

CAMPAIGN BRIEFING

CLPD newsletter for CLPs and Labour Party Members
www.clpd.org.uk (for full NEC reports)

SUMMER EDITION 2006
ISSUE NO 69

EDITOR: RAY DAVISON,
EAST DEVON CLP AND
CLPD REGIONAL ORGANISER

BLAIR MUST GO

Tony Blair must go. This demand reverberates across the political spectrum from Tory press to Guardian commentators and “radical” socialist periodicals. Labour MPs, leading trade unionists, ordinary party members and even discontented Blairites have all had enough. Yet, despite the differences in their politics, one thing unites them: when urging Blair’s resignation, they leave the timing to him.

The long goodbye

Blair’s Labour critics agree that his continuing as Prime Minister threatens the Party’s chances of winning a fourth term. Yet they don’t go beyond merely appealing to him to resign. Blair, however, has no intention to oblige. He has recently indicated that he certainly won’t go for at least another year. In the Guardian (June 27) he stated that he intends to ensure that Labour goes into the next election with his programme. This would necessitate either him staying until late 2008 or that his successor agrees to stick with his policies – policies which are rooted in a dogma which favours competition, private profit and a foreign policy tied to the United States.

Four million lost votes

Bizarrely, in Blair’s view, these articles of faith guarantee political success. But, had it not been for out-of-date constituency boundaries, a discredited Tory party and the vicissitudes of the first past the post system, Labour may not have won a working majority in 2005. Today it rules with the smallest proportion of the popular vote ever recorded by a government. Between the 1997 and 2005 elections Labour lost four million votes. The results in by-elections and local elections held since show a further decline, and in the opinion polls Labour

has been overtaken by the Tories. Although Blair now concedes that Labour’s recent results have been disappointing he still sticks to the fantasy that “**if we remain New Labour we will remain in office**”.

Open and candid debate?

Faced with mounting dissatisfaction, even Blair is now calling for the party’s “renewal” urging critics to debate his policies “openly and candidly” (Guardian June 27). He did not indicate, however, where this debate is to occur. A letter responding to Blair’s invitation (Guardian, July 7), signed among others by several trade union leaders and a number of Labour ex-ministers, promises that the signatories intend to organize a public debate on the party’s future “in order to point the way towards the change of direction in government policy ...”. Although welcome, this is no substitute for a debate within the party with all members involved. But is such a debate still possible? Not unless rules introduced in 1997 are relaxed. When he became Prime Minister, Blair lost no time before introducing rule changes which prevent the kind of debate he is now calling for. The new rules denied CLPs any input into the conference agenda and restricted the unions to four subjects which

(continued page 2)

ANNUAL CONFERENCE HIGHLIGHTS

SAT 23 SEPTEMBER, 5.00PM
JARVIS PICCADILLY HOTEL
RECEPTION FOR DELEGATES, FOOD AND DRINK PROVIDED.
HERE DELEGATES CAN MEET EACH OTHER, MEET MEMBERS OF THE NEC, TU GENERAL SECRETARIES AND MPs.
Free for delegates (£5.00 others)

SUN 24 SEPTEMBER, 10.00AM
JARVIS PICCADILLY HOTEL
CLPD RALLY AND DELEGATES’ BRIEFING WITH YVONNE BONNAMY (CHAIR), MOHAMMED AZAM, TONY BENN, ANN BLACK, JEREMY CORBYN, KATH FRY, KELVIN HOPKINS, KATE HUDSON, JOHN McDONNELL, MICHAEL MEACHER, CHRISTINE SHAWCROFT, DEREK SIMPSON, GAVIN STRANG, PETER WILLSMAN (SPECIAL BRIEFING FOR DELEGATES).
Entry £2 (conc. 50P)

THURS 28 SEPTEMBER, 1.00PM
JURY’S INN HOTEL
CONFERENCE ASSESSMENT AND THE NEXT STEP WITH MOHAMMED AZAM (CHAIR), ANN BLACK, BILLY HAYES, GAYE JOHNSTON, CHRISTINE SHAWCROFT, PETER WILLSMAN AND WALTER WOLFGANG.
Entry £1.00 (conc. 50P)

THE WILLSMAN GUIDE TO CONFERENCE — 2006 EDITION

THE INDISPENSABLE HANDBOOK FOR ALL DELEGATES AND ANYONE ELSE WHO WANTS TO UNDERSTAND WHAT IS REALLY GOING ON AT CONFERENCE. AVAILABLE FREE OF CHARGE FROM 10 PARK DRIVE, LONDON NW11 7SH.

TONY ROBINSON SEES RADICAL LIGHT

We give credit to former NEC member, Tony Robinson, who did not need to set off for Damascus to experience revelation: he just watched New Labour in action. Writing in the November 2006 issue of Red Pepper, Robinson encapsulates the depth of the revelation in a stunning iterance: 'power tends to corrupt' and follows up thus: 'In the Labour Party, of course, politicians are so governed by the experience of the Militant Tendency in the 1980s that they are in terror of their own members. They manipulate the membership. They parachute in their own favourites to constituencies as parliamentary candidates. To all intents and purposes they have got rid of the party conference as a policy-making body and replaced it with the national policy forum. This might be potentially a very good idea, except that it is a complete fix and filled with people who are very close to the leadership.' Editorial comment: complete the conversion, Tony, and join CLPD.

BLAIR MUST GO

(continued from page 1)

"had not been substantively addressed in the reports of either the National Policy Forum or the NEC, or had arisen since the publication of those reports". The rule changes were rail-roaded through conference during the euphoria which followed Labour's 1997 landslide. Delegates were swayed by the argument that, in the past, conference agendas, based primarily on resolutions from constituencies and unions, had led to disunity and harmful publicity. Horror stories as to what the party was like in the 70s and 80s, were spread by New Labourites and avidly taken up by the media. The new rules mean that annual conference has lost its function as Labour's supreme policy-making body and has become a transparently stage-managed event. The National Policy Forum which supposedly took over the function of formulating party policies, is an unrepresentative body strictly controlled by the government.

Does all this mean there is no way out for the Party? Not if members face up to two immediate problems.

Changing policies

One is that, for Labour's renewal to be credible, it must involve a break with policies which have lost the party so much support. In foreign

affairs, it means that Britain must distance itself from policies which seek to bring about regime changes by military intervention, as in Afghanistan, Iraq and now Lebanon. In domestic policies it means both ending the partial privatization of the Welfare state and the state sector generally, and not accepting the introduction into them of methods which imitate market forces (e.g. league tables). Within the Labour Party, it means the renewal of internal party democracy to give more say to members in determining policies and in ensuring the accountability of the leadership.

Changing the leadership

The other problem is what to do about a leader who has become a liability. The Labour Party constitution provides procedures by which a leader who has outstayed his or her welcome can be removed relatively painlessly through the mechanisms of Labour's Electoral College. All that is necessary is for twenty per cent of Labour MPs to nominate an alternative candidate and for the annual conference to give its consent to set the election in motion. The problem is not Tony Blair but the 'rebel' MPs. They keep whingeing about the Prime Minister but are reluctant to get rid of him. They are unable to agree on an alternative candidate or even to start the process by supporting a "stalking horse". Some think that forcing a challenge is unnecessary as they have supposedly received unofficial assurances that Blair will resign sooner rather than later. Others fear that a rival nominee might be elected and prefer to muse about hypothetical future contests rather than concentrate on the here and

RED ALERT! KEY RULE CHANGES IN MANCHESTER

● SUPPORT ERITH AND THAMESMEAD AND WESTON-SUPER MARE RULE CHANGE TO SECURE A LEADERSHIP ELECTION

Given the Labour Government's present negative public profile, it is now vital that the Party moves towards an early change of leader to give the new leader time to re-establish our position. Members need to understand the established mechanisms within the Party for achieving this. Nomination forms for Party leader should go to MPs every year but for the last five years, head office has failed to issue them. At least one MP has requested these papers three times but had no reply. It needs many more MPs to make this demand. CLPD is circulating four model rule changes on improving the procedures for leadership elections but one is already on this year's conference Agenda. The rule change proposed by Erith and Thamesmead and Weston SM insists that nomination papers be issued in accordance with the rules. All delegates should be mandated to support this rule change, which the NEC will oppose. The NEC argues that the nomination procedure can be initiated at any time at the request of MPs, but there should be no need for MPs to ask: an automatic and mandatory procedure should be in place. Moreover, CLPs and Unions should have the right to put a leadership election on the Conference agenda themselves. CLPD is proposing precisely such a rule change this year for debate next year.

● SUPPORT BEVERLEY AND HOLDERNESS ON IMPARTIALITY

This constitutional amendment will make it a disciplinary offence, possibly leading to dismissal, if party employees interfere in Labour's internal elections. We know it happens and it has to stop. The NEC will oppose this as an unwarranted intrusion into the employer/employee relationship for which the General Secretary holds responsibility and it is thus not a matter for the rulebook. They also argue that the present Code of Conduct is an adequate safeguard. This is simply not the case in reality and the amendment must be supported in order to put an end to partisan corrupt practices.

NB: THE RULE CHANGES WILL BE TIMETABLED FOR LATE ON **MONDAY** AFTERNOON

BLAIR MUST GO

now. Such reasons however are rationalizations of the fact that they are running scared. Their inaction means that a vital lesson – that if leaders are not accountable they will be removed – will never be learnt. But only by decisive action will we drive home the message that if leaders are not accountable they will be removed. Without this, Blair's successor, whoever he or she is, will merely be encouraged to continue with the present leader's autocratic practices.

Conflating members with donors

The immediate problem is that too many party members, including MPs and leading trade unionists are still blissfully unaware of the seriousness of the party's situation. Over-impressed by Blair's two landslide victories (Labour under Attlee, and Wilson in 1966, received much higher proportions of the vote) they appear oblivious of the urgent need to change course. The threat is not just of a possible electoral setback. If the Tories win next time, they will seek to complete Blair's undermining of the unions' role in the party. They plan to limit all donations by capping them to an annual £50,000 under the pretext of ending the scandal of funding political parties by millionaires. Ignoring Labour's constitution, the Tories would not treat the affiliated trade unions as an integral part of the Party. Instead they would regard the unions' affiliation fees as "donations", and therefore subject to capping. In practice this would reduce the trade union financial contribution to the Labour Party, presently about two-thirds of its income, to about one tenth of it.

Unfortunately the Tories are not the only ones who ignore Labour's constitution and regard affiliation fees as donations. Such an incorrect definition of membership subscriptions/affiliations as "donations" has been "legitimized" in the Political Parties, Elections & Referendum Act 2000, introduced by the Blair government (Part IV, Section 50(2)(c)) which is now the law.

One of the government's first priorities in the next parliamentary session therefore should be to amend the 2000 Act to prevent its possible misuse. If the Tory "modernization" of the rules governing the finance of parties were to be enacted, this would bankrupt the Labour Party.

Towards a partyless regime?

The prospect of Labour's financial crisis, however, is not the only danger. Unions' affiliated membership is both a financial and political link. Political influence of the unions is in-

(continued page 4)

TRADE UNION POLITICAL FUNDS ARE DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

With the question of state funding a major issue at this Conference, there is likely to be much discussion of the threat of capping TU affiliations and donations. CLPD is committed to opposing capping of affiliations by treating them as donations and we are all too aware that Labour Government (sic) legislation in the form of the Political Parties Election & Referendum Act 2000 readily facilitates this classification (cf. lead article on this). We also understand that at a private meeting, discussing state funding, no10 floated the old idea of trade unionists having to 'opt in' to the political levy, rather than 'opting out' as has been the case since 1946. The Blairite New Politics Network has also called for 'opting in'. We asked former Labour Party General Secretary and CLPD supporter Jim Mortimer to give us a historical overview of the fight by the unions for the right to have their own political funds and of the poisonous hostility they faced from the establishment. Here are Jim's main points:

- The law relating to trade union political funds was first established by statute in the 1913 Trade Union Act. This act reversed a Law Lords' decision of 1910 in the Osborne Case to the effect that the definition of a trade union in earlier statutes did not authorise expenditure for political purposes or parliamentary representation.
- The 1913 Act enabled unions to include in their constitutions the funding of any lawful purposes in pursuit of their objectives for their members. These objectives concerned all aspects of what we would now call industrial relations.
- The Act also made special rules for the adoption of political objectives, including the holding of a ballot, open

to all members, on the creation of a political fund. If a fund was created, any member had the right to 'contract out' of contributing.

- In 1927, after the General Strike of 1926, the Conservative Government introduced a raft of anti-union measures: certain strikes were declared illegal as were actions considered to constitute intimidation and 'opting in' was established. This greatly reduced the number of trade union affiliated members.
- The 1945 Labour Government quickly swept away the 1927 restrictions in the Trade Disputes and Trades Unions Act of 1946 and re-introduced 'opting out' rather than 'opting in'.
- Between 1971 and today, especially under Conservative Governments, there has been much restrictive legislation against trade unions. Labour restored and extended trade union rights from 1974-79 but since 1997, with the return of New Labour, whilst some improvements have been made, many of the worst features of the Conservative changes remain
- Trade union political funds provide one of the best examples of voluntary participation in democracy. In the pursuit of their objectives, unions are free to use the funds from modest contributions from their members. Most, but not all unions, with political funds are affiliated to the Labour Party and such affiliations provide the Party with a bed-rock of support from working people. This gives the Party its distinctive characteristics and a potentiality for social progress.

- And, for the record, in 2004-5 the number of union members contributing was 4,257,903 generating £17,221,228, from an average yearly contribution per member of slightly more than £4.

NO NORTH SOUTH-DIVIDE

BY PETER WILLSMAN

At the June NEC, Tony Blair tried to suggest that there was a north-south divide in the May local election results and that we had lost votes in the south. The sub-text here was that we needed to be even more New Labour to win these voters back. Unfortunately for Blair, this amazing thesis was instantly shafted by Greg Cook, the Party's number cruncher. He admitted that the results were poor but said the Tories had done well in some northern areas and that the London results were as expected, given that 2002, when London seats were last fought, had been a much better year for Labour than 2004 when the northern cities had their elections. In other words there was no north-south divide. I whispered to Greg that he would soon be out of a job if he continued to contradict his leader in this way.

PETER WILLSMAN REPORTS

● Report of National Policy Forum (30 June and 1 July 2006)

Funding of Political Parties

Jack Straw, who is the minister responsible for drafting any new legislation on this issue, made a detailed presentation. He reported that since 1980 the overall election spending by political parties has increased by some 3 times in real terms. In the past the Tories had always opposed caps on donations, but they have recently reversed that position and are now calling for legislation that would effectively destroy the link between our Party and the Trade Unions. In the 1990's the Neill Committee looked at caps on individual donations, but rejected the idea on the grounds that they could easily be evaded.

Jack argued that the way forward is for caps on expenditure that would apply at

all times, not just at elections. He said we should challenge the Tories on this and regain the moral high ground.

Both Jack Straw and Ian McCartney warned that the Tories are trying to build a wider alliance against the Labour Party and the Unions, involving the Lib Dems and organisations like the Power Commission and the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR). Indeed, Andrew Tyrie, the Tory spokesman, writing in the Guardian, referred approvingly to a pamphlet written by Matthew Taylor, the then head of IPPR, which called for the capping of trade union donations. Tyrie pointed out that, "Taylor argued for pretty much what David Cameron is now proposing". Taylor is now Tony Blair's chief policy adviser. Well-placed sources report that Taylor continues to press the IPPR line.

CLPD's Briefing, Funding our Party, is at www.clpd.org.uk

BLAIR MUST GO

(continued from page 3)

stitutionalized in the Labour party structure through the unions' substantial representation on all Labour's ruling bodies and above all at Labour's annual conference. This is a partial guarantee that the party's parliamentary leadership does not stray too far from the interests of the working class mass organizations to which it owes its existence. The proposal to treat affiliation fees as donations would disenfranchise Labour's affiliated mass membership and cut the last link that binds the party to the trade unions and the working class.

The scandal of peerages for money revived the calls for state funding. It is no surprise that both Labour and Tory leaderships are now seeking agreement on how to introduce it. Political independence at taxpayers' expense is a proposition which has obvious attractions for parliamentary pseudo-elites. It would finally rid them of accountability to their political parties. This is particularly true of the top echelons of the Parliamentary Labour Party because of the political weight given to Labour's party in the country – its complex and extensive extra-parliamentary organization. As the difference between the parties based on antagonistic class interests is

disappearing, and the difference between the Tories and Labour is turning into just two different forms of managing capitalism the need for an extra-parliamentary Labour body to act as a check on Labour's parliamentarians is also fading. With parties as we know them becoming superfluous, the door is wide open to the prospect of the domination of the political sphere by unaccountable parliamentary 'elites' subsidized by a partyless state.

Time is running out

With Labour's domestic policy increasingly permeated by creeping privatization, foreign policy slavishly following a US obscurantist ideology, and the threat to the very existence of the Labour Party arising from the systematic undermining of the political role of the unions, of the party's financial independence and of its internal democratic structure, there is indeed a need to debate the party's renewal. But no renewal is possible so long as Tony Blair remains party leader. He has been too closely associated with the very policies which must be reversed if the party is to survive. Yet neither "rebel" MPs nor the trade union leaders are prepared to make certain that the leadership issue is debated at conference. Only rank and file members' pressure can force it onto the agenda. Prior to 1997 CLPs or un-

ions could have submitted resolutions on the subject. This possibility no longer exists. However they are still able to submit resolutions relating to events which occur after the publication of the NEC and National Policy Forum reports (July 31) which require urgent consideration. In 2003 and 2004 "emergency motions" demanding a debate on changing the leadership were ruled out of order on the grounds that they were "unconstitutional". Yet it seems absurd that conference which has the right to deny MPs' request for a leadership election (rule 4B.2d (ii)) should not have the right to express an opinion when it deems such an election desirable. If motions demanding an early leadership election were submitted by a large number of CLPs and affiliated organizations, the Conference Arrangements Committee may find it difficult to rule them out. CLPD will be sending out a draft motion to CLPs and unions for consideration as their "contemporary" motion to this year's Conference. It will be worded in a way that meets existing strict constitutional requirements to prevent them from being ruled out on a technicality.

SUPPORT THE CONTEMPORARY MOTION FOR A LEADERSHIP ELECTION

First year Consultation Document

The NPF discussed and agreed this Document. It is divided into six chapters reflecting the work of the six policy commissions (Prosperity and Work; Health; Crime, Justice, Citizenship and Equalities; Sustainable Communities; Education and Skills; Britain in the World). NPF members had the opportunity to raise issues with ministers in workshops and agree changes to the wording of the Document. Detailed notes of the discussions at the workshops were subsequently sent to all members of the NPF.

● Report of NEC (18 July 2006)

Middle East Crisis

Tony Blair said the current situation is the most dangerous for decades. He believed that dialogue was possible only after hostilities had ceased and there was a stabilisation force in South Lebanon. Some NEC members gave personal accounts of visits to the region and of the unjust way the Palestinians have been treated. It was pointed out that shelling civilians was a disproportionate response. Tony Blair argued that Hizbullah, backed by Iran and Syria, had started this cycle of violence. He analysed the crisis more generally as a struggle between “modernisers”, whose aims included multi-party elections and votes for women and on the other side “extremists”.

In response to a question from Mohammed Azam, he extended this analysis to Kashmir, arguing that the Pakistan dictator, President Musharraf, wanted to return to democracy, but that terrorist groups were

derailing any move forward. Tony Blair did not explain an apparent contradiction to his general analysis, namely that Hamas and the Iranian President came to power through democratic multi-party elections.

Funding of Political Parties

Peter Willsman asked whether there is any truth in the reports that officials from No. 10 have been discussing party funding with the Tories. Tony Blair gave an undertaking that on this issue he will work closely with the NEC's elected officers.

Party's financial position and membership

The party's annual accounts for 2005 show an annual operating deficit of £14.5m. Since the year end the Party has agreed overdraft and long term facilities with its bankers, the Co-op Bank and Unity Trust Bank, totalling £13.5m.

The accounts show that at the end of December 2005 party membership was 198,026.

Other Matters

Concern was expressed that the PLP had amended its Standing Orders to include further disciplinary powers for the Chief Whip. It was felt that this should have been considered by the NEC. The issue will be an agenda item at the September NEC.

Peter Willsman and Ann Black submitted a resolution to the NEC objecting to the 184.4% increase in the cost of Annual Conference visitor passes for unwaged members (up from £29 to £82.25). It was agreed that all CLPs will be written to and refunds made available.

RECORD BREAKING SUCCESS FOR GRASSROOTS 4

This year's elections for the six NEC CLP seats were the best ever results for the Centre-Left Grassroots Alliance. The top four places were won by CLGA candidates (Ann Black, Christine Shawcroft, Peter Willsman, (Walter Wolfgang). And the runner up was Mohammed Azam, also Grassroots Alliance. All CLPS will receive NEC reports (go to www.clpd.org.uk).

RED ALERT

At the 2007 Conference, there will be elections for the 55 seats on the National Policy Forum and the 2 Constituency seats on the Conference Arrangements Committee. Watch this space.

The General Secretary has created 4 new senior officer positions at Head Office. They will have responsibility for working strategically with the regions. Regional Offices are likely to be slimmed down.

Full reports of NEC meetings are available at www.clpd.org.uk

THE JOYS OF COMPOSITING: ITS DO'S AND DON'TS

The semantically named Steve Battlemuch, delegate from Nottingham South CLP, was involved last year in a compositing meeting in support of his constituency's contemporary motion for a universal state pension index-linked to average earnings and for public sector pensions to have 'no changes without agreement being reached with the relevant TU's'. Steve wrote an admonitory article on his compositing experiences which we summarise here:

- Do make sure you read ALL the motions to be composited and look for wrecking motions from pro-leadership constituencies and affiliates. These give every appearance of coming from

LP HQ and in the case of our motion could be detected from words such as 'isn't pensioner credit great' and 'the public sector unions need to get real'.

- Do prepare for a long night: our meeting started at just after 6.0pm and concluded at 12.45 am with a two hour adjournment for consultations.

- Do expect to find a draft composite 'helpfully' prepared by an LP policy officer in consultation with some delegates but not with any anti-government ones.

- Don't expect to see the above before the meeting or know anything about it. Even the GMB had not seen the draft presented to us.

- Do expect to see pro-government types trying to dominate the debate and trying to exclude progressive CLP speakers, especially from addressing Conference by seconding the motion.

- Don't take anything for granted. Only two of the six progressive CLPs submitting the same motion as us stayed the course — Nottingham South and the Isle of Wight.

- Do enjoy securing the support of the majority at Conference despite all the difficulties.

- Don't expect under New Labour the government to support Party policy as agreed at Conference.

FUNDING OUR PARTY: WHAT WE SAY

YES TO EXPENDITURE CAPS

Capping Party expenditure would make elections more democratic by reducing the wide variations in parties' spending on election material. The £15 million national limit for general elections, suggested by the Electoral Commission, would make elections fairer.

NO TO EXTENSION OF STATE FUNDING

State funding is unpopular with voters and it reduces the democratic accountability of political parties

NO TO CAPPING OF TU AFFILIATIONS

Capping TU affiliations would lead to the end of the Labour Party as we know it. Restricting TU affiliations would reduce union involvement in the Party and destroy the democratic and participatory dimensions of union political funds.

NO TO THE POLITICAL PARTIES, ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUM ACT 2000

This Act, which classes union affiliations as donations, is potentially massively damaging to the Labour Party and movement. It should never have been passed and must now be amended immediately.

Meacher's Window Vision

Ray Davison reviews Michael Meacher's *The Politics of Conviction, a Catalyst Working Paper, The Catalyst Forum, 2006, pp. (iv)-46. £5.*

Michael Meacher straddles the decades from 1970 when he first won Oldham and, like David, the French painter of the revolutionary years, he is a survivor and keeps his head. On the evidence of this pamphlet, it is a head well worth keeping. After the multitudinous mountains of New Labour policy documents, where the classical art of saying the least to mean the most has been put into reverse and we prospect wearily for significance in a sierra madre of verbiage, it is a pleasure to read a text where concision, analytical acuity and astute political judgement blend impressively. This head perceives a window of opportunity as it surveys, like a modern Descartes doing a second meditation, the present state of the world and international power relations. But it is more than a window of opportunity – it is a vision. The sub-title of this paper is 'Vision of a Socialist or Social Democratic Society. The telescoping of socialist and social democratic is of interest. There is

no conflict between them for Meacher, as some might anticipate, for example those who would prefer democratic socialist to social democratic. Meacher's window vision defines a political space wide enough to build a consensual and pragmatic politics among left radicals and the now disenchanted Blairites of yore. Meacher argues that the political centre of gravity, now entrenched on the right, with its neo-liberal economic policies driving privatisation, deregulation and vast inequalities of wage and wealth, is about to shift. The contours of international power will be re-configured as American dominance is challenged by the growing strength of China, Russia, India and Brazil. Environmental factors (which figure prominently in the argument) will create unavoidable and extreme challenges for laissez-faire capitalism and 'we thus face irrevocably an era of fundamental change.' Meacher wants us to seize this historical moment and his programme for change will be sweet music to many left ears. Domestically, his policies are redistributive, anti-privatisation and demand a strengthened public sector. He looks to Sweden for his economic model. There is a strong anti-authoritarian and anti-Leviathan element to his thought and he calls for the abolition of the royal prerogative, increased civil rights and indeed for the restoration of the sovereignty of Labour's Conference. Internationally, our subordination to America must end and the post-1945 IMF/World Bank /WTO settlement must be redrawn. This short review cannot do full justice to a paper which is a really well thought-out and convincing contribution to present political debate. It places Meacher at the centre of attention.

Support Socialist Campaign Group News and the Socialist Campaign Group of Labour MPs
Go to www.scgn.org.uk

KEY VOTES FOR DELEGATES
National Constitutional Committee
VOTE FOR RAY DAVISON, EAST DEVON CLP
Conference Arrangements Committee
VOTE FOR JOHN BOUGHTON, TGWU
CLPs are urged to mandate their delegates to support Ray and John.

JOIN CLPD

To join the Campaign for Labour Party Democracy please fill in the form below and return with a cheque payable to CLPD to: CLPD Secretary, 10 Park Drive, London NW11 7SH.

I/we enclose £..... subscriptions/renewal/donation

Name

Address

Post Code

Phone Email.....

CLP..... Region

TU..... Date

Annual rates: £15 individuals; £5 unwaged and low waged (under £8,000); £20 couples (£6 unwaged and low waged); £25 national & regional organisations; £15 CLPs, TUs and Co-op Parties; £5 CLP branches.