

THE

WEEKLY

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS

Christmas, 1964. **9d.**
Vol. 2. No. 23/24.
Double issue.

Editors: Robin Blackburn and Ken Coates.

CONTENTS

PAGE	1	Editorial notes: Christmas thoughts.
PAGE	2	Incomes policy discussion: Real wages must go up says secretary of POEU. Wage drift idea "Erroneous" - Garment workers' chief.
PAGE	3	Trade union notes: New Left campaigner is new Scottish miners' leader. Metalworkers International reviews world economic situation.
PAGE	4	Editorial statement: "Intent" to do what?
PAGE	5	Economic notes: <u>Financial Times</u> predicts rising unemployment in 1965. Jute Industries' "good year."
PAGE	6	Political notes: No more money for Public Loans Board? Swiss bankers attack steel nationalisation proposal.
PAGE	7	Industrial notes: Who hires, fires and promotes in the pits?
PAGE	8	Political notes: Unions to be controlled in Zambia. Callaghan raps editor of <u>Investors Chronicle</u> .
PAGE	9	European notes: More students arrested in Lisbon. Lockouts in Spanish factories.
PAGE	10	U.s. Notes: American students battle for freedom of speech.
PAGE	11	U.S. Notes: " " " " " " Strikes hit Eastern seaboard.
PAGE	12	Third World revolution: Che Guevara advocates revolutionary way on American T.V. Call for liberation struggle in French Somaliland.
PAGE	13	Political notes: Wilson and Washington.
PAGE	14	" " " " "
PAGE	15	" " " " "
PAGE	16	" " " " "
PAGE	17	" " " " "
PAGE	18	CAMPAIGN NOTES: Anti-Apartheid launches a new journal.

EDITORS' LETTER: We have received a number of orders for extra copies of next week's "Education Special", including one from the recently organised readers' group in Birmingham. Please drop us a card immediately after you have recovered from Xmas if you want extra copies. It helps to know in advance.

Published by The Week, 54, Park Rd., Nottm. Subscription rates on request.

CHRISTMAS THOUGHTS.

Unreservedly we wish all our readers a happy Christmas. There are two reasons why we do not need to apologize for doing so. First, our readers, like millions of others, have earned a holiday, and only niggardly Calvinists would begrudge them their Saturnalia. Second, in a certain sense, when one strips away the commerce, the piety, and the tinsel, it is all dimly in honour of an old revolutionary hero. Few of the parsons will remember what many of our readers will recall, that all this rather silly guff has, buried under it, at its centre, a legend about a notorious political criminal, anti-imperialist, blasphemer and rebel. The celebrations can be relied upon to be secular, convivial, uninterrupted by theological lucubrations. Into the general succession of binges we do not wish to force our way with any kill-joy note of duty: but between them we would like to press certain claims of conscience.

All socialists should take some time at this particular season to think of some present day victims of imperialism, capitalism, repression and fascism. There are thousands whose names we would like to mention: but some can be taken as typical, and we are sure we will not be misunderstood if we choose them as representatives. First, in South Africa, there are Nelson Mandela and his colleagues, Jonathan Sobutwe, and Neville Alexander and his friends. Now they have been joined by Alex Kitson, a member of our own Draughtsmen's Union, and victim of the 'Little Rivonia' trial. We have written at length during the year about all these cases: now we salute brave men whose liberation is our sworn aim. Secondly, in Nigeria, there is Vic Allen and his Nigerian co-prisoners, viciously rail-roaded into prison by a directionless and hopeless neo-colonialism. Then, in Spain, there are the innumerable victims of Franco. We will be excused if we single out one, the young anarchist Stuart Christie. Carrying an atrocious sentence, Christie is accused of wishing to place bombs under Spanish fascism. The bizarre and disgusting absurdity of such a charge, when levelled by an arch-bomber, assassin of a whole generation of Spanish democrats, partner of Hitler and Mussolini, and architect of Guernica, would only need pointing out in a world whose memory had been abolished. To all these comrades we send our warm fraternal greetings. We hope our readers will write to them, sending messages of encouragement and pledges of assistance. We also hope that the campaigns for their release will be stepped up to a pitch of frenzy in the coming months, and that they will soon be back among us, helping once again in the struggle which has made them its temporary hostages.

Yet not all the fighters on our side are in prison. Through incredible costs of blood and endurance, the new world is carving its emergence. Our salute to the guerillas of Vietnam, of Congo, of Angola, of Guinea, of Venezuela, who are battling to be free! Our warmest greetings to the freedom-fighters of the USA, who in the Mississippi heartland of the past order of things are speaking, and dying, for us! To the socialists and trade unionists of the advanced European countries, our unstinted goodwill! We shall form unbreakable links with all of you, to put a speedy end to the straightening world of capitalism which is bracketed down upon all our backs! And to the workers of the Soviet Union, China, and the other countries of the communist bloc, our fraternal solidarity! In particular, to those who fight for socialist humanism, for the democratic regeneration of socialism, we send our deepest brotherly acclaim!

REAL WAGES MUST GO UP SAYS SECRETARY OF THE POST OFFICE ENGINEERS

Writing in the December issue of the Post Office Engineers' Journal, Charles Smith, the general secretary of that union wrote:

"The new Government is searching for an incomes policy. This we have been told again and again by the Press...To many trade unionists - perhaps particularly in the public service and perhaps particularly in the POEU, in light of past experience - any talk of an incomes policy is calculated to raise qualms. We have had from the previous Government various types of intervention in the field of the determination of incomes...We have had a wage freeze...The Selwyn Lloyd attempt to impose a wage freeze was indeed almost calamitous. Then we had attempts to impose a "guiding light"... This was a more sensible policy; but again it was one imposed from outside. - and the trade union movement has a deep aversion...to policies that are imposed upon it from outside....there is always a danger that the public sector might, during periods when the guiding light was operating, fall somewhat behind the movement of outside wages.

"The new Government clearly intends to avoid the blunders of its predecessors. It has made it quite clear that: any incomes policy must apply to all incomes - to dividends, to rent and to other forms of income as well as to wages; and it proposes to proceed by discussion and agreement with employers and the trade union movement." (Emphasised in the original)

Charles Smith then goes on to outline the familiar arguments for an incomes policy, explaining the reasons the TUC gives for supporting the idea and then deals with the difficulties such a policy faces. He lays down what he considers must be "the right background" for such a policy. These are fair taxation, reasonable social security payments, no discrimination against the public sector, and finally not getting "the incomes part of the economic policy out of perspective." Developing the latter point, Smith says that "Our major need..is not to influence incomes but to raise productivity. He ends by saying: "In all this it is important to start from the point of view that real wages and real living standards ought to be going up steadily. ...These changes have no meaning unless they do lead to higher living standards for the majority of people."

WAGE DRIFT IDEA "ERRONEOUS" - GARMENT WORKERS CHIEF

In his "viewpoint" column in the December issue of the Garment Worker, John E. Newton, general secretary of the National Union of Tailor and Garment Workers, discusses one aspect of the incomes policy which he finds "curious". "A few people" he says, "have discovered that weekly wages in manufacturing industry are composite wages and that the basic rates in relation to earnings are low. This leads some of them to conclude that the difference between wages rates and earnings is wages drift, which is erroneous. A great deal of the earnings in manufacturing industry is directly related to increased production, which helps considerably to reduce the costs of manufacture.....There is a need for more substantive national wages rates to be established through central collective bargaining processes, with the codification of the various systems of payments by results." He then goes on to the role of hire purchase, high rents and mortgage rates which "stimulates demands for levels of earnings". He concludes: "better regulation of this debt" would help to contain inflation. After attacking the way the Tories "tinkered" with the problem, Mr. Newton emphasises that he thinks "attention might be given to the army of 8 million working women who prime the pumps."

NEW LEFT CAMPAIGNER IS NEW SCOTTISH MINERS' LEADER.

We are delighted to report that Lawrence Daly, the Fife Miners' leader, has been elected general secretary of the Scottish Miners' Union. Winning by a handsome majority of more than 8,000, Lawrence came top of an exceptionally high poll getting 20,176 votes against 11,896 for Mr. Gavin Stobbs, agent for South Ayrshire in a 79 per cent poll. Lawrence Daly will take up his post on April 5, the day after Mr. Wood retires. Mr. Wood has held the office since 1956.

A founder of the New Left, Lawrence Daly has been an exceptional influence in the Scottish coalfields for some time. In 1959 he stood for West Fife in the Parliamentary elections on behalf of the Fife Socialist League, a New Left organisation. He polled nearly 5,000 votes, beating the official communist candidate by a wide margin.

METALWORKERS INTERNATIONAL REVIEWS WORLD ECONOMIC SITUATION.

- based on an ICFTU report.

Various resolutions dealing with the trade union point of view on major political, economic and social problems were adopted at the Congress of the International Metalworkers' Federation held from 25 to 28 November 1964 in Vienna. Some 274 delegates from metalworkers' trade union organisations in 35 countries, representing 9.3 million workers, attended the Congress which was chaired by Otto Brenner, president of the German metalworkers' union. Anton Proksch, Austrian minister for social problems, Franz Jonas, Mayor of Vienna, and Anton Benya, president of the Austrian trade union federation OGB, addressed the opening ceremony.

The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions was represented at the Congress by Albert Heyer, director of the ICFTU Geneva office. Walter Schevenels, General Secretary of the ICFTU European Regional Organisation also attended the Congress.

In one of the resolutions, the IMF Congress urged all governments to recognize the principles of trade union freedom, in other words, that workers should have the right to form free, independent and democratic trade unions and that the right to strike be safeguarded. The Congress expressed its solidarity with the Spanish workers struggling for human and trade union rights and condemned the dictatorial regime of General Franco in Spain. The Congress further appealed to all democratic forces in the world to help the Spanish people in its fight for democratic rule in Spain. It also denounced the racial segregation and apartheid policies of the Government of South Africa. Other resolutions dealt with the impact of technical progress and automation on workers' living and working conditions; the shortening of the working week; industrial safety and health insurance; women workers and young workers in the metal industry; trade union education and vocational training. A resolution concerning assistance for trade union movements in developing countries was also adopted.

As The Week went to press last week, George Brown was preening himself over his breakfast, which was obligingly televised in order that the greatness of the day should seep home to all. Mr. Callaghan took a return flight from Paris, and arrived for the event, breathless, as we were running off our last pages. The collating and stapling was under way when, at Lancaster House, the mighty assembled to affix their names to the "Joint Statement of Intent", which marks out leg number one of the Incomes Policy race. The last copies were in the post when we turned on our tellies, to see that genial, chirpy face, grinning all over, announcing in a voice like thick Christmas cake that the class war had now, with the signing of this document, come to an end.

Even the sight of Mr. Maurice Laing and Lord Collison displaying their new truce on either smiling flank of Mr. Brown did not, we must admit, suffice to convince us. Unhappily, we have witnessed a succession of similar announcements in the recent past. Mr. Macmillan made an identical discovery a few months before he fell a prey to the internecine, intra-class battles which subsequently rent the Tory party into wrangling factions. Apart from the fact that this particular treaty has been concluded between a Labour Lord and a Mister from the employers, we do not really think that much has changed since then, except that the crisis of British capital has worsened, and the thorough-going ineptitude of British capitalists to meet it has not relaxed.

Socialists cannot and will not deny that the human problems of our world require vastly augmented productivity for their solution. Our problem is that we also recognize that this productivity is restrained and set back precisely by the confining interests of capital itself. No amount of declarations of intent will alter this. Only deep-going structural reforms, aimed at carving hefty inroads into capitalist power, can lift us out of the vicious stop-go-stop cycle which has now caught even a Labour Government in its grasp. In this connection, Michael Foot's recent analysis in Tribune is entirely accurate: unfortunately, he draws the conclusion that since there exists "no mandate" for such structural reforms, they cannot yet be offered. This won't do at all. There is a mandate for thorough-going improvements in all the social and welfare services. If the bankers clobber these improvements, without any mandate to do so, then we have a mandate to clobber the bankers. And we needn't stop with them.

Meantime, active trade unionists will interpret the new declaration's exhortation "to encourage and lead a sustained attack on the obstacles to efficiency" as a charter to encroach still further and deeper on the so-called 'prerogatives of management'. The inefficiencies of capitalist production cannot possibly be overcome until the workers themselves can bring the full power of their brains, as well as their muscles, to bear on production. This is certainly not going to happen until the incubus of private property is thrown off their backs. Property can't think or work: it can only be used. George Brown really understands this, or otherwise he would exhort the machines and leave the workers alone. But what he doesn't seem to understand is how necessary the workers' inhibitions about productivity are, until the anomaly of the private ownership of social resources is overcome.

If any bridge is needed to enable people to understand this riddle, it can only be the bridge of workers' control, which will allow all the workpeople to face the problems of transition to socialism head-on. The Labour movement needs to urge this demand, strongly, before the powers-that-be get down to phase two of their plans.

'FINANCIAL TIMES' PREDICTS RISING UNEMPLOYMENT IN 1965 from Pat Jordan

The Financial Times of December 18th devoted its second editorial to assessing the significance of the mid-December unemployment figures. Although these registered the lowest December unemployment figures for seven years the paper commented: "there is now the first sign this year that the heavy pressure for labour may be beginning to ease. Between November and December more men were as usual taken on to meet the Christmas build-up in trade but the fall in unemployment was only marginally bigger than would have been expected... This return almost to the seasonal trend stands in marked contrast to what happened during the Autumn. The school-leavers were absorbed by the market unusually fast, and actual rise in unemployment was less than half what might "normally" be expected.. " However, the Financial Times does not lay this at the Government's door; the position, it says, "cannot yet be put down to the decisions of the new Government. If business has become less keen to recruit this is more likely a delayed reaction to the slow growth of industrial activity over the past 12 months."

It goes on: "From now on, however, the Government will have to face the prospect of a rising unemployment rate....the signs are that the shortage of credit, the rephrasing of investment, and the general air of uncertainty may begin to bite on industry fairly soon. This after all is what overseas observers of the British economy are waiting for. There may be a time lag....but it looks fairly certain that the percentage of unemployment will be substantially higher by next autumn than it is now..." The City journal recognises that Labour will find this "politically embarrassing" but doesn't want the Government to be "panicked into rush action". The figures need to be studied. The Financial Times argues that the much of the unemployment is short term and that if Labour's policy of technological development is successful this type of unemployment is bound to increase.

The editorial ends with a plea for the figures "to be studied more coolly than in the past". It notes that there are signs "that the Government, if not all its supporters have accepted this; Mr. Brown is right to press ahead negotiations to provide severance pay for those who become redundant." However, "It is already time for the Government to lay stress on the crucial distinction between short-term and long-term unemployment." The Financial Times does not, of course, find it expedient to say that British big business would welcome some 'easing of the labour market', but it is arguing for Labour to do nothing to stop rising unemployment when it comes. The argument about redundancy or severance payments is an old one: these are designed to take the sharp edge off militant action by the unions to fight unemployment when and where it arises.

JUTE INDUSTRIES' "GOOD YEAR"

by a special correspondent

Unlike the worker, the shareholder decides how much he is going to pay himself. This distinction is one which all trade unionists should note in the discussions around an incomes policy. An example, in this period of economic gloom, is that of Jute Industries. This firm which is mainly based on the Dundee area, has been notorious for its low wages: this year its shareholders will get a £52,000 tax-free handout. Its total dividend is going up by 3% to 16%. In addition it is proposed to pay a tax-free capital distribution of 3%, and to make a one-for-two scrip issue (each Ordinary shareholder will get one extra share for each two he now holds). No crisis of the £ here!!

NO MORE MONEY FOR PUBLIC LOANS BOARD? from a finance correspondent

Many local authorities are considering cutting down (or even completely stopping) their programme of loans for house purchase. The reasons for this are two-fold: the general credit squeeze, and now fact that most of them are convinced that the Government is not to extend the scope of the Public Works Loan Board.

The withdrawal of foreign money from the money market has left it short of cash and at the same time local authorities are faced with the demand for quick overdraft repayment from the banks. This is because the latter's liquidity position is tight (that is the ratio between the money they have 'out' and 'in'). On December 18 money at seven-day notice was being taken at $8\frac{1}{2}\%$ interest on large loans and 8% for smaller ones. This has put pressure on the local authorities and they have in turn gone to the Public Works Loan Board. This year regulations have allowed them to borrow up to 20% of their total debt from the Board. Those who had not fully drawn on this have, since the bank rate went up, been hurrying to draw the balance. In the fortnight after the rise in the bank rate, Exchequer lending to local authorities totalled £40 million; this compares with only £11 million in the fortnight previous.

As announced by the Government, rates for borrowing from the PWLB have not gone up in line with the bank rate. However, many authorities hoped that the PWLB would either increase the quota or be more willing to lend money over and above the quota as a last resort to councils who had used up their quota. The Government, however, has made it clear that the quota will not be increased and only in very exceptional circumstances will the Board be willing to help an authority to find more money beyond its quota.

According to the Financial Times of December 19th, this reluctance is due to its fear that a bigger budget deficit would not be in accord with the policy of "assuring foreign opinion of the U.K.'s intention to hold the economy in check." All this may seem a rather abstract subject but the consequences can be very serious. Apart from anything else if these reports are true it means the Government has gone back on a very important aspect of its election programme in relation to local government. In practical terms it means that Labour authorities all over the country will be faced with precisely the same difficulties in the fields of housing, education, etc., under Labour as they did under the Tories.

SWISS BANKERS ATTACK STEEL NATIONALISATION PROPOSAL

The December issue of Union Bank of Switzerland's Review discussed whether the Labour Government's economic policies were likely to 'restore confidence in pound'. It commented: "The most recent attitude of the British Chancellor of the Exchequer...certainly offered only an unsatisfactory fulfilment of expectations...Equally incapable...was the policy of the Bank of England to keep the public guessing as to the actual position of the British currency reserves." The Review says there are two main causes for lack of confidence: the 15% surcharge; and the return to nationalisation experiments "which not only fit in badly with Great Britain's economic situation but have already been written off by modern and democratic socialism itself.." This the clearest statement we have seen from such a source that there are big ideological undertones in foreign bankers' attitude to the crisis of the pound.

WHO HIRES, FIRES AND PROMOTES IN THE PITS? by an East Midlands Coalminer

As a result of a research project which has been carried out at 11 collieries, certain facts have come to light which are very interesting.

One Colliery Manager in No. 1 Area of the East Midland Division, interviewed by a Deputy, stated that he was uncertain who hired, who fired and who promoted. When pressed to give his reasons for his uncertainty, he said there were so many other agencies whom he must consult; for example, Area Manpower Officer, Medical Officer, Ministry of Labour, Area Records Office and the Unions. In the case of firing, he could not definitely state that he was responsible, except in the case of a serious breach of the Coal Mines Act. When asked to state who promoted, he said that he had to consult the following people: his own staff, the Industrial Relations Officer, the St. John's Ambulance Brigade and the Group Manager.

In six cases out of the other ten, managers had to consult with the unions when it came to hiring labour. In some cases the unions had more say than in others. In one colliery the Union has an embargo on coloured labour and in another there is a closed shop against foreign labour. When it came to firing, much more authority was left in the Manager's hands. Serious breaches of the C.M.A. seemed always to be dealt with by the Colliery Manager, but absenteeism is dealt with in various ways from pit to pit. Here some of the responsibility is taken to a greater or lesser extent by the various Consultative Committees. The method taken to promote people varied with grade and from pit to pit. When promoting Deputies to Overmen all managers have to consult with Area Officials. When promoting workmen to chargemen the process was more involved. For example: Markham No. 4 consult with union. Ollerton men elect chargemen. At Markham No. 2 and Hucknall under officials grade workmen. At New Lounts it is done by the Manager. At Gedling (in transition) men choose chargemen with managerial approval. At Clipstone it is done by the Manager, officials and Under Manager in consultation, but Ripping chargemen evolve by process of who has taken over in the past when the original chargeman has been absent. Moorgreen has the same system as Clipstone for chargemen; overmen are appointed by the manager in consultation with the Production Manager and Area General Manager. Silverhill chargemen are promoted by deputies, under-officials by the Area Selection Board. At Cossall there is no firing problem at the moment as it is very short of labour. In the past it has been limited by the requirements of the Area Manpower Officer. There has been nobody fired for years except in one case of a man ill-treating a pony. Promotion varies for different grades: chargemen are selected by the district deputies and overmen in consultation with the men and under-manager; promotion of workmen to shot-firer by the manager in consultation with N.A.C.O.D.S. representatives. Deputies by the manager in consultation with the under manager, overmen, and N.A.C.O.D.S. representatives; overmen by the manager, under manager and Area Officials.

On looking through the information received from various collieries, it seems that a lot of the prerogatives of the management have been encroached on, especially in the case of hiring. In the case of firing the unions are reluctant to take the same amount of responsibility. Methods of promotion vary to such a degree that one wonders at times if we are all working for the same Nationalised Industry.

UNIONS TO BE CONTROLLED IN ZAMBIA

from a special correspondent

On December 15th, Mr. Justin Chimba, Zambia's Minister of Labour and Mines, introduced a Bill to the National Assembly which he said was "a direct departure from the old and out of date British trade union tradition." Then moving this piece of legislation - the Trade Union Bill - he claimed that 60% of the disputes in industry were caused by the lack of cooperation between employers and trade unionists. "This" he continued, "stems from sheer negligence and stubbornness on both sides. He added that it was hoped that the new Bill would do much to achieve stable industrial relations.

However, the main part of the Bill is devoted to preventing "infiltration" by outside influences. Affiliation to foreign agencies is forbidden. The Bill has a provision which enables the Minister to control all outside funds destined for the labour movement. It is expected that the Minister will be given powers to remove those officials whom he believes are abusing their posts. There is also provision for the registrar of trade unions to examine the books of unions, and a number of clause have been inserted to hinder the use of unions for political purposes. The Minister has also inserted a clause to empower him to impose a check-off system in any industry or place of work where a union can show at least 60% membership. Under the Bill, to be effective any union would have to join the proposed Zambian Congress of Trade Unions.

The provisions against foreign influence are clearly directed against the activities of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, which has blatantly supported certain of Zambia's trade unions. However, the Communist-inclined international trade union centre - the World Federation of Trades Unions (the ICFTU is a pro-Western breakaway supported mainly by American and British trade unions) will also be affected. There has been in recent months a conflict between the Government party, the United National Independence Party and the United Trade Union Congress over monies received by the latter from WFTU and other agencies. Speaking of foreign influence, Mr. Chimba said: "we are fully aware of the activities of these agencies which have led to continuous disruptions in industrial stability. We are now forced to control these activities by legislation. It is my wish that these agencies should stop interfering in our internal affairs."

Given the fact that despite political independence the overwhelming majority of Zambian workers are employed by foreign enterprises (mainly British) this Bill must cause misgivings to all trade unionists.

CALLAGHAN RAPS EDITOR OF "INVESTORS CHRONICLE"

by Dave Windsor

"Nothing like it since Mein Kampf" ran a headline in the Financial Times of December 15. The article, by Harold Wincott, editor of Investors Chronicle was not about South Africa as one might have expected (Wincott visited that country last month and had a lot to say about the economic achievements of South Africa). No, he was referring to the proposed corporation tax, and laid the blame for this tax on one Nicholas Kaldor. The article was in the form of an 'open letter' to Mr. Callaghan, and the Chancellor replied to it in the columns of the paper two days later. He castigated Wincott for attacking Kaldor, explaining that as a civil servant, 'as Mr. Wincott must know' he could not reply. There was further correspondence next day; apart from two letters from academics all the writers supported Wincott. It seems that certain sections of the City would like to ^{see} Kaldor removed.

MORE STUDENTS ARRESTED IN LISBON

from a Portuguese reader

In connection with the detention of a student involved in an explosion that occurred in Lisbon during October, 29 university students were recently arrested by the Portuguese political police. An official account of the detention appeared in the evening papers of the 4th of December. This stated that among those arrested were a group of 18 students and others who are members of the Front for Popular Action, describing them as a branch of the Communist Party. "During other investigations concerning subversive activities of the so-called 'Portuguese Communist Party'", the report goes on, "a house was found where secret meetings took place and many members of the party were detained including eleven university students." In more recent official information to the press the political police claimed the arrest of the ex-university student Nuno A. Pereira whom they consider the Communist Party member in charge of subversive agitation in academic circles. He was arrested while meeting another student of the Faculty of Science, by the name of Antonio Jose Borrani Crisostomo Teixeira.

From all these facts it is apparent that a new wave of political activity is occurring in the Portuguese universities. The young people in Portugal are becoming more and more aware of the hopeless political future of their country if the present state of affairs - colonial wars in Angola, Guinea and Mozambique and a politically and economically retarded police state at home - continues. On the other hand no constitutional solution is possible and the opposition parties - mainly the Movement for Revolutionary Action and FAP - have realised this for a long time. The 'unity fronts' of the opposition parties do not offer - this is the FAP position - the means of putting an end to Dr. Salazar's regime. Being as they are an ideologically "mixed bag" of communists, socialists and democratic liberals they are in fact guided and controlled by the more moderate groups and therefore completely paralysed as far as practical strategic measures are concerned. This is in name of a cherished unity which has, however, no political meaning.

Against this FAP, a revolutionary communist organisation (it is labelled 'Chinese' in the rather poor jargon of the experts) intends to carry out a political attack on totally different lines - a revolutionary strategy designed to bring the working people into active and organised struggle, the only one capable of achieving in the foreseeable future the radical changes this poor and under-developed country so badly needs. The era of petitions for the dismissal of Dr. Salazar, and of disguising one's political analyses and programmes in diffusely democratic compromises with other so-called opposition forces is over. Time now - so the FAP thinks - is for action.

LOCKOUTS IN SPANISH FACTORIESbased on ICFTU report

Some 6,000 workers employed in the Lanz Iberica tractor factory in Madrid started a sit-down strike on December 10 in support of their demands for higher wages. The management immediately ordered a lockout and strong police units helped the management to expel the workers from the factory. A few days earlier, the management of a metal factory in Bilbao ordered a lockout of some 1,500 workers, when they started a go-slow in protest against the dismissal of fifty of their colleagues. They were later accused by the management of inciting a strike.

AMERICAN STUDENTS BATTLE FOR FREEDOM OF SPEECH

The following article is based on reports from a Berkeley student.

The huge University of California at Berkeley has been in a ferment since the beginning of the fall term over the issue of free speech. The original cause of the conflict was the introduction by the Administration of regulations which prohibit students from advocating political and social action, from recruiting members and from soliciting funds for off-campus political causes, other than those officially sanctioned by the Administration. One of the consequences of these regulations is the severe hampering of such projects as the Voter Registration drive in the south, because most of the workers for these projects are recruited at universities.

At the beginning of term many students asked without success for the new rules to be rescinded. Then students from several off-campus political groups defied the rules by setting up tables with literature advocating political action. Eight students were then suspended indefinitely. The Administration refused to deal equally with 400 others who signed a statement that they had violated the same rulings. Then, on October 2nd, a graduate was arrested for violating these rules. This provoked a massive non-violent demonstration. Before the arrested graduate was removed, thousands of students 'sat down' in front of the police car. They held it captive for 32 hours. Some 3,000 of the 27,000 enrolled students took part and they ranged in political opinion from Young Republicans to members of SNCC, and Marxists.

The Administration refused to recognize that the issue was that of free speech and charged the students with disturbing 'law and order', and summoned nearly 1,000 police armed with riot sticks, guns and tear gas. Under the threat of violence the leaders of the students negotiated a settlement. The students are now organized as the Free Speech Movement (FSM) and have got the support of the American Civil Liberties Union. The latter consider that the Administration's action contravenes the guarantees of political rights in the First Amendment of the American Constitution.

The ensuing negotiations broke down in early December. The President of the University presented to the Regents (the governing body who are appointed by the State Governor) a suggestion that would restrict political and social action to "legal activity" only - he also asked for more campus police. The suggestions were accepted in spite of a crowd of 5,000 students who demonstrated outside the hall where the meeting took place. The proposals were designed to eliminate civil disobedience activity. The FSM argued that only the courts of law could decide what actions were legal, and that the proposals would make the students "second-class citizens" by depriving them of political rights.

The students then decided to test the constitutional position so they continued to advocate picketing and civil disobedience at the Oakland Tribune (a kind of local Hyde Park). The Deans took the names of such students and threatened to expel them but were deterred because of the numbers involved - many hundreds. Following this the University brought charges against the leaders of FSM and were obviously trying to get these people into serious trouble. Simultaneously a MacCarthyite smear campaign was carried out in the local press - notably the San Francisco Examiner - in which the FSM leaders were described as

/continued over

American Students Battle for Freedom of Speech - continued.

'communists' or members of 'communist front organisations'. In the present American context this can lead to considerable victimisation.

At this point the leader of the FSM delivered an ultimatum: either drop the charges or massive civil disobedience will follow. The Administration under-estimated the FSM's support and rejected the ultimatum. Next day, (December 2nd), a really fantastic demonstration resulted: thousand upon thousand of students marched into the administration building and sat down. All the workers were sent home and the FSM took over the building. Six hours after (7.00pm.) the campus police moved in and, as is normal at that hour, locked the doors of the building with about 800 students inside. Outside huge crowds waited; nearly all were sympathetic to the demonstrators. Inside FSM leaders organised the "Free University of California"; films were shown and freedom classes held. Then at 3.00am. the police moved in. The students were treated with considerable brutality: being dragged down the stairs by their feet, arms were twisted, students were deliberately trodden on, kicked etc. The arrests went on all day until 4.00pm. (December 3rd). Bail was set at \$250 each and this money has to actually be paid in. Much bail was put up by the faculty. The police brutality and the mass arrests shook the staff and at a huge informal faculty meeting of 1,000 professors it was agreed that they should stand by the students.

A student strike was immediately called. All buildings were picketed and 75% of the classes were closed. The Teamsters Union agreed not to cross the student picket line. The students are insisting on total amnesty in addition to their original demand for free speech.

All progressive people in Britain can help by sending protests to the U.S. Embassy in London or direct to Governor Brown, Sacramento, California. The protests should make two points: (1) decrying police brutality; and (2) calling for the freedom of speech for American students.

STRIKES HIT EASTERN SEABOARD

from a special correspondent

The ports of New York and Baltimore were hit on December 21st and 22nd by a wave of strikes by members of the International Longshoremen's Association. Several thousand were involved in New York (there are conflicting reports of the precise number) and 1,000 longshoremen walked off their jobs at Baltimore. A feature of the strikes is that they are being organised by complete work-gangs. This reflects the dissatisfaction among the rank and file with last week's settlement between their union and the employers. This agreement included a clause which allows the employers to reduce the size of the work-gangs "in the interests of greater efficiency" from 20 to 17 men.

The employers are complaining of weak "union discipline" and the union leaders have replied by claiming that the strikes merely reflects a slow flow of information.

This kind of strike, so familiar in Britain, is not so common in the U.S. It is to be hoped that the men draw the logical conclusion from the events and work through their union to discipline their leaders, or oust them.

CHE GUEVARA ADVOCATES REVOLUTIONARY WAY ON AMERICAN T.V. based on Hsinhua

American T.V. viewers brought up on a diet of soap-box opera, and whose brief acquaintance with T.V. politics is restricted to vote-catching platitudes from the Republicans and Democrats, must have found Che Guevara quite a contrast when he spoke on the Columbian Broadcasting System on December 13th. He was interviewed by newsmen in his capacity as the head of the Cuban delegation to the 19th session of the United Nations General Assembly. To a question on the possibility of the "peaceful transition" to socialism, he said: "In America this is very difficult and practically impossible. Therefore, when dealing specifically with America, we must say that in all countries and with all people, the road to the liberation of the people, that is, the road to socialism, must go through bullets."

He pointed out, "Revolution is not of our own making. It is the making of the imperialist system and its allies in various countries. answer to another question about relations with the U.S., he stated: "we do not accept any condition imposed by the United States." When asked whether Cuba would agree to inspection by the United Nations or the OAS (the Organisation of American States), he answered that the OAS was an American front and that inspection by OAS meant inspection by the United States. Guevara told the American newsmen: "You said that the United States did not feel itself safe. We would like to ask the United States: can we feel ourselves safe, can we be sure that there is no missile (in the United States) trained on Cuba?...Let us inspect each other."

Guevara continued: "We say that the United States tries to make us pay dearly for the non-peaceful co-existence which confronts us today, while we can only pay within the bounds of dignity, and not beyond them... We will not bend our knees for a peaceful life, unless they kill us first. If they do not want to go to such lengths, we shall go on living as best we can. Such is our non-peaceful co-existence with the United States."

Asked if Cuba felt itself alone in America, Guevara replied: "We have lots of friends, but not friends in the Government. These friends are among the people. And in the final analysis, the peoples will come to power in these countries." Speaking of his country's industrial development, Guevara said: "We shall strive to rely on our own raw material resources to develop our industry, and lessen our dependence on markets abroad."

CALL FOR LIBERATION STRUGGLE IN FRENCH SOMALILAND

One of the few remaining pockets of direct colonialism in Africa is French Somaliland, which remains under French domination even though the former colonies of British and Italian Somaliland have been united to form Somalia. Now the Government party of Somalia have made a call for their fellow-countrymen to launch a liberation struggle. In the latest issue of Journal of the Liberation Front of Somali Coast, the people of French Somaliland were urged to struggle to free themselves from the yoke of colonialism; "struggle is the only means to break slavery" the article stated. It declared that no imperialist force could arrest the march towards liberation, and pointed out that imperialism and colonialism were getting weaker all the time. "The road to victory lies in unity alone. Only through solid unity can the people surmount the hurdles in their way, defeat the enemy and win final victory." the article concluded.

WILSON AND WASHINGTON by Tom Nairn.

The present strategic aims of President Johnson and the American government are well known. America requires a far more successful and coherent policy towards the Third World: from Chile to Leopoldville, from Stanleyville to Saigon, her interests - the interests of American capitalism and of the Free World as a whole - are obviously threatened by emergent nationalism and popular revolution, with or without help from the communist powers. But at the same time as this problem has grown more acute - giving rise to Goldwaterism in its train - another problem has appeared in its turn, and has in effect made doubly difficult any effort to solve the first. This second threat comes from within the capitalist world itself.

Once, the American world contained only the relics of the older imperialisms, struggling for survival. Now, after the economic renaissance of Europe and the establishment of the Common Market, these relics have assumed a new aspect. Once they were a subordinate exploitation of Africa and Asia, tolerated by America within the broad cloak of her general hegemony and swiftly disciplined if they transgressed certain limits (as at Suez). Now, in the light of General De Gaulle's ambitions, they have become potential elements in a European challenge to that hegemony. Gaullism may have many archaic and pathetic sides. But these are secondary, seen from Washington. What counts is its character as a genuine challenge to the American dominion, as an alternative strategy other European powers might be tempted to embrace. And once the Free World is divided at its heart, how can America be sure of any ambition, how can she concert any effective strategy towards the Third World? De Gaulle's picturesque peregrinations in South America, his attempts to foster French interests in the Congo, his plans for Vietnam: for Washington, these are in themselves only minor irritants, but foreshadow a major storm, a possible fissure within capitalism as grave as the Sino-Soviet split within the socialist camp.

This menace is aggravated by the trend towards better relations between the USA and the USSR. Each step towards disension between the giants slackens the cohesion in their respective alliances, by appearing to make them less important and indispensable. And although the American government desires an entente with Moscow, it is not prepared to pay for it with the disintegration of its own forces - that is, with a radical weakening of its own position which would (or so it thinks) in any case undermine any agreement arrived at with the Russians. Peace must come from strength.

The only answer to this danger, for President Johnson, lies in a determined attempt to arrest it at its source, inside the Atlantic Alliance itself. America must tie her allies to her more firmly and irrevocably. She must neutralize in advance all serious efforts at independence, and - obviously - concede something to the new European aspirations, as an integral part of such a re-inforcement of her dominion. Hence the urgency with which Washington presses for the formation of that improbable modern Hydra, the Multi-Lateral Force.

The Honest Broker.

Hence also, the haste with which the British Prime Minister has taken himself to Washington so soon after his election. What does he

/continued over.

Wilson and Washington continued

intend his role to be, in this massive drama ? What forces and interests determine the evident British wish to have a leading part in the reform of the Atlantic Alliance ?

Only two weeks before Mr. Wilson's departure for America, the world saw the true basis of British power displayed before it, in humiliating nudity. Great Britain, at first sight indicated by history as the main opponent of American imperialism, is in reality less able to challenge Johnson's designs than any other major European power. Her foreign interests and commitments are still the greatest, among the European nations; but - as the events of November showed once again - these have turned into an intolerable burden. From being an extension of metropolitan power, they have become a frustration of that power. Trapped in her anachronistic web of relationships, her internal economy profoundly distorted by their influence, Britain alone has not shared fully in the great capitalist boom of the fifties and sixties. The weight of half the world's commerce still rests upon the pound sterling, and through the pound sterling upon a feeble economy unable to generate the most modest economic progress. Periodically, the weight proves too much, and threatens to crush British capitalism altogether. It was the fashion in Victorian England to sneer at Turkey and her decaying empire as "the sick man of Europe"; now England herself has become the sick man of Europe and the West, a perpetual island anchored only in the past, a question-mark on the edge of the Atlantic.

Unable to challenge America, Britain is compelled to support her. Tradition (including notably the traditions of the first post-war Labour government), sentiment, common culture, and a precarious presence alongside American imperialism in many parts of the world, all combine to define a role of faithful ally. This necessity was brutally underlined in the recent economic crisis. Like an elderly prostitute the town has become somewhat ashamed of, Great Britain is still of some use to others: rather than lose the convenience of the pound sterling, the world's bankers preferred to raise for her one of the largest loans in financial history. But only through American initiative, and on a solid dollar basis. The solid foundation of Wilson's negotiating position in Washington was a suitcase-full of freshly contracted debts to the mighty dollar, and an internal economic crisis from which (as yet) no escape seems possible.

Britain has no real aims comparable to the great strategic designs of American policy. She only has problems. No British Prime Minister feels properly dressed without resounding affirmations of Britain's greatness, Britain's independence, Britain's leadership. Like Macmillan and Churchill before him, Harold Wilson repeats the ritual phrases. But the political reality behind them is, necessarily, of the narrowest kind. Having no real power behind them, and no real vision before them, British governments cannot function in the intricate game of international diplomacy as a force. They can only act as intermediaries between the various real forces. This is the classic role of the "honest broker", first fully defined by Macmillan with his efforts at mediation between Moscow and Washington. Wilson's visit to Washington was another, more recherche, phase of the same function.

/continued over.

Wilson and Washington continued.

He aspires to mediate between President Johnson and his European allies, to be the inventor of a formula of reconciliation that will render everyone content, preserving and re-inforcing NATO. The same fundamental situation explains the other striking aspect of Labour's foreign policy: the extraordinary emphasis upon the United Nations, as the key to world peace and disarmament. The real powers in the world know that UNO is a battlefield. But the British are compelled to shut their eyes and pretend it is something more: their own weakness is sublimated in the mystical vision of UNO as the perfect, neutral resolver of international problems.

The Rationalization of Imperialism.

The particular British problems which Wilson carried to Washington can be briefly described. Firstly, the disposal of the British nuclear force, to which Labour is pledged in some form or other. Secondly, the need for a radical reduction in military costs in order to relieve Britain's economic crisis and help the re-organization of British capitalism.

In other words, the Labour government affirms itself as the principal agent in that world-wide "rationalization" of capitalist forces desired by the Americans; and in return asks for a less exacting role, a role more commensurate with its means, within this more rational system. This was the essence of the Washington talks.

No accord could possibly emerge from them, no definite results with a clear label on them. The reform of NATO and the rationalization of imperialism are enormous tasks, requiring hundreds of negotiations across many years; and Britain's particular problems - quite secondary in relation to the grand perspectives of American action - will have to be fitted into this developing process where it is possible to do so. Wilson cannot insist on their solution, or upon anything else; he can only ask, putting "the British point of view" and seeking for each small possibility of action in the interstices of American hegemony.

Some idea of what the process - and so the Washington talks - really signifies can easily be obtained by glancing at the situation in South-East Asia. Immediately before Wilson's departure a story exploded in the British press. President Johnson was going to ask for British participation in the war in Viet-Nam! The stories embroidered on the theme can be imagined: alarm, horror, doubt, indignation were everywhere. But why did it occur to the Americans to make such an impossible request, a request which they must have known Wilson could not agree to, given his tiny parliamentary majority and the certainty of intense opposition within his party? Almost certainly, because they knew a refusal was inevitable. A British refusal to touch Viet-Nam makes it much easier for them to refuse to touch the Malaysia-Indonesia conflict - they obviously suspected that Britain would ask for more support in the fight against Indonesia, in order to reduce her military costs. From the American point of view, Indonesia is the country that really counts, and they want to nothing which would permanently

/continued over.

Wilson and Washington continued.

alienate her from the Free World - consequently, from the same point of view, while it remains desirable that Malaysia should be defended, it is even more desirable that Britain should do so and not America. For Washington, this is a rational division of imperialist labour. For London, it looks a little less rational. But what can London do about it, since it is in general committed to being a kind of accomplice in American leadership and strategy? The British have eagerly sold their souls to the devil, hoping that he will accord them occasional help and privileges in return. That is, they have sold their only real bargaining asset, their only way of forcing the devil to be kind, and must depend upon his good nature. At bottom, they think he is a gentlemen.

Which Way to Peace ?

Wilson's justification for Labour's fundamental attitude can be put in a few words. They are not the words Labour leaders use, but indicate the same facts in a different perspective. American hegemony, and the rational systemization of that hegemony, are indispensable to prevent nuclear war. Better a unified imperialism under a strong leadership than a fragmented imperialist world, because the latter course will lead to the dissemination of nuclear arms and to the impossibility of control and disarmament - and hence, in the end, to war. This is why Gaullism can be represented as Original Sin.

This theology is - to say the least of it - open to question. To put it crudely: the Original Sin lies in the nature of imperialism, and not merely in that minor province of which it is in France. And because this is so, it is at bottom the most utter lunacy to confide the destinies of half the world entirely to the most powerful of the imperialist powers. Nothing less is at stake, in the negotiations centred on the MLF. This is what matters, not the minor troubles of British imperialism and the small ambitions of the Labour government.

The peril of the diffusion of nuclear arms is a genuine one. It may be more likely to happen, in a divided capitalist world (though it is certainly not clear how American hegemony can prevent it happening, at least to some extent, as nuclear technology develops), However, this peril cannot be compared - as does Harold Wilson - to the safe assurance of American control. God is not installed in either the Pentagon or the White House; the powers of the universe cannot be put into his hands. The choice is between evils. Only a little reflection will define them.

The imperialist (and the social-democratic) theology has it that the world's troubles come from communism: "If it were not for NATO, war would have happened a long time ago", one right-wing Labour M.P. primly commented last week. Not the slightest trace of tolerance towards Stalinism, not the slightest degree of complaisance towards many (or even most) of the policies currently pursued in and by the communist nations, is required for the utter refutation of this notion. There is not, there never has been, any evidence for it; every day,
/continued over.

Wilson and Washington continued

the evidence against it accumulates, in the Congo, Viet-Nam, and a hundred other places. It is the metaphysics of imperialism.

Accept it, and the American dominion is justified: Wilson's outlook will appear simply as a more "liberal", "progressive" form of co-operation in the grand American design than (for instance) that of the Italian or German governments. Reject it, and Wilsonism will appear as merely the most insidious form for the extension of American imperialism.

Reject it, and it will become clear that it is above all important to preserve such independence as is possible from American hegemony. For American power is not going to keep us all safe in our beds. This is merely the pious, mediocre hope of the incurable provincials Europeans have become: pickled in self-satisfaction, their dim ideas no more measure up to world realities than those of the Swiss cantons measure up to European ones. American power, including nuclear power, has a purpose: the maintenance and extension of the American empire. It is because this is becoming more difficult that Washington requires more power, and a more coherent type of command and strategy. And it is becoming more difficult because of the sharpening conflict in the Third World. This conflict is certain to grow much worse, in the years to come: as yet, it has scarcely arrived in the American hemisphere itself. To believe that America will disarm, while engaged in a global conflict like this, is a parochial delusion; so are the village-idiot ideas of a "socialist" Europe emerging in the shadow of American missiles (whether the missiles are to be polished up by Americans or teams of assorted European villagers). Submission to the new American drive for hegemony means one thing: the abdication of any chance to intervene in this enormous war, and prevent it from becoming Armageddon. Peace depends upon the controlling of American imperialism. not upon grovelling before it like so many superstitious bumpkins. It depends, therefore, upon independence of America. That is, immediately, upon a rejection of the Multi-Lateral Force and of the more elaborate and ambiguous substitutes for the MLF that the British government would prefer.

London December 10th.

ANTI-APARTHEID LAUNCHES A NEW JOURNAL

We have included as part of this week's issue a letter issued by the Anti-Apartheid Movement. This speaks for itself and there is no need to elaborate except to say that we earnestly hope that all readers, despite their other commitments, will fill in the bottom of this page and become subscribers.

URGENT - WE WANT THIS LETTER BACK

Dear Friend,

The January launching of an 8-page monthly paper, Anti-Apartheid News by the AAM, is a significant step forward in our fight against racial oppression in South Africa.

Anti-Apartheid News will spearhead the attempts of the Movement to make the British people aware of the misery and brutality of apartheid. Our Movement is active on many fronts, in many ways. But our ultimate success depends on our ability to make people ACT against apartheid. This is the role of Anti-Apartheid News. By exposing the crimes of racialism, aguing for sanity, and reporting and co-ordinating the activities of Anti-Apartheid groups in Britain and throughout the world, it can make people conscious of the part they must take, through protest and personal boycott, in toppling the Verwoerd tyranny.

Anti-Apartheid News will sell for 6d. It will cost a lot of money to produce; £200 a month. We would have liked to send it free to all members but unfortunately their 10/- membership subscription is absorbed by the production of leaflets, posters, pamphlets, demonstrations, meetings and the day to day running of the office. The paper must therefore rely, for its financial underpinning, upon individuals taking out an annual 10/- postal subscription. Groups and individuals are also encouraged to take bulk orders of 6 or more copies for sale at meetings etc. These copies will be supplied on a sale or return basis and will be charged at a special discount rate of 4d. per copy. The balance will help finance local Anti-Apartheid campaigning.

We need at least 3,000 individual subscribers by January to make Anti-Apartheid News self-supporting. This is why we urgently need this form back, - with ten shillings.

ANTI- APARTHEID NEWS

- I wish to a) become an individual subscriber. I enclose 10/- (year)
- b) take a regular order of copies every month.
- c) become a MEMBER of the AAMovement and SUBSCRIBER. I enclose £1 (yr.)
(delete whichever is inappropriate)

Name: (Block letters)
Address:

Organisation (if any)

Cheques and postal orders crossed and payable to Anti-Apartheid News

Post to 89 Charlotte Street, London W1