

The Labour Government and the Co-ops.

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS Vol. 5, No. 19, 12th May, 1966

THE SEAMEN'S CASE

54 Park Road, Lenton, Nottingham

Subscription: £2 per annum and pro rata



THE WE	EEK - A	NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS	Vol. 5. No. 19. May 12th, 1966
CONTEN	TS		
PAGE	1	Editorial notes.	IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT
**	2	Docks situation.	The Anti-Devlin Report is now
n	3	The Pay-roll tax.	ready. This is an invaluable
	4	Labour and the Co-ops.	document on the situation on the
11	6	An analysis of Nasserism.	docks coming at a most apposite
"	7	Labour men block African	moment. Not only will it be a
		speakers.	blue-print for the type of deman
n	8	C.I.A. exposed.	that dockers should raise in fac
11	10	Labour businessmen to	of Devlin and the Government's
		form group?	attack on them, it will also be
	11	Workers Control.	a guide for action in all indust

" 13 The Seamen's case. " 14 May Day in Hull.

Vietnam campaign.

THE SEAMEN AND THE LEFT

11

12

document on the situation on the docks coming at a most apposite moment. Not only will it be a blue-print for the type of demands that dockers should raise in face of Devlin and the Government's attack on them, it will also be a guide for action in all industries faced with similar problems. All readers of <u>The Week</u> should buy this report and sell it. They should do everything they can to get it to dockers. 2/6d from 1, Plantation Dr. Anlaby Park, Hull.

It is certain that the Government will make every effort to avert the Seamstrike. They will attempt to do a repeat performance of the way Mr. Wilson persuaded the N.U.R. to call off its strike at the 11th hour. Just as certain is that if the strike takes place the whole apparatus of the press and the mass media will be brought into action to discredit and vilify , the strikers, We will hear much of "extreme left-wing elements", "holding the country to ransom", "communist influences", etc., but scarcely nothing about the intransigence of the employers. The left must counter this. We must regard ourselves as the allies and spokesmen of the seamen. In every locality, T.U. branches, Labour Parties, C.S.E. branches, etc., must organise meetings for members of seamen's strike committees can come along and explain their case. If the strike is prolonged by the employers putting their profits before the interests of the country (as if they ever do anything else) a great solidarity fund must be set up. The seamen are going into action not only against backward and stubborn employers but indirectly against a Labour Government which applying Tory measures on the industrial front (as everywhere else). As such the Seamen are the first in battle and desave all our support. If the strike is called off we must also support the seamen in any efforts necessary to make sure their demands are not lost by lack of militant leadership. This will particularly apply if sections are goaded into taking "unofficial action."

PERSECUTION OF POLISH SOCIALISTS

The Week has received an appeal from Berkeley, California, signed by leading members of the Free Speech Movement, the Du Bois Clubs, and the Vietnam Day Committee, concerning the imprisonmentof a number of Polish socialists for distributing literature of protest and political opposition. The most well-known of these/Ludwig Haas , a Polish Trotskyist and collaborator of Isaac Deutscher who was imprisoned in the Soviet Union for eighteen years, and only released in 1957. Haas is obviously a man of deep principle, and that he should now be in Gomulka's/is a mark of how . far the Polish October of 1956 has fallen short of the high hopes we all had of it. Naturally The Week adds it voice to that of our U.S. comrades. This is appalling repression, which will cause socialists all over the world the most serious concern. Next week we shall publish a protest by Isaac Deutscher on this matter, and news of the activities of solidarity by British socialists. We understand that there is to be a demonstration this Sunday outside the Polish Embassy in Portland Place, at 3.00. The demonstration will be preceded by a march leaving speakers corner at 2.30.

THE FUTURE OF THE DOCKS INDUSTRY

from Humherside Voice

The publication of the Government's proposed 'Amendments' to the Dock Labour Scheme has thrown the whole industry into ferment, and a great chance for a real step forward for dockers now presents itself. For the dockers' reactions against the Amendments were so firm and determined, that the Government is unlikely to press forward with them in their original form. If they do, we can be sure of a massive protest response; for these Amendments are nothing more than the employers'wishes, for which they have been struggling for years. Jack Dash has taken the initiative in calling for the Nationalisation of the industry, and the rejection of the Amendments. Humberside Voice, in a leaflet issued to dockers last month, called for support for these demands, and the leaflet has received widespread approval amongst the port's workers. The Hull Portworker's Committee has held joint/Jack Dash and the London Liajson Committee, and supported the lobby of the Prime Minister, which demanded the suspension of the Amendments, pending an enquiry. Dash has now said that, because of a Government promise to hold an enuiry, the dockers should refrain from further pressure for the time being. The herseyside Blue Union was in favour of token strikes for the rejection of the Amendments, immediately. They called off their stoppage however, as it failed to arouse support on other Ports. The mass meeting heard that the Hull Committee is going to take part in a national meeting of all Portworkers and Liaison Committees in the near future, at which a united policy towards the Amendments and the Nationalisation issue will be worked out. As between the Liverpool and London tactics and demands, the Hull Committee at present appears to have taken no firm position, and is clearly prepared to weigh up the situation for the time being. How ver, things are now moving quite rapidly towards the possibility of a united dockers policy, which can sweep Devlinisation away forever, and usher in a new era for the dockers and for a socialist altern tive to that backward Report. The position of the different groups- and the view of the local "Humberside Voice"- can be summed up as follows:-1. The Government: at first, ready to do the bidding of the employers

and Devlin, and still at present committed to the Amendments. But wavering and retreating before the obvious determination of the dockers. Therefore likely to consider some form of public ownership in the near future. NO EFFORT SHOULD BE SPARED TO PUSH THE GOV RNMENT INTO NATIONALIS -ATION NOW! IF PARLIAMENT'S TIME CAN BE SPENT ON THE AMENDMENTS, IT CAN BE SPENT ON A NATIONALISATION BILL JUST AS WELL!

2. <u>T&G Leadership and Labour Back Benchers</u>: like the Government, they have been forced, by the dockers'stand, to consider nationalisation. They have a report on nationalisation, which speaks of "some" dockers going on to the Boards, but the Executive seems curiously reluctant to **publish** it. Kevin McNamara has called for early nationalisation. This view is bound to find strong support **cm** the backbenches, and even amongst some of the Cabinet. But there is a real uncertainty as to WHAT KIND of nationalisation should be proposed. Some kind of "workers' participation" is being discussed very widely in the Party, but this is only a <u>step</u> in the right direction.

SOUTH WALES C.S.E. INAUGURAL MEETING

This will be held in the Council Chamber of the National Union of Mineworkers, South Wales branch, at 3.00 p.m. on Sunday 15th May commencing at 3.00. The Council Chamber is at 2, St. Andrews Crescent, Cardiff. The openingspeaker will be Don Bateman, national treasurer of the I.L.P. and chairman of Bristol C.S.E. For further information write: Tom Nicholls, 33, Burghley Rd., Bristol 6.

FIRST THOUGHTS ON THE PAYROLL TAX by Janet Blackman

By penalising the service industries price are bound to go up for us as consumers wherever we are <u>served</u> by the middleman or retailer. This means higher prices, especially for food, fuel, clothes and the like, whether you are a business tycoon, a worker with a family to support or an old-age pensioner. Therefore the Payroll Tax will be an added burden to the poorer sections of the community - Point One.

Point two: The Middleman and Productivity

Employers in the service industries will think they now have a cast-iron case for putting up their prices to pay for the payroll tax of 25/- a week on each man they employ. This is just the part of our economy where prices already run away with themselves quite unrelated to the costs of production and distribution. The middleman already makes a vast profit; he now has the green light to push up his profit margins even further. This leads, or should lead, to:

Point three: PRICES and Incomes Policy

Price increases such as these envisaged above should bring the prices side of the incomes policy into play. Yet this has been the weakest side of the incomes policy so far. We have yet to get down to a rational pricing policy whereby the method of price-fixing by manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers will be scrutinised and related to production costs. This would be the beginnings of a genuine <u>socialist</u> prices and incomes policy. Instead we have:

Point four: The Great Divide

The Payroll Tax drives a wedge right through the workers; i.e.,

Men: in manufacturing industry

1) Eqch man is worth <u>plus 7/6</u> to his employer. I.E., the employer pays a payroll tax of 25/- a week for each man, but receives a Government subsidy of 32/6 a week per man. (No strings are attached The result may well be the "hoarding of labour."

2) Men in this part of industry have a higher take-home pay with more chances of overtime and bonuses.

3) A higher proportion of industrial workers are organised in trade unions with long experience of wage negotiations and redundancy agreements.

Men in the service industries

1) Each man is worth <u>minus 25/-</u> to his employer; I.E., employers pay a payroll tax of 25/- a week per man, but receives <u>nothing</u> back from the Government. The result will be higher unemployment in this sector.

2) Men in this sector are poorly paid with fewer chances of overtime working with pay or bonuses.

3) Fewer men are organised trade unionists.
4) Some workers are not allowed to join a union, e.g., bank clerks.
5) For many there is still a long tradition of individual wage settlement with the boss.

Finally, What about the women? Point Four:

Women workers in manufacturing industry will be worth only a subsidy of <u>plus</u> <u>3/6</u> per week to an employer against a man's plus 7/6. Whereas in the service industries an employer will pay a <u>lower</u> payroll tax for his women workers than for his men. Net result? Could mean even fewer opportunities for women in the manufacturing side of industry, and even more women used as cheap labour in the service sector. Is this what we want in the socialist Britain of the future? One answer must be greater union organisation of women workers in both sectors of the economy to put a stop to their use as cheap labour anywhere.

TO THEM THAT HATH IT SHALL BE GIVEN

The Tory Party was condemned and continuously attacked by both the Co-operative and Labour Movements for its discrimination against the Co-operatives during its thirteen years in power. Some of the actions that gave rise to this anger were as follows:

In 1956 the Tory Finance Act gave to deposit ors in the Post Office and Trustee Savings Banks income tax relief on the first £15 of interest but every penny of interest on Co-operative shares was left taxable. In 1958 the Tory Budget merged the two existing taxes on distributed and retained profits thereby increasing the Co-op rate from 5% to 10% but reducing big business from 30% to 10% thus providing them with a windfall of £16 million but costing the Co-ops an extra £1¹/₂Million.

Even this wasn't enough, the Tories again raised this tax from 10% to 15%. This meant a rate of tax five times higher than in 1957 for the Co-ops. Every year the Labour Party when in opposition challenged these discriminatory taxes and voted against this section of the Finance Act. Working in a vast effort the trade union, the Co-op and the Labour movements defeated the Tories in October, 1964, and the Co-operative movement looked forward to the ending of discrimination and the full recognition of the social purpose of Co-operation in its battle against monopoly. Instead of recognition of this special role and aid being given to help to keep down retail prices, the first eighteen months have been almost disastrous for the Co-ops because of the increased costs placed upon them by Labour Government legislation.

For example. the R.A.C.S. has had to face the following increases: National Insurance, £60,000; Postage, £3,000; Fuel, £7,000; Motor Tax, £7,000; and local authority rates (mostly due to excessively high Bank Rate) £47,500; a total of £129,000 as an annual increase in expenditure. All of these were followed by what appeared then as the final crushing blow, the publication of the Government's White Paper on "Investment Incentives"," Its purpose is the substitution of cash grants for the investment allowances. This gives to manufacturing industry, almost irrespective of what they produce, cash grants of 20% (40% in development areas.) of the cost of new machinery. These grants are payable irrespective of whether the plant will be used efficiently, or even whether used at all. Machinery for making one-armed bandits qualifies for full grant as will most other machinery producing socially worthless articles for people who have capital that allows them to command resources and direct production into luxury channels.

The White Paper estimates that the "cash grants" will cost between £200 million and £250 million a year and this means that, once again, the rich industries gain at the expense of the distributor. The R.A.C.S., in its efforts to keep prices down by lowering the costs of distribution, spends nearly \pounds_2^1 million per annum on new machinery, equipment, vehicles and plant and, on this sum, would expect a tax relief of £150,000. It will get nothing. If this were the end of the story it would be a sad commentary on the failure of a Labour Government to recognise the fundamental difference between the Co-operative movement and the profit seeking distributor. But, unfortunately, it doesn't even end there. On May 3rd, 1966, the Budget Speech of the Labour Chancellor introduced a "selective employment tax". The majority of people in this country gave a sigh of relief that income tax, fags, beer, spirits, purchase and car tax had not gone up. But it would have been much more honest of the Chancellor to state that he was introducing * Fred Styles is an active and well-known member of Royal Arsenal Co-op. a food tax in an attempted deflationary move to take some £350 million consumer spending power out of circulation. In this effect it is both dishonest and unfair. It is dishonest in that it is a confidence trick that will not be fully realised until some some time after the Budget has been forgotten and the public will blame the shopkeepers for the steady increass in prices. It is unfair in that it abandons the Labour & Copoperative principle that direct taxation is a fairer system because it places the burden according to means while indirect taxation of this nature imposes the heaviest burden on the least able to pay.

It is disastrous for the Co-operative Movement in that it will cost, nationally £11 million, and to the R.A.C.S. £550,000. If such charges weree to be carried without increases in prices it would have to be at the cost of total dividend to most societies. In many of the smaller societies (probably the majority) it would be impossible to bear the new tar even at the expense of dividend. Twice in less than four months a Labour Government has divided the business community in two: the productive and the distributive, the former highly favoured, the latter, heavily penalised and in both instances the Co-ops have been in the penalised group. Surely we are entitled to ask what kind of economic reasoning is used to justify a blanket exemption and/or a subsidy to industry chargeable to distribution?

Under present proposals we have a situation where the soft drinks industry which last year spent $\pounds l_4^{\perp}$ million on advertising and made large profits, will be subsidised by the retail trade. We will have the fantastic situation where the Co-operative Movement has to pay $\pounds ll$ million to help subsidise such monopolies as Unilever, who recently spent $\pounds 370,000$ on an advertising campaign for one of its toothpastes. One can only hope that the Co-operative MPS will urge the Government to recognise the essential social role of the Co-operative Movement by treating its capital investment programme as necessary expenditure with full relief of taxation by means of the new "cash grant allowances, and exempting all food shops from the proposed "selective employment tax."

For our Labour M.P.s one can only hope that they will press the Chancellor to clearly define what the real object of the exercise is. He claimed in his Budget speech "I think it is more important to encourage the deployment of labour and to give manufacturers a relative advantage in costs compared with the service sector. The fact that employment in manufacturing, in the public sector, and other parts of the economy will be relieved of the tax in various ways increases the importance of <u>using labour efficiently in these</u> <u>sectors.</u>" The Minister of Technology in a speech during the election (Cardiff March 10th) said "In some industries the output per worker in the best firms <u>is seven times</u> what it is in the worst. Ratios of <u>3-4-5- to one</u> between the best firms and the worse are common in important industries. There are few industries in which the best firms do not organise their production so as to get twice as much output per worker as the worst."

Jim really must get together with Frank and find our just what (or should that be who?) industry is doing before he subsidises them with payments from $1\frac{31}{2}$ million co-operators. It is rather frightening (for a socialist) to look at the Corporate Income Account in the Government's White Paper and find Profits at the highest ever level: Gross taxable profits

Gross taxable profits all companies	£4.823	million
Rent and non-trading income	896	
Income via investment abroad	1,143	**
Total	£6.862	

Compare this with the figure for total wages of all manual workers: £9,920 million which less than a third more than what is taken in profit. Socialism is the language of priorities - lets start getting them right!

ANALYSIS OF NASSERISM

from an Amb comrade

The 'Arab Revolution' (an Arab magazine published by the 'Organisation of Revolutionary Socialist Youth-Abroad') has recently translated and reproduced, with a brief introduction, a valuablearticle written originally in the 'Workers' Banner' (Organ of the Revolutionary Workers! Organisation' in Iraq). This article is a theoretical study of the historical development taking place today in many underdeveloped countries including the Arab world and Nasser's Egypt. It deals with the nationalis -ation measures and explains the driving force behind them, together with the nature of the states and regimes. This article is also a reply to the Iraqi Communist Farty leaders and their Soviet "theoreticians" who characterise the Egyptian phenomena, for example, as the "Non-capitalist Road of Development"(1)

This article is useful not only in the field of theory, but also for the information it gives about the situation in the Middle East, particularly Egypt and Iraq. For copies of this pamphlet(9d each)write to: Editorial Board, Arab Revolution, c/o Pioneer's Book Service, 8, Toynbee St., London.E.L.

MAJORITY OF MALAWIAN EUROPEANS TO SIT IN PARLIAMENT ? from I.U.S.Y. Survey

Dr. Hastings Banda announced in Parliament that he had instructed the committee drafting the Constitution to make provisions for five Europe Members of Parliament. The new Constitution will be proclaimed in July. Only nine Europeans are registered as Malawi citizens and eligible to sit. Dr.Banda, however, maintained that the present three European members had done "some valuable work". Moreover, better European representation was motivated by the increasing foreign investment in Malawi.

IS "CHE" IN PERU?

Ernesto Che Guevara, Fidel Castro's former right-hand man, who disappeared 12 months ago, was quoted in the Italian weekly magazine, 'Le Ore'. It published an interview with Guevara, which it said he gave in the heart of the Andes.

The Lima police said on April 14th that they had captured Ricardo Gadea Acosta, the brother of Che Guevara's first wife, Hilda Gadea. Ricardo Gadea was the leader of a group of guerilla fighters operating in the central zone in close connection with Luis de la Puente Uceda, who was killed by the Peruvian army last October.

CAMBRIDGE C.S.E. FOLLOW-UP MEETING from I

from Ian Taylor

This Sunday, May 15th, at 3.00 p.m., the Cambridge branch CSE will be following up its earlier meeting on 'Incomes Policy and the Trade Unions.' The place is the same as before - the Horse and Groom, King St., but the speakers this time will present new perspectives in the discussion. John Palmer, ex-Labour candidate, candidate, Croydon N.W., and Paddy Reilly (N.U.R.) will be the set speakers, but but participation and attendance will be welcomed from militants and socialists from all over the region. The C.S.E. branch has plans afoot for a pamphlet on Pye's and for other projects, spanning the town labour movement as well as the university.

OXFORD VIETNAM PEACE MOVEMENT SET UP Jennifer Hinton (173, Walton St., Oxford) reports that a group has been set called the Oxford Vietnam Peace Movement and that it is having an open meeting on Wednesday, May 18th, at the Friends Meeting House, 43, St. Giles, Oxford, at 8.00 when plans for a demonstration will be made. All are welcome as are enquiries at the above address.

LABOUR DELEGATION BLOCKS AFRICAN SPEAKERS AT SOCIALIST CONGRESS

from a Special Correspondent

Uneasiness at the British policy towards Rhodesia is likely to be intensified by the extraordinary attitude of British Labour Party members attending the Socialist International Congress in Stockholm. African leaders, including Tanzania's Dr. Wilbert Klerruu and representatives from Zambia and from both the Rhodesian African nationalist parties, had come straight to Stockholm after attending, as observers and at the British Labour Party's suggestion, a Socialist International Conference on "Thought and Action in New Countries " in Uppsala. They had been given the impression by their Swedish hosts that they would be permitted to address the Congress, and they certainly expected to be allowed to speak during the debate on the report of the Uppsala Conference which they had assisted in drawing up.

However, at a preliminary meeting of the Executive Board the British Labour Party representatives feared that African participation might lead to conflict over Britain's Rhodesia policy and sought to prevent this by making a technical objection to the right of non-members to speak. A compromise was eventually reached whereby the Africans would be allowed to address a special private session on African affairs, which would not be considered as part of the Congress.

Even this unsatisfactory arrangement does not seem to have satisfied the British Executive members who are understood to have said that they reserved their position in the event of this private meeting degenerating into a "squabble". The Labour Party representatives included Len Williams, the party secretary, Mr. J. Gormley, Mr. Padley, Minister of State at the Foreign Office, and Gwyn Morgan, head of the Overseas Department at Transport House.

We trust that this all-too-typical abitrary action by the Labour Party's bureaucrats will not be permitted to pass without vigorous protest within the party and in the House.

WELSH MINERS WANT WELSH T.U.C.

from a South Wales correspondent

A resolution demanding the setting up of a Trade Union Congress for Wales was passed by the 55,000 strong South Wales National Union of Mineworkers at Porthcawl last week. The resolution, from Morlais Lodge, was moved by Cyril Parry, who said that events of recent years had clearly indicated the need for such a body, and that rail and pit closures, reorganisation of the docks, the chaotic condition of our transport system, and plans for alternative industries were among the developments which demanded the closest attention of the trade union movement. His point, that a Welsh T.U.C. would also serve to unify North and South Wales, was taken up by the vice-president, Glyn Williams, who said that "Now we have a Secretary of State for Wales, I believe we should also have parity with Scotland by the creation of a T.U.C. of Wales."

Voting in support of the resolution was unanimous, and steps will now be taken to gain the support of other trade unions in Wales. The 26 Mining MPs were represented at the Conference by Ness Edwards, MP for Cae.philly, who spoke of the crisis now confronting the industry, and expressed concern at the acceleration of pit closures which had followed the publication of the National Plan. He warned that lack of manpower would produce a coal famine by 1970 unless there was a reappraisal of Government policy.

MOUNTING CONCERN AT CIA ACTIVITIES (New York Times Survey) by Geoff Coggan

The US Central Intelligence Agency has been making the headlines in the American press recently. In Baltimore the CIA has interceded, so far with success, in the slander trial of one of its agents in an effort to obtain exoneration without explanation. This agent is claiming complete legal immunity from the Federal Government, adding point to Senator Fulbright's call for a widening of the membership of the Congressional sub-committee which is the only supervisory political body to have access to CIA information. Mounting concern will surely be further intensified by the New York Times' publication, in a five part survey, of the results of an investigation which it has carried out over the last few months into the activities of the CIA.

Amongst numerous examples of blatant interference in many parts of the world, the New York Times states that "in South East Asis over the past decade, the CIA has been so active that the agency in some countries has become the principal arm of American policy. It is said, for instance, to have been so successful at infiltrating the top of the Indonesian Government and Army that the US was reluctant to disrupt CIA covering operations by withdrawing aid and information programs in 1964 and 1965."

"In 1960 CIA agents in Laos, disguised as military advisers, stuffed ballot boxes and engineered local uprisings to help a hand-picked strong man, General Phoumi Nosovan, set up a pro-American government that was desired by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles. ... When the Kennedy Administration set out to reverse the policy of the Eisenhower Administration, it found the CIA deeply committed to Phoumi Nosovan and needed two years of negotiations and threats to restore the regime of Prince Souvana Phouma."

"After helping to elect Ramon Magsaysay as President of the Philippines in 1953, buttressing the family Governmentsof Ngo Dinh Diem and Ngo Dinh Nhu in South Vietnam in 1954, the CIA agents responsible obviously became for long periods much more intimate advisers and effective links to Washington than the formally designated American Ambassadors to these countries. Moreover, the CIA's skill drew for it many assignments in South East Asia that would normally be given to the Defense Department. It was, for instance, able to fly supplies to the Meo tribesmen in Laos at a time when treaty obligations forbade the assignment of military advisers to the task."

Of operations on the African continent, the New York Times describes how the CIA delivered an "Instant Air Force" to Leopoldville: "At the Ituri River in North Eastern Congo, a column of 600 Congolese troops and 100 white mercenaries had been ambushed by a rebel force and was under heavy fire. Suddenly three B-26's skimmed in over the rain forest and bombed a path through the rebel ranks. ... At the controls of the American-built planes were anti-Castro Cubans, veterans of the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba, who had been recruited by a purportedly private company in Florida. Guiding them into action were American 'diplomats' and other officials in apparently civilian positions. The sponsor, paymaster and director of all of them, however, was the CIA." The survey admits that - "the CIA, long in advance, had information on the plans by which Algerian Army officers overthrew Ahmed Ben Bella last June."

"The CIA's talent for secret warfare is known to have been tested twice in Latin America. It successfully directed a battle of 'liberation' against the leftist government of Col. Jacobo Arbenz Guzman in Guatemala in 1954. Seven years later, a CIA sponsored army jumped off from secret bases in

Mounting Concern at CIA Activities continued /

Guatemala and Nicarague for the disastrous engagement at Cuba's Bay of Pigs. Not so melodramatically, the agency runs dozens of other operations throughout the hemisphere. ... It provides anti-Communist front organisations for students, workers, professional and businessmen, farmers and political parties. It has arranged contact between these groups and American labor organisations, institutes and foundations. It has poured money into Latin-American election campaigns in support of moderate candidates and against leftist leaders like Cheddi Jagan in British Guiana."

The NYT survey puts the number of CIA agents stationed overseas at about 2,200, though it admits this conflicts with Arthur Schlesinger's estimate of around In American diplomatic missions, one staff member in three is said 6.000. to be a CILA employee, while in certain missions the proportion is as high as "Within the US, the CIA maintains field offices in 30 three out of four. cities. At one time these field offices sought out scholars, businessmen, students and even ordinary tourists whom they knew to be planning a trip behind the Iron Curtain. Very little of this is assertedly done any more, probably because of some embarrassing arrests and imprisonments. In greater secrecy the CIA subsidises, in whole or part, a wide range of enterprises - 'private' foundations, book and magazine publishers, schools of international studies in universities, law offices, 'businesses' of various kinds, and foreign broadcasting stations. 'Encounter' magazine was for a long time one of the indirect beneficiaries of CIA When Air-America or any other false front organisation has run into financial difficulties, the agency has used its influence ... to drum up some legitimate sources of income. Unknown to most of the directors and stockholders of an airline company, for instance, it may approach the leading officials of the company, e plain its problem and come away with some profitable air cargo contracts."

"As in the case of its overseas reputation, its actual activities in the US - for instance its aid in financing a centre for international studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology - have made the fear of infiltration real to many scholars and businessmen. The revelation that CIA agents served amongst Michigan State University scholars in South Vietnam from 1955 to 1959 has contributed to the fear. Their involvement has aroused concern that hundreds of scholarly and charitable American efforts abroad will be tainted by the suspicions of other governments."

The New York Times survey, though it clears the CIA of the charge of acting on its own, - "without the approval or control of the political leaders of the US Government", adds that this raises in itself the central questions: "What is control ? And who guards the guards ?" It concludes that - "While the institutional forms of political control appear effective and sufficient, it is really the <u>will</u> of the political officials who must exert control that is important and that has most been lacking."

<u>Shameful Footnote:</u> CIA revelations apart, the NYT last week, and all week, carried <u>many</u> expressions of protest at America's self appointed role in the world. These ranged from editorial comment on - "Dean Rusk's flimsy legal case for intervention in Vietnam" to Sen. Fulbright's - "Unmistakeably America is succumbing to that arrogance of power which has afflicted, weakened, and in some cases destroyed, great nations in the past... It is showing signs of that fatal presumption which brought ruin to ancient Athens and Nazi Germany." In shameful juxtaposition with such comments appears the NYT report from London: "Britain's Labour Government firmly backed US Vietnamese policy tonight, and warned that an American withdrawal could be a disaster."

MOVE TO FORM LABOUR BUSINESSMEN'S DISCUSSION GROUP

from Geoff Coggan

Merchant Banker readers of The Week will be interested in the proposal to launch a Labour Businessmen's Discussion Group. In a letter to last week's Economist, a Mr. Grant, of G.F. Grant & Co. Ltd., writes: "The old nationalisation/free enterprise argument is irrelevant and is, at the moment, narrowed down to one industry - steel."

"Now, at the beginning of what should be a long period of Labour Government, is the time to break down some of the old suspicion and distrust between Labour and the City. It is entirely wrong to assume that the City and everyone who works in it is inherently hostile to the ideas and ideals of the present Government."

"I should like to start a lunch hour" (on expense account ?) "discussion group which would meet, probably monthly, possibly more often, in the City, and have speakers both from the Government and from Merchant Banks and the Stock Exchange, etc. The object would be to get a better understanding of how the policies of the Government and the methods of the City institutions affect each other. Members would not necessarily be members of the Labour Party. They could include Liberal voters, though I doubt if any Conservatives would wish to join. Will those who work in the City and who are interested in this idea, please comtact me ?"

Having never ourselves made the mistake of assuming "that the City is inherently hostile to the ideas and ideals of the present Government", we can almost claim parentage of this venture, which we heartily commend to all our Stock Exchange subscribers. There is no reason why the idea should not attract support from the widest business circles, and we feel that Mr. Grant is unduly pessimistic in suggesting that Conservatives might not feel completely at home in such company.

COUNCIL HOUSE RENTS UP 81 PER CENT IN TWO YEARS from a London Correspondent

"Housing Statistics (England & Wales)", published by the Institute of Municipal Treasurers and Accountants, makes some revealing comments on the effect of high interest rates on council house rents. Based on returns from nearly 1,000 local authorities, it quotes a rise in average basic rents from £63 in 1962/3 to £68 in 1964/5 - an increase of 8.5 per cent. In the same two year period, the average total expenditure per dwelling from the revenue account rose from £94 to £103. Says the report: "The cost of the capital raised is by far the largest item of expenditure, and debt charges account for more than two-thirds of the total expenditure."

BARBARA CASTLE IN FAVOUR OF "OPEN" LINER TRAIN TERMINALS

In answer to a recent question in the Commons, Barbara Castle, Minister of Transport, said that negotiations on the liner train issue and the admission of private road hauliers to liner train depots was primarily a matter for the Railway Board and the unions. However, she made it quite clear to both sides that she hoped their decision would be in favour of "open" terminals. On this issue Mrs. Castle seems to be echoing Mr. Fraser's words of nine months ago, and appears equally remote from the principle of integration of road and rail transport.

WORKERS' CONTROL SEMIMAR SHAPES UP

from Ken Coates.

There is every sign that the seminar on Industrial Democracy, organised by the Centre for Socialist Education and supported by <u>The Week</u>, <u>The Voice</u> and <u>Tribune</u>, amongst other socialist journals, will become the most important gathering of socialist trade unionists for many years.

Enrolments are already flowing in, and it is clear that the organisers will be faced with a considerable accomodation problem. In a number of key industries, the seminar will serve as a vital focus for the ideas of militants and socialist union officers. The Inti-Devlin Report, published last week by <u>The Week and Humberside Voice</u> (available at 2/6d post free from our business manager) will serve as a basis for discussion between dockers from most of the major ports. Approaches have been made to portworkers all over the country, and the response has been most stimulating.

The busmen will also be meeting with other public employees to discuss the project for workers' control elaborated in Hull by Jack Ashwell. Jack Ashwell is convening a very representative grouping to discuss and carry forward the proposals of the Hull group.

Mike Noble, who has been making a special study of the packagedeals which have been proliferating in recent months, will be organising a seminar on the problem of countering package-deal proposals, and the ways in which workers can secure extensions to their powers of control in privately controlled industries.

If the steel bill is finally published before the seminar meets, it is hoped that it will be possible to prepare detailed proposals for the necessary amendments to ensure that the new measure really does result in a democratic breakthrough.

A number of MPs are warmly interested in these discussions, and several will be making the journey to Nottingham to take part in them.

All in all, the CSE seminar will be very likely to prove a turning-point in Labour history. It can secure the grouping of a strong movement of trade unionists around very definite and clear policies.

Those who wish to participate in the work of the seminar should send a postal order for 5/- and details of their choice of seminar grouping, occupation and name and address, to the conference organiser, Geoff Coggan, 47 Brindley Road, Bilborough, Nottingham, Tel. no. 281364.

If accomodation is needed please specify for how many people. Offers of accomodation in the Nottingham area will be gratefully appreciated.

OXFORD CSE COMMEMORATES THE GREAT STRIKE.

Oxford CSE have published a valuable panphlet on the history of the General Strike in Oxford, written by Richard Hyman. Copies are available, price 6d., from Oxford CSE,34 Swinburne Rd., Oxford.

LAWRENCE DALY'S SPEECH AT THE SCOTTISH T.U.C.

The Scottish Miner reports: "Only eight of the 450 delegates at Congress voted against the Scottish miners' resolution which called for an immediate halt to the bombing of North Vietnam and for the withdrawal of all foreign troops. Delegates were hushed as Mr. Daly declared that trade unionists had the moral duty to denounce again and again the brutal inhumanity being inflicted by the Americans. 'After all the cosy explanations have been made, after all the appeals to political expediency are exhausted, the simple fact still remains: The armed forces of the greatest capitalist power on earth are committing the most fiendish, bestial atrocities since Auschwitz, Belsen and Buchenwald. But unlike the German people, none of us can claim that dwe did not know.

"'The evidence has been absolutely clear from pictures on press and television of prisoners being dragged by the feet behind American tanks, of children being roasted alive by napalm bombs, of Americans instructing their troops on the use of torture.' Mr. Daly said that the foremost leaders of a country which has the capacity to destroy us all several times over were obviously incapable of realising their crimes. He recalled that only a day or two ago, the American Secretary of State for war, ex-Fords' boss, Robert McNamara, had spoken with 'unusual heat' before a committee of the U.S. Congress. McNamara had revealed that the U.S. had dropped nearly three times more bombs in Vietnam in one month than in the whole of the Korean war. 'His unusual heat' was engendered not by moral indignation - but by the suggestion that the U.S. Air Force wasn't dropping enough bombs,' said Mr. Daly.

"Of America's offer of 'unconditional negotiations,' he declared: 'How would the people of London, Coventry, Greenock and Glasgow have felt if Hitler had suggested we should go to the conference table while bombs were dropping on their towns and cities? We can't blame the victim of the atrocities in Vietnam if they react in the same way as we would do ourselves.' And he added: 'The Buddhist challenge has indicated once and for all that the puppet regime in South Vietnam would not last for a single day without the support of American military power.' He ended to thunderous applause: 'We must speak up against what is being done in our name.'"

DRAFT AGENDA FOR VIETNAM SOLIDARITY CONFERENCE PUBLISHED

The draft agenda for the Vietnam Solidarity Conference is now available. It is open to amendment by all delegates and will be finalised at the beginning of the conference. It is proposed that the organisational aspects of the conference be dealt with in the first session, after which Bertrand Russell will speak on his reasons for supporting the conference. It is hoped to have personal messages of greetings from Vietnamese speakers following this. On the Saturday afternoon, the conference will hear two reports: one on the draft statement of aims and the other on the proposed structure. Commissions will be appointed to deal with amendemnts, etc.

On Sunday morning it is proposed that the session be opened by Ralph Schoenman who will speak on his recent visit to Vietnam. This will form a fitting prelude to the discussion of projects such as the War Crimes Tribunal, a photographic exhibition at the Labour Party and T.U.C. conferences, etc., Sunday afternoon will see an American reporting on the movement in that country, this will be followed by a preliminary discussion on the question of an international solidarity conference. If you have not written for your delegates credentials you should do so immediately to 8, Roland Gardens, London S.W. 7. You will/receive all the documents of the conference as

SEAMEN CALL FOR 40 HOUR WEEK

A 40 hour week at sea and £60 a month for the fully rated seaman is the moderate claim submitted by the National Union of Seamen. The story of the current dispute is summarised in a leaflet circulated by the N.U.S., and from which the following information is quoted:

<u>How the 1965 Agreement Worked</u>: Last year's agreement (March 29, 1965) meant a monthly lump sum - it was £8. 2s. 8d. for the A.B. - in the consolidated basic rate for adult ratings, to compensate for up to 8 hours' work each on Saturdays and Sundays when a ship is at sea. That gave a good increase in earnings to most of our members, but they had to be prepared to work a <u>7 day week of 8 hours</u> each day at sea to get it.

Making Work: Despite the fact that the spirit behind this agreement was that the existing pattern of work should continue, many of our members have been called upon to carry out manufactured and clearly non-essential work at weekends. The policy on many ships seems to be, "The Agreement says we can work you 56 hours a week; so work you we will." There were exceptions to this and some owners began to arrange for week-day rest periods for ships at sea at week-ends. But, because of the backsliders among the owners, resentment began to build up against this system of working.

<u>Cut the Hours at Sea</u>: So the Union decided that the only course was to go for the 40-hour week at sea as well as in port, with no cut in the present consolidated rates.

<u>Owners' Final Offer</u>: After lengthy negotiations the owners finally agreed to offer something in terms of hours reduction. Their <u>final</u> offer was :-1) A 40-hour week at sea in three annual stages; 2) Direct overtime for all hours at week-ends and on public holidays, again in three stages; 3) A monthly increase of 12s. 6d. on the fifth year Efficient Service Pay (that is, to £60 for the fully rated A.B.); 4) Annual leave to go up to 36 days, and increase of 20 days. But at the same time they insist on 5) Withdrawal of the Sundayat-sea Leave Agreement, meaning an average loss of 37 days' paid compensatory leave a year; and, 6) A standstill on further wage increases for three years.

<u>What the Offer Means</u>: It would mean a 48-hour week at sea immediately with 12s. 6d. monthly on the 5th year Efficient Service Pay and 36 days' annual leave now. But we would lose the Sunday-at-sea agreement. The next stage, in 12 months' time, would be a 44-hour week, with overtime for Saturday afternoon or after 4 hours worked before noon. The final stage, in 1968, would mean the 40-hour week at sea, with all week-end work paid at the appropriate overtime rate (e.g. 6s. for most deck and engine room ratings, and 5s. 7d. for assistant stewards). The owners say this offer would increase earnings by 5% now, 4% in a year's time and another 4% a year after that. But this calculation depends on whether the pattern of working remains as now. New techniques and equipment on ships tend to lessen the actual physical work required, and give wide scope for shipowners to reduce hours of duty.

<u>The Union Says "No"</u>: The Union's Executive Council cannot accept this final offer; it takes away the Sunday-at-sea leave with an inadequate replacement by annual leave and means that, though there <u>might</u> still be an opportunity for overtime earnings, the basic rate would stand still for 3 years. And the 40 hours at sea would not come in until 1968. The Union cannot negotiate further, so the logical next step is to declare ourselves in a state of dispute. And May 16 is the deadline we have set for withholding of labour. Full plans have been laid, and members will be kept informed through the Union's branches.

This country needs an efficient and growing mercantile marine. But that cannot be achieved without decent pay and conditions for the men and women who

MAY DAY IN HULL

by Tony Topham

Harry Nicholas was guest speaker at Hull's May Day. Last year enormous effort in publicity, offical union "floats", the complete turn-out of Labour's Aldermen, Councillors, trade union officials, etc., greeted Harold Wilson when he came to face a barrage from the Vietnam demonstrators. This time, with an "anti-incomes policy" union leader, there was active discouragement from the local establishment to the whole idea of a parade, and only a handful of the hierarchy were present. This did, however, mean that the left's banners and presence were most prominent! "Solidarity with the Vietnam NLF", "Attack profits, not wages", "Hands off the unions", and "Rhodesia, one man, one vote " were amongst the slogans, whilst several NLF flags were carried - carried incidentally along the shortest possible route that the official organisars could contrive. The procession was visible to the public for about fifteen mintes!

CSE's local branch produced an open letter to Harry Nicholas, extracts of which we print below, which was distributed to all on the march. The speaker, moreover, felt obliged to reject the leaflet's point that the TGWU's present line on the docks' question was highly ambiguous. He correctly stated that the union's broadsheet on the industry had said that they would campaign for an extension of public ownership <u>alongside</u> their approach to Devlin. What he failed to refute was our point that it is impossible to put Devlin and public ownership alongside one another. They are incompatible. Kevin McNamara, M.P. for North Hull, in his speech to the rally, demanded early nationalisation of the industry but did not refer to Devlin. The TGWU really must set about repairing this sizeable dent in its reputation as a left leader.

"An open letter to Harry Nicholas

May Day is the day when the working classes of the whole world re-affirm their internationalism. It is also the day on which we review our achievements and press for advances at home...Internationally, Labour's first concern must be the <u>Vietnam War</u>. Rightly, you union...opposes the Labour Government's shameful support of American atrocities against the common people in that crippled country. Is this enough? Surely you should recognise openly that the Vietnam War is a part of the colonial revolution against tyranny and foreign capitalist domination. That it deserves the support of socialists, workers and trade unions everywhere. Surely your union should stand for solidarity with the Vietnamese people.

"<u>On the industrial front</u>, the TGWU has been amongst the opponents of the Government's incomes policy and the Early Warning Bill. Socialists share your view that whilst fighting to destroy Toryism at elections, we should maintain a vigorous and effective opposition to Tory policies when they are adopted by a Labour Government. <u>But</u> it is up to those who choose opposition to Government policy to oppose it <u>in practice</u>. And it is in practice that the TGWU's leadership has failed to match the militancy of policy declarations:...

"Hull Fishermen, Recently, Hull's fishermen...built up a militant campaign for 100% unionism, for TGWU membership." (but the) "union failed to make the strike <u>Official</u>.... <u>Municipal busmen</u>: The TGWU accepts an anti-strike clause in the Bonus Agreement for Municipal Busmen, which allows employers to fine strikers. <u>Why?</u>....What is the TGWU doing to pursue the Busmen's Pay Claim?.....

The dockers and Devlin: The TGWU has flooded the docks with pro-Devlin literature Yet it claims to be FOR nationalisation and an extension of the dockers' power over the industry....

The Incomes policy: Opposition to the incomes policy is growing. Yet your union is doing nothing to help or guide it. Instead, your statements stress increasing "productivity". Its good that you demand the power of shop stewards to investigate and report backward managements, Excellent to call for the opening of the books But the steward is powerless to make his inspection role effective without union help. .. " The leaflets ends by calling on the union to fight along a firm left line.