secure and the poor and insecure.

One fertile area of engagement is the emergence of what is labelled the 'precariat'. These include wide range of people whose employment is based on precarious terms: those working on ‘zero hours’ contracts; casual workers, often working with no legal recognition and thus unregulated employment; recurring temporary and fixed term work, those doing home based or telecommuting work at piece-meal rates and those forced to be self-employed, in order to lighten the burden of employment rights on business; those in minimum wage employment that is demonstrably lower than a ‘living wage’; those in work with no possible skills development and progression and therefore disposable at any time. These forms of work have become legitimised by claims that global competition and lower labour costs elsewhere, technological development and changing flexibilities in employment require more flexible employees.

**Jobs**

Whilst it is difficult to get a sense of what volumes of workers we are describing, The English Business Survey reported in 2013 that one in ten of the UK’s entire private sector workforce, some 2.3 million people - were in precarious employment (interestingly, the survey was discontinued in 2014). A TUC Labour Market Report at the end of 2014 put the figure at one in twelve and noted only one in forty new jobs were full time, whilst 60% of advertised jobs were self-employed and 36% part-time. It reported over a million zero hours contract workers - 3.1 of the UK Workforce, with less than half (44%) lasting for two years.

This is one constituency that is woefully neglected in contemporary political debate. It is an exemplar of class relations, where people are reduced to disposable assets. This is a constituency waiting to be mobilised and recognised, and to be brought back into politics, and at the core of Labour’s strategy should be that, rather than simply trying to fight the Conservatives over a hostile middle class whose interests are entrenched in the status quo (though they can also be drawn in on some of the other political agendas for Labour).

C Wright Mills famously set the agenda for a sociological imagination as dispelling anxiety and indifference and making the connections between personal troubles and public issues. That should be the mantra for Labour over the next five years, and Jeremy Corbyn is the only leadership candidate who appears to represent that prospect.

---

**OUR HISTORY**

**Eden and Cedar Paul - Creative Revolution (1920)**

Eden Paul was the son of the publisher Charles Kegan Paul. He was a medical student who assisted Beatrice Webb and Charles Booth in their social studies of East London before becoming a war correspondent for The Times in the Sino-Japanese war of 1895. He practiced medicine in the Far East before returning to England. He was a member of the ILP and worked for the French Socialist Party before joining the Communist Party. Cedar Paul, Eden Paul’s second wife was born Gertrude Davenport, daughter of a composer, and studied music. She joined the Independent Labour Party (ILP) in 1912 and was secretary of the British section of the Women’s International Council of Socialist and Labour Organisations from 1912 to 1919. Marrying Eden Paul in 1915, the couple translated over 130 works by French, German, Russian and Italian writers, including works by Marx, Hilferding, Michels, Stalin and Plekhanov. Cedar Paul also joined the Communist Party and was on the committee of the Plebs League. They published a Creative Revolution in 1920, subtitled A Study of Communist Ergatocracy. They coined the word ‘ergatocracy’ to replace the more commonly used ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’. In 1921, they published Proletcult, which was a study of proletarian education and culture in Britain, France, Germany and Russia.

“In the theoretical field, we wish to affect an analysis of socialist trends and to attempt a synthesis of contemporary proletarian aims. In the sphere of practice, we hope to intensify and to liberate the impulse towards fresh cre-ative effort.

“Socialism… has threefold roots in the three spheres into which, for convenience, the human psyche has been artificially divided. Intellectually, socialism is a criticism of the existing order; emotionally and in the realm of art it is the feeling that we can replace that order by a better, by an order that shapes itself in the imagination of the result of our intellectual criticism of capitalism; volitionally, or in the realm of will, it is an endeavour to create in the world of objective fact what we have already conceived in the intellectual and artistic imagination. It is an endeavour to overthrow the capitalist order, that latest and most finished form of ownership rule, and to replace it by the rule, or better by the administration, of the workers. It is an attempt to put an end to exploitation, to the use of man or woman, as a mere means to another’s ends.

“We return to the idea that the revolution is a transcendent creative act, wherein man’s will, guided by the accumulated knowledge, asserts its freedom, widening the bounds of freedom alike for the individual and for the race…Human freedom is, with all its inevitable limitations, precisely one of those phenomena wherein is displayed the triumph of life over material causation. …The will to revolution is for us the real cause of the creative revolution now in progress, a revolution that will signalise an enormous advance in man’s movement towards freedom. If this be no more than poetry, we say with the poet: Yet freedom, yet thy banner, torn bat flying, streams like the thunderstorm AGAINST THE WIND.”