

to employ fair-haired or brown-eyed workers for the same reason?); a landlady who once had an Irish lodger who was a drunkard, or a coloured lodger who took a prostitute to his room may vow to take no more Irish or coloured lodgers, when what she really wants is no more drunken lodgers or lodgers who entertain prostitutes; and any of us may declare a belief, say, that Britain should have coloured policemen, when what we mean to advocate is that an individual who is qualified to be a policeman should not be disbarred for irrelevant reasons of which skin colour is only one. The outstanding illustration is (to put it in its traditional form), that of a father who would object to his daughter's marrying a black man. But if his daughter does wish to marry a black man it is not because he is black but because he is John Smith, whom she loves, and if the father is to pronounce on the worthiness of potential husbands for his daughter it is not "a black man" but John Smith whom he must meet and judge.

There are no doubt many ways in which immigrants can be given a warmer welcome, and it is to be hoped that there will be plenty of new suggestions for specific measures of integration or education which can be considered and discussed. The burden of trying to ease the process of integration falls largely on those splendid bodies the voluntary liaison committees, whose members are the people on the spot and are in close touch with immigrants and can offer the advice and help most needed. These voluntary committees, together with the National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants, should be broadened to deal with aliens too, so that the problems of all kinds of immigrant can be properly tackled.

The first target should be the rootlessness of an immigrant on arrival. The provision of hostels to accommodate newly arrived immigrants for a short period would give those immigrants a chance to choose where they wanted to settle, and reduce the sense of urgency for putting a roof over their heads that now drives many of them straight into districts where people of their race already live. When they do settle, courses in the English language and English customs should be readily available for them. It is essential that immigrants are allowed to bring their families with them to lessen the feeling of isolation—as with free immigration they would be able to do—and they must be greeted with hospitality by the local community in which they take up residence and not be regarded as intruders. An immigrant should be received into a local organisation which is itself multi-racial, for if he feels obliged to run always to his former fellow-countrymen for social consolation, racial separatism and antagonism are bound to increase. When an immigrant encounters unfair discrimination he should talk about it to the members of the committee or other organisation to which he belongs and in particular to its native members. It must be emphasised that it is not the immigrant who is the outcast but the bigoted native; that

the immigrant is in alliance with enlightened natives in a crusade against race and colour prejudice.

Many more people in this country are prejudiced than will admit it, and because it is founded on irrational fear, it will not be cured by official condemnation but only by more contact between people as individuals and families. The Englishman who has a black friend will never again throw stones at "niggers." The black man made welcome is unlikely to heed an extremist call for black supremacy.

BOGUS PATRIOTISM

from an article by Andrew Alexander
in *The Daily Telegraph*

IT IS NOT NEW, of course, for governments to try to solve economic problems by a sort of secular prayer meeting. Once people laughed at the early Bolsheviks' continual exhortation to workers to overfulfil norms and indulge in all manner of Stakhanovite excesses. But in the past few years this has become the vogue in Britain, too.

The latest nonsense is "Quality and Reliability Year." The British poster industry has donated spaces to bills which idiotically demand of passers-by: "What are you doing about Quality and Reliability Year?"

What has got into the country that it is turning more and more to slogans and appeals to bogus patriotism? . . .

Seen calmly, it is absurd, is it not, that a government should urge businessmen to be efficient? That it should urge employees to step up their output? It is not usually necessary to ask dogs to bark or cats to mew. In a properly run economy it will *pay* to be efficient, *pay* to work hard. Inefficiency or idleness should be too costly to the individuals concerned. If these conditions do not prevail in the British economy then the fault lies with the government. It alone controls the whole paraphernalia of taxes and levies that should provide incentives to achievement and penalties for incompetence.

If our Victorian ancestors were to observe the contemporary scene, they would view proceedings with disbelief. Urge businessmen to be efficient? Surely that is equivalent to urging them to make more profits? Surely, they would say, human nature has not changed so much since our time that people have to be *asked* to do that. Human nature has not, of course, changed. The tax structure has . . .

What am I, a humble private soldier in this battle, doing about Quality and Reliability Year? Nothing personally, nor do I intend to. If my work declines in quality or reliability, regardless of any national campaign, I shall be demoted or sacked. If I improve in both I shall (I trust) get more pay. If tax takes so much that extra effort in these matters is not worthwhile, that is the government's fault, not mine. And if I take pride in my work, it is a personal, not a patriotic matter.