

The Week

POTTERY

WORKERS

DISAFFILIATE

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS
Vol. 7 No. 6 9th February 1967 6^D

TUD 1151

HANDS OFF

N.A.L.S.O

8 Roland Gardens, London, S.W.7.

Subscription: £2 per annum and pro rata

THE WEEK

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS
Vol. 7 No. 2 9th February 1967

POTTERY
WORKERS
DISAFFILIATE

HANDS OFF

M.A.L.S.O.

CONTENTS

| | | | | | |
|------|----|---------------------------|------|----|---------------------------|
| Page | 1 | Editorial notes. | Page | 2 | Titmuss defends welfare. |
| " | 3 | Trade union unity. | " | 4 | Hugo Blanco campaign. |
| " | 5 | Kensington Tories. | " | 6 | NALSO secretary's letter. |
| " | 7 | NALSO fights back. | " | 8 | Political notes. |
| " | 9 | Vietnam campaign notes. | " | 10 | Chemical war in Vietnam. |
| " | 11 | U.S. scientists' protest. | " | 12 | Economic notes. |

INCOMES POLICY: FROM BAD TO WORSE

It appears that the Government has definitely decided to make the repressive aspects of the incomes policy permanent. What is worse they appear to have the intention of intensifying these repressive features. Those union leaders who accepted the incomes policy thinking it was a temporary measure have had their illusions smashed. Many sections of the working class which favour the incomes policy will think again. In short, now things are more clear cut there is a much better basis for opposing the Government on this issue. But opposition will not arise spontaneously leadership is required. The seamen's strike and numerous smaller struggles have demonstrated that given a lead the workers are prepared to fight. The lobby of Parliament on February 21 must be part of a process to work out a strategy for fighting the wage freeze and anti-trade union legislation. The trade union executives meet on March 2 - they too should be lobbied and between now and that date every effort be made to force the executives to reverse their former support of the Government.

THE POTTERY WORKERS DISAFFILIATE

The action of the Potteryworkers' union in disaffiliating from the Labour Party is very understandable but regrettable. Their votes are needed at the Labour Party conference by the left. Acts of despair are no substitute for action. Militant action by the Potteryworkers would be much more effective. Instead of abandoning the Labour Party to the right, militants should go in and take it over. If local branches of the Potteryworkers were to mobilise their members they could throw out those M.P.s who support Mr. Wilson in pottery constituencies. But there are other lessons from this affair: Ever since the election of the Wilson Government left critics have been accused of damaging the Labour Party, now we have real evidence that the left was correct in pointing out that the right wing policies of Mr. Wilson are a disaster for the party. If more and more people learn this lesson, maybe the action of the Potteryworkers will have been a good thing after all.

SUPPORT N.A.L.S.O.

Elsewhere in this issue we carry a letter from N.A.L.S.O. and some material on Transport House's attack on that organisation. We wish to stress that this is the affair of the whole labour movement and make an appeal for C.L.P.s, trade union organisations and young socialist branches to protest. Resolutions should go to Transport House, Smith Square, London S.W.1. marked for Sarah Barker. We would like to know of these resolutions and so would N.A.L.S.O. Urgent steps should be taken to (1) Get a resolution on the question for the Labour Party conference; (2) make the facts known as widely as possible. We also note that the N.A.L.S.O. statement makes it clear that the officers are going to resist ultra-left temptations. Advice to opt out of the struggle in the Labour Party is very bad advice indeed.

"Choice and the Welfare State", by Professor Titmuss, is the third of a series of Fabian pamphlets concerned with what Professor Abel-Smith called, in the first of the series, "the ugly imbalance between private affluence and public squalor." The first two contributions showed how (in Abel-Smith's ably argued thesis) the projected and now forgotten National Plan falls far short of meeting the most elementary needs for growth in the welfare services, and how (in Peter Townsend's harrowing and definitive "Poverty, Socialism and Labour in Power") the incidence of poverty and deprivation was, far from diminishing, showing an alarming likelihood of becoming "wider instead of narrower ... during the term in office of the present Labour Government." Both are required reading for all serious socialists.

This third essay is a little different in scope and significance. It consists of a brief discussion of four erroneous notions, all of which have obtained a wide currency. The first is that poverty can be overcome simply by economic growth, without redistribution. The second, that the "problem of discrimination and stigma" can be solved by private markets in welfare. The third, that consumer choice will be widened by reversion to market determination of standards and provision. Lastly, Professor Titmuss makes a detailed onslaught on the theory that "social services in kind, particularly medical care, have no characteristics which differentiate them from goods in the private market."

Titmuss shows that the assumption that growth alone would cure poverty, and, in Daniel Bell's hyper-spurious phrase, bring about the "end of ideology" into the bargain, has been decisively rebutted by American experience. "One is led to wonder", he says, "what liberal economists would have said 15 to 20 years ago had they foreknowledge of the growth in American wealth, and had they been asked to comment on the following facts for the year 1966: that one American child in four would be regarded as living in poverty, and three elderly persons in ten would also be living in poverty that the U.S. would be moving towards a more unequal distribution of income, wealth and command-over-resources that many grey areas would become ghettos that a nationwide civil rights' challenge of explosive magnitude would have to be faced - a challenge for freedom of choice, for the right to work, for a non-rat infested home, for medical care and against stigma that, as a nation, the U.S. would be seriously short of doctors, scientists, teachers, social workers, welfare aids and professional workers and that American agencies would be deliberately recruiting and organising the import of doctors, nurses and other categories of human capital from less affluent nations of the world." In comparing U.K. experience with this, Professor Titmuss points out that however badly we treat our immigrant doctors, at least we do not systematically recruit them from the underdeveloped countries. That may be: but it should be borne in mind that the Labour Government's measures for immigration control make it difficult for unskilled labourers to come here, whilst establishing a clear preference for trained personnel.

Titmuss also uses evidence from U.S. experience to show that private markets in welfare, far from removing discrimination and stigma, fortify them, and he shows that the slogan "freedom of choice" is a hollow mockery

in the whole area of privately imposed pension schemes agreed between employers and the insurance companies. The Government's proposals for transferability and full preservation of pension rights are still not public. Meantime, the car workers are sacked wholesale (as when BMC announced on 27th June that 6,000 employees would be sacked on 29th June) without any protection at all in this field.

But it is when he comes to dissect the distinction between social services in kind, or goods in the private sector, that Titmuss scores most heavily. He takes a careful look at the Blood Transfusion services in Britain and New York. Using hitherto unpublished material, he shows how 150 separate agencies collecting blood on a commercial basis in New York completely fail to meet a chronic blood shortage. Every day operations have to be postponed. The derelicts of skid row become "professional donors", earning their livelihoods by retailing their blood at 10 to 25 dollars or more a pint. This blood, six times more likely to be contaminated by hepatitis than that of voluntary or family donors, is pumped out of the victims, predominantly unemployed or unskilled workers, far too frequently for the good of their health. In Britain, people give blood freely, and it is distributed freely. There is enough. So much for the virtues of the market, which many more than Enoch Powell would be happy to bring home again across the Atlantic.

These three Fabian pamphlets sketch out a basic argument in defence of Britain's welfare services. But it is clear that we need a fourth such pamphlet, to go over to the attack, and work out the claims which should be made by the welfare sector on areas which up to now are the sole unchallenged province of the market. Two sectors, at least, are obvious candidates: housing, which is a national disgrace, and public transport, which is the only cure for thrombosis on the roads. Free housing, free transport, will seem as necessary as free air to the people of the future. How long will Britain delay entering that future? Certainly for as long as is necessary to reverse the wholly reactionary priorities of the Wilson administration. All three of these excellent but grim pamphlets are welcome as weapons in the struggle to do just that.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST JOURNAL ON TRADE UNION UNITY from our own

correspondent

The latest issue of International Socialist Journalist, number 18 (available 5/6d. post free from 19, Greenfield Street, Dunkirk, Nottingham.) contains two vitally interesting symposia on trade union unity in Italy and France. In France, representative spokesmen of Force Ouvrier (socialist), the CGT (communist) and the Christian unions gathered in an informal round table to discuss problems of union strategy: in Italy, representatives of the CGIL (socialist-communist) and CISL (catholic), including members of the Socialist Party, the PSIUP and Communist Party met under the chairmanship of Lettiori of the PSIUP, our fraternal New Left party in Italy. These discussions are of crucial interest to British trade unionists, because the pressing need for unity across the whole European continent becomes central if labour is to meet the growing threat of European capital organised in the Common Market. The same issue contains documentation on our own Workers' Control Conference, about which Bill Boyle, of DATA, has contributed a comprehensive article.

THE SAVE HUGO BLANCO CAMPAIGN from Charles van Gelderen

A well attended meeting at the Caxton Hall, London, on Thursday January 26, launched the British Campaign to save Hugo Blanco. Syd Bidwell, Labour MP for Southall, was the principal speaker. He expressed his complete solidarity with Hugo Blanco's struggle to organise the oppressed peasants of Peru, protested at the savage sentence passed on him by a military court and added his voice to the world-wide demand for an amnesty. Bill Molloy, MP for Ealing North, who had also agreed to speak at the meeting, was unable to do so because of a last-minute constituency engagement, but he sent a message of support through Syd Bidwell. Freda Laski, widow of the late Harold Laski, gave a moving account of the servile conditions under which the peasants of Peru were living and working. She said their status was little better than that of chattel slaves and she urged that all should be done to save Hugo Blanco and to give support to the movement he led.

Messages were received from Ernie Roberts, Assistant General Secretary of the A.E.U., who conveyed his "personal opposition to the attempted legal assassination of Hugo Blanco." He called on the British trade union movement to "voice its opposition to this attempt to kill a man for his opinions." Bill Jones, of the T&GWU, also expressed his regret that a previous engagement prevented him from being present. "I have no hesitation," he said, "in supporting all your efforts on behalf of Blanco and wish them every success."

Speakers from the International Socialist Group and the Irish Workers' League also addressed the meeting and expressed their solidarity with the campaign. Kenneth Jordan, Executive member of the Pan-African Congress of South Africa, drew a parallel between the situation in Peru and South Africa, where the peasants were also fighting for the most elementary human rights. Eighty-five members of his organisation had been executed for political activities since 1945 and nine were now under sentence of death in Cape Town.

It was agreed to send a protest to the Peruvian Embassy in the name of the meeting. Since the first appeal on behalf of Hugo Blanco appeared in Tribune a few weeks ago, numerous letters of protest from individuals and organisations have been sent to the Embassy. None has been acknowledged.

The Movement for Colonial Freedom, whose speaker was also unable to appear at the last moment, sent a message of solidarity and protest.

LABOUR M.Ps. DEMAND CLEMENCY FOR BLANCO

A cable, requesting clemency for Hugo Blanco, has been sent to the Minister of War, in Peru, in the names of the following Labour members of parliament: Syd Bidwell, Stan Newens, William Molloy, John Lee, Gwilym Roberts, John Ryan, and Gerry Fitt (Irish Republican Labour).

JOIN THE MARCH TO THE PERUVIAN EMBASSY ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 19th

The Committee for Solidarity with the Victims of Repression in Peru (8, Eaton Terrace, London, SW.1) calls for support for the Protest March to the Peruvian Embassy on Sunday, February 19. The March will assemble at 3 p.m. at Marble Arch and London readers of The Week will no doubt be present to demonstrate their solidarity with the Campaign.

KENSINGTON TORIES ARE "MEAN, DESPICABLE AND UNJUST" by Derek London

The last meeting of the Kensington and Chelsea Council on Tuesday, January 31, saw some real fireworks. Throughout the meeting, tenants in the public gallery shouted and heckled Tory speakers. They were warned several times by the Deputy Mayor to keep quiet or they would be thrown out. The cause of the trouble is the decision by the Council to collect 6-months' back rent increase from council house tenants. The Council had increased rents by up to £3.10 per week last year. These increases were due to come into effect on October 3, 1966, but were delayed until the beginning of this year. The Council plans to start collecting the back increases over a six-month period beginning on October 1st this year. Thus tenants will be paying a double increase for 6 months.

During the debate Labour members were particularly sharp: Councillor Alan Jenkinson said: "I don't know whether it's legal for a council to deliberately put its tenants in areas, but the action seems monstrously unjust. The Council has borrowed ideas from some of the more unscrupulous landlords in the borough." Councillor Stanley Lawrence said that the action was something no slum landlord could ever hope to get away with. The Tories, on the other hand, showed their typical contempt of council tenants. Councillor Dennis Piper said: "What is special about them" (council tenants) "that makes them feel they have some right to come to me for a contribution to their rent? I would like to know where it's going to end. Are we to contribute to their clothing and food?" Alderman Ernest Anslow-Wilson, the Tory leader of the council, added with sickening hypocrisy: "What we hoped for was to have happy and grateful tenants. Our action seems to have misfired and not been appreciated" (sic) "It would probably be a good thing if we collected the whole amount straight away."

Labour's attempt to get the matter referred back was defeated. This rotten attitude has its roots in the desire of the Tories to keep down the rates of their supporters (private house-owners) at the expense of council house tenants. The complete hypocrisy of the Tories' arguments that they are applying the Government's incomes policy was demonstrated by one Labour Councillor when he pointed out that the Council had stopped certain wage increases. There was, however, no question of paying them six months' back increase. Whilst we must be heartened by the Labour Councillors' opposition to the Tories we must note the sobering thought that the Tories have been encouraged to take this action by the Labour Government's general policies.

NORTH KENSINGTON TENANTS ORGANISE by a London reader

Over 150 people attended a crowded meeting held at the All Saints Hall, Powis Gardens, on Tuesday, January 31, to discuss the problems of Kensington tenants. The meeting was attended by Mr. George Rogers, Labour M.P. for North Kensington, Lord Kennet, joint Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Housing, and several Labour councillors from Kensington and Chelsea Council. The meeting was the outcome of a seven-month inquiry by the Notting Hill Neighbourhood Service Unit into the activities of Davies Investments Ltd. - the firm now going into liquidation. Rent tribunal forms were distributed and the meeting split up into groups to discuss how best to use the rent tribunals to ensure security of tenure. The groups, formed on a geographical basis, agreed to form the nucleus of tenants' associations. A major aim of the campaign will be to force the Council to buy up properties formerly owned by the Davies trust, failing this to try to "shame" the council into lending money to housing associations so that they could buy the houses.

N.A.L.S.O. SECRETARY WRITES TO THE WEEK

We have received the following letter from Bruce T. Bebington, secretary of the National Association of Labour Student Organisations:

"Dear Comrade,

I wish to convey NALSO's deepest thanks for your support in our recent difficulties with Transport House. It is of merit that without being even approached, you went to the trouble of amassing material in our defence. I enclose a general release to clubs which while being somewhat "shop", you will find useful for information in any future support you may give us.

Yours fraternally,
Bruce T. Bebington,
NALSO Secretary."

The text of the NALSO release is given below in full because we want to equip our readers to the fullest extent in fighting on this question.

N.A.L.S.O.'S BREAK WITH TRANSPORT HOUSE

We would be obliged if you would distribute and seek discussion on this document.

HISTORY

At the interim conference, N.A.L.S.O. decided to take a firmer line in opposition to the Wilson's Government's policies, especially on the economic front. Transport House complained about these militant policies especially about a resolution carried by a clear majority calling on left M.P.s to come out in clear opposition to the Wilson Government and to campaign inside and outside Parliament for socialist policies.

They also complained of irregularities in the calling of the interim conference; that only a month's notice of the conference was given to affiliates thus giving them no time to receive resolutions and mandate their delegations on them. Finally they alleged that N.A.L.S.O. at the interim conference had passed under the control of the Socialist Labour League.

While this exchange was continuing, the N.E.C. decided to withdraw financial and moral support from N.A.L.S.O. without even informing the E.C. of any possibility of such a decision.

NATURE

The decision to withdraw support is "because of recent developments inside the Association." Organisational doubts about N.A.L.S.O.'s role do not enter into its consideration. The N.E.C. probably plan to set up an alternative organisation through their regional officers - picking the groups they want to be included.

While it is not altogether unwelcome that the money spent on N.A.L.S.O. may be available to individual groups, this in fact will be a good method of distinguishing Left-Wing and Right-Wing groups. Specifically, where there are two groups in universities supporting the Labour Party, one can be sure which group will receive the money.

In short, the N.E.C.'s move is political in its entire motivation.

OPPOSITION

The Chairman has drafted a press release outlining our opposition to the move.

(1) There was no discussion of this break. It is almost feudal the procedure in which this break took place. The N.E.C. acted as judge, jury and prosecutor. The defendant was not invited to state its case and was sentenced "in absentia."

2. It is undemocratic. No attempt was made to draw groups or N.A.L.S.O. conference into this discussion on N.A.L.S.O.'s role. The N.E.C. seems to consider groups have no right to have an effective say in their future national organisation.

3. It is yet another attempt to stifle criticism by labelling it as "Trotskyist" or shutting down organisations. The N.E.C. must face the fact that it will either have to tolerate critical groups or have few groups at all.

4. It is not true that we have repudiated the Labour^{Party} and joined the S.L.L. No such resolution has ever been adopted.

FUTURE

We have enough money to survive for some time. Nevertheless, we shall have to face attempts, probably, by Regional Officers to split off clubs from N.A.L.S.O. and numerous attempts to found alternative organisations.

N.A.L.S.O. can only survive if local groups remain loyal and channel their criticism into the next conference - on April 3rd to 6th at Hulme Hall, Manchester - and not into disaffiliationism or collaboration with the Party bureaucracy.

N.A.L.S.O. must also face the fact that certain delegates at the last conference were not in favour of working inside the Party. It is quite clear that we shall face ultimate proscription if we do not define our attitude clearly towards these comrades at the next conference.

We retain our faith that N.A.L.S.O. can sort out these problems, and the financial one and need not submit to the whims of the Party machine and play a useful role on this basis.

We appeal to you to:

FIGHT FOR OUR OWN FULLY REPRESENTATIVE N.A.L.S.O.

Alan Richardson, N.A.L.S.O. Chairman,
Bruce Bebington, N.A.L.S.O. Secretary.

For further information write to Bruce T. Bebington, Chandos Hall, Manchester 1.

Editorial Note: because of the importance of this fight we are printing extra copies of this section. They are available on request.

COMMON MARKET TEACH-IN AT EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY from a Scottish correspondent

A seven-hour Teach-in on Britain's proposed entry into the Common Market was held in the Pollock Hall, Edinburgh University, last Friday. Analysing the economic and agricultural implications for Scotland, Mr. Henry Munro, General Secretary of the Scottish National Farmers' Union, said he felt that in discussions on the Common Market there had been far too little specialised comment on what the implications of entry would be for particular sections of our community.

"It was sometimes alleged, he said, that there was no room for negotiation, and that Britain must either accept or reject the Common Market's agricultural system in its entirety. This was a fatuous and nonsensical suggestion. He warned that the food prices would rise rapidly in this country to an estimated £700 million per year - sufficient to add 25 shillings a week to the average budget for a family of four, though this would be offset by the extent to which less support is given to the British farmer. But it had to be remembered that the increases would apply to produce from outside or inside the Community."

Lord Balniel, Tory front bench spokesman on foreign affairs, spoke clearly in favour of entry. "I welcome the conversion of Harold Wilson to this vision of the political future", he said. "I wish him every success in resuming the negotiations initiated by the Conservative Party in 1951."

GOVERNMENT REFUSES PAY RISE TO SCOTTISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Feeling among Scottish local government employees is running very high because of the Government's refusal to allow a pay rise for 22,000 Scottish NALGO members. They are particularly incensed as the refusal is in marked contrast to the rise agreed for England and Wales. The NALGO agreement in England and Wales was signed a week before Mr. Wilson announced the pay freeze, and the rise was delayed for six months, eventually becoming due this week.

The Scottish members' agreement was due to operate from September 16. They expected it to be subject to a similar six months' delay, and to be payable from March 16 this year. But the Government says No, on the grounds that the agreement was not reached before the start of the freeze and that there was therefore no prior commitment. The leaders of NALGO and four other unions are now inviting members of the Scottish TUC to join them in a protest to Mr. William Ross, the Secretary of State for Scotland.

ENGINEERS' DISPUTE IN KILMARNOCK

Nearly 2,000 workers at the Massey-Ferguson farm machinery factory in Kilmarnock were sent home last Friday after a dispute in the press and machine shops. The workers wanted day-rate working to be applied instead of the present bonus system.

SUCCESSFUL VIETNAM DEMONSTRATION IN EDINBURGH by Ian Millar

There was a successful march in Edinburgh last Tuesday (January 31) to protest against American policy in Vietnam. 500 people participated, including sixty Trades Council delegates. The demonstration was organised by the Trades Council, the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and the British Council of Peace in Vietnam. This was the first political demonstration in Edinburgh for several years and it is even longer since the Trades Council has taken such a direct part.

The march received wide press coverage, with photographs in several papers (including one in the middle of the front page of The Scotsman.) None of the papers reported the speeches made at the protest meeting at the Mound nor the contents of the resolution given to the U.S. Consulate which demanded an end to the bombing of Vietnam. Both the Daily Express and Daily Mail devoted most of their articles to a minor incident which took place when a few white South African students arrived with a placard saying: "We support U.S. policy in Vietnam." This was torn down by the demonstrators.

The part played by the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign in the demonstration was generally agreed to be the most effective. Banners were carried and N.L.F. and North Vietnamese flags were flown. Placards ranging from: "Cease supporting American aggression" to "Support the N.L.F." and "Victory for the Vietcong" were also carried. An effigy of Johnson was made by members and this was burnt by them outside Consulate. One member of the Campaign is included in the delegation of three which will meet the Consul.

NOTTINGHAM'S LABOUR COUNCIL BANS VIETNAM EXHIBITION from a CND reader

Relieved of all restraint by the emasculation of the Nottingham City Labour Party, resulting from the disciplinary actions taken by Transport House last year, Nottingham's conservative Labour Council has refused permission for the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation's Vietnam Exhibition to be displayed at one of the city's art galleries. Labour aldermen and Tory councillors spoke with indistinguishable voices in defence of their refusal to permit "propaganda". This was also the line taken by Alderman Mrs. Case, who is Chairman of the Art Galleries Committee and is also, ironically, a paid-up member of C.N.D.

With widespread support from C.S.E., C.N.D., Labour Party members and trade unionists, the Exhibition has been found an alternative venue at the Co-operative Education Centre, Broad Street, Nottingham, where it will be open on Friday, 10th February from 12 noon until 9.30 p.m., and on Saturday, 11th February, from 10 a.m. to 5.30 p.m.

Allied with the Exhibition is a Public Meeting on Vietnam, sponsored by CSE, to be held at the Albert Hall Institute, Derby Road, on Friday 10th February, at 7.30 p.m. The speakers include Ralph Schoenman, Secretary-General of the International War Crimes Tribunal, and Professor Setsure Tsurushima, a member of one of its Investigating Teams. Both have only just returned from Cambodia and Vietnam.

Chemical and Biological Warfare in South Vietnam

By Dr R. J. RUTMAN,* U.S.A.

THE USE BY U.S. MILITARY FORCES in South Vietnam of chemical agents directed against personnel and against crops or food supplies (*New York Times*, 25 March, 21 December 1965; 11 September 1966; and *Vietnam Courier* (Hanoi), 31 January 1966) has focused new attention on the issue of chemical and biological (C-B) warfare. There is every reason to believe that this development is not coincidental, but involves the deliberate intention of testing and evaluating C-B weapons as a new major strategy applicable to the special conditions of guerilla warfare as they exist in underdeveloped countries. For this reason, it may be anticipated that the variety and intensity of this form of warfare will increase in direct proportion to the commitment of the U.S. to military solutions.

Destruction of rice crops

According to information currently available, limited gas warfare, involving tear and nausea gases, has been used against military and civilian targets. No reports of the use of so-called lethal or incapacitating agents (mustard or nerve gases) have been encountered, but there has also been no U.S. statement that these would not be used in South Vietnam. In addition, defoliation, originally intended to reduce overhead cover in densely wooded areas, has been extended to the specific destruction of rice crops, the staple food in Vietnam. According to the *New York Times* the use of arsenicals and chlorphenoxyacetic acids will be expanded to encompass 1 500 000 acres in the coming year, leading to a potential destruction of one-third to one-half of the rice crop in the northern part of South Vietnam. There have also been no reports of the use of germ warfare, but there have been persistent reports of major increases in the incidence of plague.

C-B agents can be produced cheaply and involve relatively simple technology, so are accessible with ease to all nations. There is also no obvious limit to the way certain of these agents (poisons, toxins, virus, bacteria) can be disseminated and there is no foreseeable defence effective against all of these agents. Thus, the failure to control the use of C-B warfare and the

first use actions by the U.S. pose hazards to humanity which are in some ways as great if not greater than those posed by the failure to control atomic weapons.

While the first use of C-B weapons has not produced major repercussions in the U.S., particular interest currently focuses on an effort by faculty members at American universities to rid their campuses of projects concerned with C-B warfare. At the University of Pennsylvania, a major centre of C-B weapons research, suspected of involvement in the present uses in South Vietnam, the faculty voted last year to bar secret or classified research from the campus. Although the University administration accepted this policy, the contested research was renewed on the grounds that it was not restricted and was freely publishable, despite statements to the contrary by project directors and by U.S. military officials. However, during the summer, *Ramparts* magazine, ran an exposé of the University policy and this led to administrative responses suggesting that the University was about to terminate the C-B projects. Currently, the faculty is undertaking a review of the entire situation. In the main, faculty members have concerned themselves with the conflict between secret research and the open publishability features of academic freedom but a substantial part of the faculty at Penn has also held that inhumane, illegal research objectives are incompatible with the goals and purposes of a university. These faculty members have also contended that the C-B research is part of the chain of links to present applications in Vietnam and therefore, under the Nuremberg Code, is a war crime.

The Geneva Protocols

Although the U.S. does not regard itself as party to any of the treaties specifically forbidding C-B warfare, there are strong reasons to believe that U.S. action directly violates international law. First, there is the widely held view that with the adoption of the Geneva Protocols of 1925, the first use of C-B warfare is now prohibited by the customary rules of international law. In fact, this position is implicit in President Franklin Roosevelt's World War II declaration that the use of C-B weapons have "been outlawed by the general opinion of civilized mankind" and "we

*The author is Associate Professor, Department of Chemistry, University of Pennsylvania and National Secretary of the American Association of Scientific Workers.

shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies". Secondly, beginning with the Hague Conventions and culminating with the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg, deliberate attacks upon, or starvation of, civilian populations have been regarded as crimes against humanity (war crimes); in the context of Vietnam an attack on a rice crop is a potentially genocidal act and therefore potentially subject to the full sanctions of the Nuremberg Code.

Apart from legal grounds, the use of C-B warfare has been opposed on moral grounds, for it has long been known that C-B weapons are relatively

indiscriminate and that, therefore, the victims are likely to include the most susceptible targets, i.e., children, the elderly and pregnant women. In general, the designation of standard doses, a device intended to restrict lethality, is regarded as dubious because it is a probability function based on a large number of uncontrolled variables. In the case of one class of C-B weapons, the bacteriological agents, the results are inherently unpredictable and uncontrollable because of unknowns in the responses of different target populations and the probability of genetic alteration in the agents (virus, bacteria) following dissemination.

U.S. scientists write to President Johnson

22 American scientists, including seven Nobel Laureates, were the initial signatories to a letter of 19 September 1966 to the U.S. President. The text of the letter and the list of signatories appear below. The letter has since gained the support of the Federation of American Scientists and been circulated for additional signatures.

Dear Mr. President:

We, the American scientists whose names appear below, wish to warn against any weakening of the world-wide prohibitions and restraints on the use of chemical and biological (CB) weapons.

CB weapons have the potential of inflicting, especially on civilians, enormous devastation and death which may be unpredictable in scope and intensity; they could become far cheaper and easier to produce than nuclear weapons, thereby placing great mass destructive power within reach of nations not now possessing it; they lend themselves to use by leadership that may be desperate, irresponsible, or unscrupulous. The barriers to the use of these weapons must not be allowed to break down.

During the Second World War, the United States maintained a firm and clearly stated policy of not initiating the use of CB weapons. However, in the last few years the U.S. position has become less clear. Since the late 1950's, Defense Department expenditures on CB weapons have risen several fold—and there has been no categorical reaffirmation of the World War II policy.

Most recently, U.S. forces have begun the large-scale use of anti-crop and "non-lethal" anti-personnel chemical weapons in Vietnam. We believe that this sets a dangerous precedent, with long term hazards far outweighing any probable short term military advantage. The employment of any one CB weapon weakens the barriers to the use of others. No lasting distinction seems feasible between incapacitating and lethal weapons or between chemical and biological warfare. The great variety of possible agents forms a continuous spectrum from the temporarily incapacitating to the highly lethal. If the restraints on the use of one kind of CB weapon are broken down, the use of others will be encouraged.

Therefore, Mr. President, we urge that you:

Institute a White House study of overall government policy regarding CB weapons and the possibility of arms control measures, with a view to maintaining and reinforcing the world-wide restraints against CB warfare.

Order an end to the employment of anti-personnel and anti-crop chemical weapons in Vietnam.

Re-establish and categorically declare the intention of the United States to refrain from initiating the use of chemical and biological weapons.

• The Signatories

Felix Bloch, Physics, Stanford University; Nobel Laureate, 1952.

Konrad E. Bloch, Chemistry, Harvard University; Nobel Laureate, 1964.

James F. Crow, Medical Genetics, University of Wisconsin.

William Doring, Sterling Chemical Laboratory, Yale University.

Paul Doty, Chemistry, Harvard University.

Freeman J. Dyson, Institute for Advanced Study.

John T. Edsall, The Biological Laboratories, Harvard University.

Bernard Feld, Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Irwin C. Gunsalus, Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, University of Illinois.

Robert Hofstadter, Physics, Stanford University; Nobel Laureate, 1961.

Arthur Kornberg, Biochemistry, Stanford University Medical School; Nobel Laureate, 1959.

Fritz Lipmann, Rockefeller University; Nobel Laureate, 1953.

Robert B. Livingston, School of Medicine, University of California at San Diego.

Matthew Meselson, The Biological Laboratories, Harvard University.

Severo Ochoa, New York University School of Medicine; Nobel Laureate, 1959.

Ray D. Owen, Division of Biological Sciences, California Institute of Technology.

Keith R. Porter, The Biological Laboratories, Harvard University.

Charles Price, Chemistry, University of Pennsylvania.

Eugene Rabinowitch, Botany, University of Illinois.

E. L. Tatum, Rockefeller University; Nobel Laureate, 1958.

George Wald, The Biological Laboratories, Harvard University.

Paul Dudley White, Boston, Massachusetts.

Low wages attract investors to South Korea

A particularly cynical article in an economic supplement to the January 27 issue of the New York Times shows exactly what is meant when the Americans claim that they are defending South Korea for the "free world." Entitled "Low Korean wage draws investors," the article reads:

"Low wage scales and the ability to learn new skills quickly are attracting an increasing number of foreign investors to Korea....Thirty-nine foreign concerns are operating here or have secured Government approval to invest in wholly owned plants or ventures with Korean businessmen. The investments total \$50 million and nearly twice that in loans. Twenty-five companies are American, with investments of \$41 million. Their lines range from oil refining to fertilisers, electronic products, truck manufacturing, sweater knitting, and mink breeding.

"Major American concerns include Gulf, Caltex and Skelly oil companies. Three electronics manufacturers are setting up plants around Seoul to assemble such products as integrated circuits and television tuners....One American economic official here said: 'Korea is probably the last frontier in the free world where you can find a large supply of low-cost and competent labour.' With this in mind, representatives of more than 100 American companies visited Seoul last year to look into investment possibilities. A survey conducted two years ago placed the average Korean wage one-eighth that of Japan, one-fourth of Hong Kong and one-half of Taiwan." (Editorial note: these figures are not misprints.) "....According to recent Bank of Korea figures, the average factory worker earns roughly \$21.15 a month." (Approximately £7. 12s) "But the low wage is not the only factor that makes foreign investments profitable. Equally attractive is the adaptability of Korean workers to new skills.

"If we had looked only for low wages we could have gone to Africa," James Stokes, president of the Signetics Korea Corporation, said. The company, employing Korean girls, has recently begun producing integrated circuits at a temporary plant in downtown Seoul.....Another thing I like about Koreans is that they're very hard workers. They're used to hard work and they don't mind working long hours...." Of course, when the Korean workers start to organise against the super-exploitation "communist subversion" will be blamed.

The affects of the July measures

Recently published National Income and Expenditure figures (from the Treasury Bulletin) show the economic consequences of the July measures. Wages - after taking into seasonal adjustments - rose only $\frac{1}{2}\%$ in the third quarter, against $1\frac{1}{2}\%$ between the first and second quarters. Personal consumption fell by 2% in the third quarter and there was a sharp reduction in personal savings (although this figure is subject to a wide margin or error). Company profits were some 4% lower in the first nine months of 1966 compared with the corresponding figure for 1965. Dividends were £30 million higher in the first three quarters of 1966 than in the same period of the preceding year - this rise was concentrated mostly in the first quarter. Private investment was nearly 3% down - with the fall largely concentrated in housing - while public sector investment rose by 5% .