Dear Comrade,
You call yourself a Gaitskellite. You have rather enjoyed the tea-party intrigues of the Campaign for Democratic Socialism and you have been flattered by the suggestion that you are a hard-headed realist and not one of those impractical utopians of the Left. You are perhaps slightly disappointed to find that those who denounced Trotskyism among your friends had never actually read Trotsky and you may even have wondered why your friends campaign so much more assiduously against the Left than they do against the Tories. But now an issue has come up which ought to worry you even more. For you claim to be a democrat, and all around you in the Young Socialists a campaign is going or directed towards proscriptions and expulsions. The despicable untruths about Communist infiltration into CND have no doubt made you uneasy. But you have probably felt happier about the proscription of INDEC,\(^1\) which proposes to run candidates against the Labour Party at elections. Certainly this makes proscription unavoidable. But the question I want you to answer is: who made INDEC or something like it inevitable?

---

\(^1\) Originally published in *Socialist Review*, First Series, June 1962, pp. 1, 7.

\(^2\) Independent Nuclear Disarmament Election Committee.
First of all, take note that the announcement that an independent committee to promote the intervention of unilateralist candidates in parliamentary elections had been formed was greeted by the more Pecksniffian members of Transport House and the Right with public horror and private glee. Surely they had now found an excuse for proscribing at least selected members of CND! It is perhaps worth asking not only you but also those more Gadarene members of the Labour Party as they rush towards disaster to pause and ask who is responsible for the birth of INDEC? The answer is clear: it is Mr. Gaitskell and his friends. For if, at a time of crisis for the Labour Party, Labour supporters are prepared to split the Labour vote in the interests of getting the unilateralist case heard, it is precisely because of Mr. Gaitskell’s determination to have his private way in the party, not by answering the unilateralist case, but by preventing it being put, insofar as he can prevent that. For Mr. Gaitskell has openly declared himself against argument: ‘I have always said that the one thing that prevented the Labour Party getting into power and staying in power was our inherent tendency to argue.’

The case against the possession of the H-bomb by any government whose policies we can affect does not rest upon any of the three positions to which Mr. Gaitskell is presumably alluding when he tries to smear his opponents by calling them pacifists, neutralists and fellow-travellers or even Communists. Very few unilateralists in the country are pacifists. The support for pacifism is tiny compared with the support for CND. Again, only a handful of supporters of CND are neutralists (Lord Russell dealt with neutralism in the best possible way by inviting those neutral governments who have proclaimed themselves unconditionally against testing to send their navies into the area of Christmas Island tests and so prevent them – nobody responded at all. But the moral is not just that neutralism is a political non-starter! it is that it was only from Russell’s position that it could possibly be exposed in this way). But, of course, the allusions to neutralism and pacifism are only window dressing for the great CP smear. On this count, either Mr. Gaitskell is ignorant or a liar. The Communist Party is not unilateralist: it could not possibly support the policy resolution passed at the CND Annual Conference in 1961, demanding the unilateral renunciation of the H-Bomb by every government which possessed it. Moreover the Communist Party on this whole issue is fundamentally in the

---

3 The Guardian, 7 May 1962.