is made; publicity is the life-blood of democracy. In the view of the Labour Party it is equally vital that all citizens in every land should be able to scrutinise and to judge the actions of those who operate the new international institutions. The guarantees, therefore, that all questions of importance in those institutions are discussed in public and decided in public, must be as complete and effective as they are in the legislatures of the most advanced democracies.

(8) The Labour Party notes with strong approval the declaration in the Atlantic Charter that the peoples of the enemy countries shall, after their defeat, nevertheless share in the prosperity it is sought to organise by the common effort of all nations. It declares that it will be a party to no attempt to impose any peace of revenge, nor to impose upon the defeated any terms which deprive them of the right to that well-being which is the due reward of capacity and energy exercised in a peaceful way for peaceful ends.

(9) The Labour Party recognises that, as the Axis governments begin to crumble, widespread revolution is certain in the countries they now dominate. It declares its view that each people is entitled to determine its own form of government subject only to its obligation to accept and respect the Four Freedoms and the international implications to which they lead. It will oppose any attempt on the part of the victors, at the conclusion of the war, to use their military or economic power against the determination of each people to shape its own destiny, apart from the obligation to which reference has been made. It is convinced that it would be a grave disservice to the future of the world to use the power of the victors, under penalty of postponement of recovery, to promote in any country where revolution may occur the claims of any privileged interest, whether of class or religion or dynasty, against which that revolution is a protest.

(10) Finally, the Labour Party is bound to emphasise that the power of democracy in the future to maintain international peace is, in the long run, inseparable from the growth, in each country, of the common ownership of the main instruments of production and their co-ordinated planning for common ends. This is no doctrinaire affirmation; it is the unescapable lesson both of the inter-war years on the one hand, and of the war itself on
the other. The private empires of privilege, whether in oil or munitions, whether in land or minerals, whether in power or the basic means of transport, are bound on the evidence to frustrate the fulfilment of democracy at home and the maintenance of peace abroad. It was these private empires which, in association with militarism, exploited the misery of the masses and conspired to subordinate their claims to outlaws like Hitler and Mussolini; they share the responsibility of these evil men for the outbreak of the war. In France, they preferred to hand over the people to them in chains rather than risk their privileges for the service of freedom. In Japan, they were willing to inflict the agony of war upon nearly one thousand million people to preserve the authority of an alliance between militarist feudalism and commercial rapacity whose purpose was a denial of the needs of half the world. Even in Britain and the United States, there was a considerable danger for more than five years that the similar interests of privilege would betray democracy by accepting peace on the aggressors' terms; it was only the massive protest of public opinion which frustrated this betrayal. As it is, the history of Manchuria and Spain, of Austria and Abyssinia and, not least, of martyred Czecho-Slovakia and Poland, is the record of the price democracy has paid to privilege for its blindness to human rights. The Labour Party cannot but remain aware that this privilege still seeks to retain, even to increase, its power; and that unless it is deprived of its control over those aspects of economic life, national and international, which are pivotal to peace, it will continue to prevent that union of peoples which is its indispensible condition. Only the rapid socialisation of these instruments of production will enable us to move to that plane of common action where co-operation for abundance instead of division through scarcity is the chief motive in international effort. Only, further, as we move to that plane can we maintain in peace that partnership in the common cause which has enabled the peoples of the grand alliance of the democracies against aggression to triumph over past errors of policy and historical misunderstandings. Democratic relations of production are the highroad to freedom. The barriers in their way must be taken down that the nations may move swiftly to the goal for which they have sacrificed so much.

VIII

WHY LABOUR DEMANDS CHANGES

40. The Labour Party does not deny that this approach to reconstruction involves massive changes. It does not deny, either, that the ability to make these changes as rapidly as our emergency requires has been a rare quality among human beings. Upon these two facts certain comments must be made. The war itself has changed the direction and tempo of our thinking far beyond those confines which accepted the principles of the Labour Party before September 3, 1939. It is now widely recognised that this war is not merely the outcome of the ambitions of two evil men; it is also the product of the circumstances which gave them power. It is widely recognised that circumstances which have given birth to two World Wars within a generation must be radically and speedily transformed.

41. It is widely recognised, also, that the changes in our economic and social structure which the war-economy has exacted, while, if they are wisely used, may lead to a strengthening of the democratic principle, cannot less surely lead, if they are unwisely used, to its destruction. It is certain that, at the
end of this war, the economic system will have to lean heavily upon the support of the State. The central question this raises is whether this support is to be operated by the few in the interests of the few, as in the past, or by the organised community in the interests of the community. One or the other is the choice we have to make. If we choose the first, a war for Democracy and Freedom will end in their destruction; if we choose the second, we can enter upon an epoch richer in fulfilment in ordinary men’s lives than any past age. The choice cannot be postponed. It has to be made now.

42. We have to choose now because the character we give to the remaining period of this conflict itself determines the character of reconstruction, domestic and international. If we try to retain in being the foundations of the old system and regard reconstruction, as we regarded it in the last war, as a collection of pious maxims to be discarded when victory comes, it is quite certain that the after-war period will be one of frustration deepening into internecine conflict. If, on the other hand, the nation begins now the task of permeating its war-economy with the principles here affirmed, as peace comes, the minds of men will become accustomed to their acceptance and enlargement. By embarking now on a necessary readjustment, we shall make possible, in the post-war period, that unity of mood and purpose which enables the citizens of a community to keep the great ends of life in common, and to attain them stage by stage by the methods of democracy.

43. It is for the speedy enlargement of democratic purposes that the Labour Party is most deeply concerned. They are part of the fulfilment of that democratic ideal we are defending; they are part of the necessary means to freedom. That is why the Labour Party seeks to begin these changes now at a time when the mind of the whole community is receptive to their necessity. It does not seek for their support on the narrow ground of class or of party. It asks for their support from all citizens who are concerned to maintain in the Peace that high place in the moral leadership of the world Great Britain has won in the years of conflict.

These principles exclude no person from the full enjoyment of civil rights; they seek no acquisition of property without just compensation. They are built on the assumptions, first, that to have meaning to-day freedom must be set in the context of economic security, and, second, that the frontiers of democracy may not legitimately be halted at those boundaries where, in the past, the forces of privilege have stayed its progress. The time has come to end the exploitation of the masses; without that end, there can be no hope of peace. It is because the building of peace is so urgent a matter that the Labour Party demands these great changes. It demands them on the basis of their claim to democratic support; it demands them also as the necessary completion of the victory we shall achieve.

44. The Labour Party, finally, believes that the principles it here affirms have two merits no alternative programme can rival. Their acceptance will strengthen the determination of our own people to conquer; thereby it will advance the speed of the victory. Their acceptance, moreover, will give new hope and courage not only to our Allies, but to the masses in stricken Europe and Asia. It will present the majestic spectacle of a nation capable, even while fighting for its life, of renewing the foundations of its democratic faith. No act could do more than this to strengthen, the world over, that living spirit of democracy upon which victory depends. No act could reveal more surely that the future of civilisation is safe in our hands as victors.
President Roosevelt's
Annual Message to Congress

January 6th, 1941.

THE FOUR FREEDOMS

In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms:

The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peace-time life for its inhabitants, everywhere in the world.

The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbour—anywhere in the world.

That is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation. That kind of world is the very antithesis of the so-called new order of tyranny which the dictators seek to create with the crash of a bomb.

To that new order we oppose the greater conception—the moral order. A good society is able to face schemes of world domination and foreign revolutions alike without fear.

Since the beginning of our American history we have been engaged in change—in a perpetual peaceful revolution—a revolution which goes on steadily, quietly adjusting itself to changing conditions—without the concentration camp or the quicklime in the ditch. The world order which we seek is the co-operation of free countries, working together in a friendly, civilised society.

This nation has placed its destiny in the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free men and women; and its faith in freedom under the guidance of God. Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights or to keep them. Our strength is in our unity of purpose. To that high concept there can be no end save victory.
THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill), representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

1. Their countries seek no "aggrandisement," territorial or other.

2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

3. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of Government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

4. They will endeavour, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world, which are needed for their economic prosperity.

5. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement and social security.

6. After the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

7. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

8. They believe all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armament.

(Signed) FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT. WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

August 14, 1941.
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