

The Week

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS

6^D

Volume 8 No. 6. August 9th 1967

U THANT and the LEFT —

DEFEND CIVIL LIBERTY



71 Onslow Gdns., London, N.10. Subscription: £2 per annum & pro rata.

DRIFTER

CIVIL

LIBERTY

THE WEEK

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS

6p

Volume 5 No. 6 August 2nd 1981



U THANT AND

THE LEFT —

21 Grafton Street, London, W.1. Subscriptions: £5 per annum & postage

CONTENTS

Page	1	Editorial notes.	Page	2	Labour Party conference.
"	3	Political notes.	"	4	NALSO protest.
"	5	Right-wing disloyalty?	"	6	U Thant and Vietnam.
"	7	Vietnam notes.	"	8	DRV criticises Brockway.
"	9	More political notes.	"	10	Hammersmith VSC impact.
"	11	Mercenaries sensation.	"	12	Industrial notes.

* * * * *

CIVIL LIBERTIES UNDER ATTACK

Michael Defreitas, best known as Michael X, was stopped last week from speaking at the L.S.E. and is reported as saying that he is under immediate danger of being arrested. There have been press reports that special branch men are carrying out intense investigations in connection with Stokely Carmichael's visit to this country. Doctor Joseph Berke, who organised the Dialectics of Liberation conference, has been informed that he is likely to be prosecuted if he publishes a recording of Stokely's speech to that conference. It would appear that the British ruling class is determined to nip in the bud any development of a militant organisation among West Indians and other black people in this country. The spectre of black power is haunting them too.

On the other hand, numerous racist journals continue to appear and the operation of the Race Relations Board mechanism is characterised by its slowness and ineffectiveness. "Europeans only" notices continue to shame the accommodation notice boards in London and other big cities. A report issued in the London Borough of Hammersmith last week emphasised that immigrant children on leaving school have nothing like the jobs' opportunities that white London-born children have. If the newspaper The People is to be believed - and the Government's mini-worded denials are not very convincing - the Labour administration is actively supporting the recruitment of mercenaries; even to the extent of paying their wages. Truly, this Government must be one of the most hypocritical in British history!

The Labour movement must counter the challenge to civil liberties posed by the Government's attitude. It should not be deterred by the hysteria of the capitalist press and reactionary Tory politicians like Duncan Sandys. This movement of ours must be very firm and clear: it must acquire a sensitive and deep understanding of the issues involved. The crude distortions of the concept of black power - whether they come "left" or right - must be opposed. An attack on the rights of Michael Defreitas is an attack on civil liberties and should be countered as such.

ABERFAN: A CASE FOR WORKERS' CONTROL

It is a normal part of the functioning of the capitalist system to choose scapegoats when some scandal comes to light. We are not friends of Lord Robens but we recognise that he is filling this role. This not merely distorts the truth - it fails to get to grips with the real problem: the lives of men, women and children are being subordinated, as always under capitalism, to profitability. Socialists should counter the demand for a scapegoat with a demand for complete workers control of every aspect of the mining industry - and other industries - which concerns safety. And it should be workers' control with teeth: the power to override management investment decisions if this is necessary for safety reasons. This is the real lesson.

When Labour meets in Conference at Scarborough in October, what are the main problems which will confront the delegates?

The "bread-and-butter" issues will be uppermost in the minds of most delegates, especially those from Scotland, the North-East, South Wales and other areas especially highly-hit by the rapid rise in unemployment. It was not for this that they worked so hard to return a Labour Government with a thumping majority.

From the mining villages of South Wales, Durham, Scotland and Kent delegates will come anxious about the future of their industry and about their own livelihoods. Labour, the party which, by definition, believes in planning has set in motion a process of pit closing without making adequate provision for alternative employment for the displaced miners.

When Labour met at Blackpool in 1965 Harold Wilson could still bask in the glow of achievement - the magical survival of a Labour Government on a majority of three. In 1966, in Brighton they could still blame the sorry condition of the national economy on 13 years of Tory misrule.

What can Wilson, Callaghan & Co. boast about today?

That they have used their power to save a capitalist system which Labour came into being to destroy? That they have done so on the backs of the working class whose votes put them in power? That, in foreign policy, they are aligned with the world's most powerful capitalist country, giving whole-hearted support to its efforts to hold back the rising tide of revolution in Asia, Africa and South America?

These anxieties are reflected in the resolutions on the Conference agenda. On balance the resolutions amount to a vote of no confidence in this Labour Government but manifest an abiding faith in socialism as the only solution to the problems which beset Britain and the world today. The enemies of Labour can draw no comfort from the critical tone of the resolutions. Indeed, if the majority of the resolutions on Prices and Incomes, on the economy, on the European Common Market, transport, coal and Foreign Policy are carried by Conference and put into effect by the Labour Government, the foundations for a socialist Britain will have been well and truly laid.

This brings us to the crux of the whole matter. Who decides Labour's policy - Conference, the voice of the whole movement or a Cabinet cabal arrogantly assuming for itself a superiority of wisdom which it does not possess?

In theory and according to the letter of the constitution Annual Conference is the supreme policy making body of the Labour Party. Through the years a bureaucratic leadership has corroded away some of the legitimate rights of Conference the rank-and-file have always fought back, sometimes enlisting the support of powerful figures such as Anuerin Bevan. It is not so long ago that a certain Harold Wilson contested Hugh Gaitskell for the leadership of the Parliamentary party on this very issue!

LABOUR'S TASK AT SCARBOROUGH (Cont'd.)

When the leadership could rely on an Ernest Bevin or an Arthur Deakin to swing the massive trade union vote behind the platform they could afford to permit Conference the luxury of imagining that it was the fount of power. Those days are gone. There is a ferment in the Trade Unions, exemplified by the rise of Frank Cousins in the T. & G.W.U. and the support for Scanlon in the A.E.U. elections, which the leadership must take note of. Conference must, from Wilson's point of view, be transformed from a Parliament of Labour into a national demonstration of support for the leadership. This is perhaps the main issue which faces Conference in 1967.

There will be heated discussions on the economic issues and foreign policy. But perhaps the most significant fight will be waged round the resolution which will emerge from those submitted by Lincoln C.C.P., Newbury C.L.P. and others. They all call, to greater or lesser degree, for more real power for Conference. That from Newbury ends with:

"Conference further declares that unless the Prime Minister and the Government pays greater attention to Conference decisions and arrests the growing disillusionment of the electorate and active Party members, we shall be in grave danger of losing the next General Election."

These words are a challenge which must be taken up by the whole Conference. Scarborough's Spa Grand Hall is the historic place where the platform was defeated on the issue of nuclear disarmament. At Scarborough and after Scarborough Labour's rank-and-file must "fight, fight, and fight again" to save the Party from the dustbin of history into which it will inevitably be cast unless it becomes again the party of the working class; and the Labour Government becomes the conscious servant of the movement working with it for the socialist future of Britain and the world.

SOVIET - U.S. DEAL ON MIDDLE EAST? from a special correspondent

Official circles view the Middle East crisis as being effectively sealed off by a secret understanding between Washington and Moscow. They believe this understanding was reached at the end of the Glassboro summit between Johnson and Kosygin. The eagerness of the Soviet Union to make a compromise of the Vietnamese situation by negotiations has been extended to the Middle East, and their failure to maintain a line of solidarity with the victims of aggression there certainly seems to indicate a deal with the imperialists that the Yugoslavs suspect - much to their own agreement.

CHINESE H BOMBS DESIGNS BETTER THAN FRENCH. from a U.S. reader

In a report from the "Joint Congressional committee" in Washington concerning the possibilities of a development of China's H bomb, a report incidentally basing its findings on data from the C.I.A., it was said that China can develop a hydrogen bomb warhead by about 1970 with a yield in the megaton range for use on inter-continental ballistic missiles. "They now have the capability to design a multi-megaton thermo-nuclear device for delivery by aircraft."

N.A.L.S.O. SAYS LIFT STOKELY BAN

The following press statement was issued on August 7th by Bernard Reaney, chairman of the National Association of Labour Student Organisations, on behalf of that organisation:

N.A.L.S.O. deplores the decision of the Home Office to exclude Mr. Stokely Carmichael from the United Kingdom on the grounds that Mr. Carmichael holds views inimicable to those of the British Government and exercises his right to propagate them. It is not Mr. Carmichael or the militant advocates of Black Power who bear the responsibility for the recent outbreaks of violence in the cities of North America. It is the society which isolates a people, systematically degrades and exploits them, and hides its failings in the flabby rhetoric of the 'Great Society' which bears the total guilt for the incipient civil war which threatens the United States.

Driven North by the relentless pressure of mechanisation, and the Southern Bourbons the Negro is crowded into substandard urban accommodation in the crumbling hearts of the cities, where his lack of education, and increasing automation rob him of any chance of improving his position. These pressures are growing, and with them the hope of emancipation through the last desperate attack on privilege and exploitation. Black Power is the legitimate child of the ghettos and the slum tenements and its spokesmen are the leaders of the American Negro. Compromise has failed, but the threat of Watts, Newark and Detroit in every state of the Union will give an edge of iron to the Civil Rights struggle.

The reaction of the British Government in banning Stokely Carmichael from Britain expresses not only their usual subservience to the U.S. State Department's desire to silence every critic of its racist policies, but the fear that Carmichael's activities among British Negroes will encourage them to take up a more militant struggle against racism here. Despite the desperate efforts of the Wilson Government to appear to be combating racialism in Britain they have been forced through the logic of their position over Vietnam and the struggle of oppressed peoples everywhere, to strengthen the racist immigration laws passed in 1962 by a Conservative government. By pursuing this course of action they have given encouragement to those who would wish to see Negroes expelled from Britain in large numbers. Since Stokely Carmichael's visit to Britain the demand for a total ban on Negro immigration, and the 'repatriation' of those now living in Britain have again been raised. Part of this witchhunt is expressed in the vicious attacks mounted in the press against Michael X, the well known Black Nationalist.

N.A.L.S.O. reaffirms its fraternal solidarity with all Negro organisations in Britain fighting against the racist policies of the Wilson Government, and with similar student and Civil Rights groups risking their lives in the fight for racial equality in the United States.

IS GORMLEY ENCOURAGING DISAFFILIATION?

by Raymond Challinor

Workers at the Ebro engineering factory in Bolton have written to the local Labour Party. They say that, unless the Government alters its plans to stiffen the Race Relations Act, they will disaffiliate from the Labour Party. In a period of increasing unemployment, the Ebro workers consider British should have a prior claim for jobs, that definite and open discrimination against other nationals should take place.

While this incident is only a straw in the wind, it does indicate that the Government's economic policy, with its resultant rising unemployment, is likely to aggravate race relations in this country. This will be especially true in areas where men are out of work for prolonged periods.

In the past, union members at Ebro have not been renowned for their level of political consciousness. Their action would tend to confirm the view that the tactic of disaffiliation from the Labour Party is the response of the politically unsophisticated. But it also prompts the intriguing question of whether their conduct was prompted in any way --- the idea of leaving the Labour Party put there --- by recent publicity in the local papers.

The Bolton Evening News gave front page headlines to a speech by Mr. Joe Gormley at the Eastbourne conference of the N.U.M. He said there that he was so perturbed by the Labour Government's treatment of the mining industry that he was seriously considering tearing up his Labour Party card. Now Mr. Gormley sits on the National Executive Committee. When a person so prominent in the Party publicly expresses his grave doubts over continued membership, is it not likely to put misgivings in the minds of humbler members, such as those at Ebro?

But it raises yet another question. Mr. Gormley is chairman of the Party's Organisation Sub-Committee. As such, he is in charge of considering expulsions and the vetting of parliamentary candidates to see they are a 100 per cent Labour supporters. Should a man whose own loyalty appears to be so shaky hold such a responsible post? Perhaps Ken Coates would be doing a service if he rang Sara Barker and asked for Mr. Gormley's position to be investigated by Transport House.

U.S. BOMBER VETO FOR PERU SHOWS WHO'S THE REAL BOSS.

by Jim. Clough

On August 3rd the U.S. State Department said that it had blocked the sale of British Canberra Jet bombers to Peru because of that Country's "current financial difficulties" and the pressing need to stabilise its economy. This recent revelation would certainly appear to have the effect that any misconceptions about the ruling Oligarchs in Peru being independent, must now be crushed under the weight of a real demonstration of the truth, and expose them as the puppets that they are. The reason for this ban of sale by the US State Department is a little mystifying. They claim that they have no intention of selling their own aircraft to Peru. Their reason is that "economic development and stabilisation are of course its first priority". The US State Department is not usually as blatant in showing up the relationships between poor countries and the US., as it has been in this instance. Perhaps "economic development" means greater investments for US capital, and this is just that little bit more important at this time than, than the bombers which were to be used to supplement those that have already dropped their cargoes of death on the Andean peasants.

U Thant's latest pontifications on Vietnam (July 30 '67) do not help the anti-imperialist cause. No socialist should expect anything else. But a part of the Left still looks to U Thant for some kind of leadership in the Vietnam crisis. This is one of the continuing sources of confusion among the British Left on Vietnam. Consequently, there is a lack of socialist argument about Vietnam as such Left groups e.g. C.N.D. and the C.P., give considerable priority to finding common ground with various religious organisations in popular front politics.

The lack of socialist content in U Thant's latest analysis of the Vietnam crisis is very clear. Apart from his remark which likened the historical struggle of the Vietnamese to that of the Americans in the 18th century, there are no progressive remarks in U Thant's recent speech.

It is not helpful for U Thant to say that the continuation of the Vietnam war is "totally unnecessary". This is a useless and totally unnecessary remark. It gets us nowhere.

U Thant says that he is worried that the Vietnam (and Middle East) war could have a bad effect on the relationship between the U.S.S.R. and U.S. Governments. U Thant advocates more co-operation between the two "super powers" as a key to peace. This seems to be unrealistic advice - especially for the U.S.S.R. After all, the current practical experience of the U.S.S.R.'s "peaceful co-existence" policies have allowed the U.S. rulers to extend their arrogance of imperialist power notably in Asia, Latin America and the Middle East.

Superficially it may appear to some people on the Left that U Thant's emphasis on the non-Communist aspects of the Vietnamese people's struggle for national liberation is progressive. After all, it may be argued, part of the National Liberation Front is non-Communist. This is true. However, U Thant's emphasis on the non-Communist elements in the Vietnam war is part of his non-socialist argument which leads him on to say that the ideological aspect is not important, that it is quite possible for all parties to get around the conference table and that the war is "totally unnecessary".

Just as U Thant's analysis of the Vietnam war is non-socialist, so too are his suggested solutions. He is equally critical of those who seek military victory through escalation and those who want to get the Americans troops out of Vietnam immediately: "It seems to me that nothing could be more dangerous than this kind of thinking, that the only alternatives are military escalation and immediate withdrawal. I am convinced that there are other alternatives..." However he does not say, even suggest what these are. U Thant acts as a diplomat. And he apparently thinks it is undiplomatic to demand immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops.

The sooner the British Left adopts a socialist critique of U Thant's approach the better will be the chance of building a real anti-imperialist campaign. The North Vietnamese (and N.L.F.) rightly rejected U Thant's earlier plan (March 28 '67) with the remark that "the Vietnam problem has no concern with the United Nations, and the United Nations has absolutely no right to interfere in the Vietnam question". This is historically correct.

U THANT, SOCIALISTS AND VIETNAM (Cont'd.)

Instead of continuing a policy of political 'tail-endism' on Vietnam (behind U Thant), the British Left should be now fully campaigning for the October 22 Mobilisation and for the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops - however many diplomatic headaches this may cause in Washington and New York.

* * * * *

VIETNAM NOTES by George Collinson

The nature of the U.S. Government's role in Vietnam is continually exposed in the Western press.

In a report dated 25/7/67 in the International Herald Tribune the following conclusions are reached:

Observers (Government) can see no signs of enthusiasm for the forthcoming 'Presidential' elections in South Vietnam's provincial capitals. Rural areas are largely unaware of the coming vote, and those that are, seem likely to support 'whoever is in power', because they think there is no choice anyway. The people also believe they are expected to vote for those in power. "None of the ten civilian candidates still in the race has indicated he will campaign actively to try to reach the people or will disagree with the government on any of the fundamental issues of Vietnam". So the Saigon 'government' is organising a presidential election of which most of the people are unaware, and those that are aware are somehow receiving 'indications' as to whom they should vote for.

The report continues, "Since the promulgation of the constitution April 1, the government (Saigon) won everytime it went to bat against the Constituent Assembly. Election laws were shaped according to the government's wishes. Those candidates known to be objectionable to the government were barred from standing. The power of the generals in the last month has been absolute".

Now we know that the 'democratic future' of Vietnam (U.S. style) is arranging an election in which the only candidates are those not opposed to the hyenas Thieu & Ky. As well as that, those people told anything about the election are given an 'indication' to make sure they vote for the right puppets. When Thieu & Ky are 'elected' on September 3 the U.S. administration will, no doubt, start to tell us once again about the wonderful job they are doing in Vietnam, and how ~~through~~ their efforts the people of South Vietnam now have elected representatives.

We shall have to work hard to ensure that the Left in Britain is not thrown into confusion by this.

Another report in the Herald Tribune of 26/7/67 (U.P.I.) says "Vietcong terrorists kidnapped five men and woman in a Saigon suburb today and executed them on a main highway in a grisly warning to anti-Communist Vietnamese". The report goes on to quote a government spokesman as saying that the terrorists were dressed in South Vietnamese Ranger uniforms. This is an obvious attempt to cover up the excesses of the puppet army. Even assuming that the N.L.F. forces would need to give such warnings, they are hardly likely to issue anti-Government warnings dressed in Government uniforms. The Americans aren't even good liars.

BROCKWAY DISTORTS THE TRUTH

from 'Vietnam Courier', July 24, 1967

"At the International Congress to discuss the Vietnam problem in Stockholm in early July, the delegates of both North and South Vietnam energetically denounced the U.S. aggression in Vietnam and exposed the correct stand of the Vietnamese people on the settlement of the Vietnam issue. This was warmly hailed by the Congress. But according to Western reports a British politician, Brockway, who attended the Congress, made the assertion that the Vietnamese people have "lowered their demand". He said that he would inform Johnson and discuss the matter with British Foreign Minister Brown, the propagandist of U.S. "peace negotiations".

This allegation is a mere distortion of the stand of the Vietnamese people; it runs counter to the appeal of the Congress demanding that the U.S. definitively and unconditionally put an end to the bombing, shelling and other war acts against the D.R.V.N., stop aggression, definitively and unconditionally withdraw all U.S. and satellite troops and war materials, dismantle all U.S. bases in South Vietnam and let the Vietnamese people settle themselves their internal affairs without interference from outside, on the basis of independence, democracy, peace and neutrality and in conformity with the platform of the South Vietnam N.L.F., the sole authentic representative of the fundamental aspirations of the South Vietnamese people.

The allegation that the Vietnamese people have "lowered the demand" in their stand on the Vietnam problem is only profitable to the U.S. imperialists who are trying to bring pressure to bear on the Vietnamese people fool world opinion which has been staunchly supporting the Vietnamese people in their struggle against the U.S. aggressors.

The leaders of the D.R.V.N. have also clearly pointed out that if the U.S. government sincerely desires to talk with the D.R.V.N. government, it must first of all definitively and unconditionally stop the bombing, shelling and other acts of war against the D.R.V.N."

This statement exposes the hypocrisy of those who claim that their call for negotiations reflects the wishes of the Vietnamese people. A lasting solution to the Vietnam problem can only be reached on the basis of an immediate and complete withdrawal of U.S. and satellite troops and the recognition of the right of the Vietnamese people to decide their own future.

SUPPORT THE AMERICAN PROTEST MOVEMENT from David Robinson

Plans for a massive demonstration in support of the March on Washington during the weekend of October 21-22 are now taking shape. The October 22 Vietnam Ad Hoc Committee held its second meeting this week and small sub-committees have been set up to take responsibility for each aspect of the demonstration. The London area has been divided into areas on the basis of boroughs and supporters have been allocated to contact all local groups in their area. Publicity among Americans will be undertaken by members of the Stop-It Committee, a committee based on the L.S.E. which has the support of NALSO and the RSA will contact students, Rebel will organise L.P.Y.S. support and individual Y.C.L. members will contact branches. Anyone who can help in any way should contact myself at 739 6951.

NEW LEFT REVIEW 44

The July/August edition of NLR contains at least three important articles. Jon Halliday writes on "Japan - Asian Capitalism", attempting to distinguish the important historical and contemporary features of the country which is about to become the third industrial power in the world. This is a subject which is worthy of much greater attention in socialist journals. An interview with Isaac Deutscher on the Arab-Israel war provides a useful clarification of the confusion which has hit the left on this issue. He also pays particular attention to the role of the Soviet Union in the crisis showing how the demands of 'peaceful co-existence' have once again led her rulers into the most contradictory position. Deutscher makes it plain that Soviet assurances must largely explain Arab unpreparedness for Israel's pre-emptive strike. Nicolas Krasso contributes an article on 'Trotsky's Marxism', which is bound to raise considerable controversy. He attempts to show that the latter suffered, throughout his lifetime, from a constant tendency to over-estimate the importance of the movement of social classes and to ignore political considerations. He goes on to examine Trotsky's attitude to the party, the industrialisation debates, the theory of permanent revolution etc. in the light of this analysis. It is to be hoped that this article will provoke further contributions. The Review also contains contributions in the 'Work' series from 2 railway employees, further discussion on students and the Dominican Republic and a note by Conor Cruis O'Brien on 'Encounter' magazine. Obtainable from NLR, 7, Carlisle Street, London, W.1. 5/-.

JAPAN'S £530m. VIETNAM WAR PROFITS

An article from Christopher Lucas, Tokyo, in the Sunday Times, 6th August, says banking circles in Japan estimate earnings from the Vietnam war at a possible £530m in 1967. The Fuji Bank's Chief Economist, Shigeo Kurebayashi warned of possible balance of payments difficulties if Vietnam war exports were to decrease too rapidly. The figure also includes US expenditure on expanding their hospitals, bases etc. in Japan and on ship and aircraft repairs. Amongst the Japanese fast selling lines were camouflage jackets, jungle boots, electric generators, prefabricated buildings and plastic bags for wrapping home coming American corpses.

BRITISH TROOPS AGAINST TRADE UNIONS

'The Times' 2nd August contained a report from David Bonavia, Hongkong, that 117 people were arrested when Hongkong police assisted by British troops raided seven sets of premises occupied by a Chinese labour union, the Government, Armed Forces and Hospitals Chinese Workers' Association. It was alleged that their premises were used for the manufacture of homemade weapons. Police were said to have found tins with cotton wadding and fuses which could have made up bombs. Such reports have been frequent in the past few weeks. In many cases no attempt has been made to disguise the fact that the sole aim has been the destruction of 'propaganda' (i.e. leaflets and posters etc.). Such actions and allegations are all too reminiscent of the methods used by British government's of the nineteenth century against Reform agitators, Chartists and Trade Unionists. Even Lord Rhodes, ex-Secretary of State at the Board of Trade was moved to protest publicly last week at the backward state of industrial relations and particularly at the low wages prevalent in the colony. The British Labour Movement should protest most strongly at Wilson's government taking up this blatantly anti-labour stance in Hongkong.

The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation's Vietnam Exhibition continued its nationwide tour with a visit to Hammersmith Town Hall last week. This was one of a series of events organised by the Hammersmith Vietnam Solidarity Committee. This Committee has received widespread Press publicity recently on account of the support given to it by local Labour Party councillors and officers who are said to be in trouble with the party establishment for lending their names to an organisation which is unambiguously committed to the support of victory for the National Liberation Front. The Exhibition takes no less firm a line, and it is interesting to note that in their publicised sponsorship of the Hammersmith event, the so-called "rebels" were joined by Frida Laski, and by three Labour Party M.P.s, Bill Molloy, John Ryan, and Hugh Jenkins.

The response to the Exhibition was encouraging; one leading Town Hall official was heard to remark that it was attracting more visitors in half an hour than the Council's own Art Exhibition attracted in a week. Even the anger of one military-looking Tory councillor could be taken as a compliment to the manner in which the Exhibition's message was going home. His loudly expressed opinion that it was a disgrace for the Town Hall to be utilised for such "propaganda" was echoed by one or two notorious conservatives from the Labour Party, but such sentiments were quite outweighed by the willing help in staffing the exhibition, and in distributing leaflets in the main street, given by many of their colleagues. Donations were generously given - many of them in paper money - and there was a brisk trade at the literature stall. Perhaps the most valuable response of all were the firm proposals made by visiting Labour Party members from two other London Boroughs for the Exhibition to be shown in their own areas. There was also an approach from sympathisers in Plymouth who were visiting London for the weekend and has been attracted to the Exhibition by the Press advertising.

In a subsequent issue of The Shepherds Bush Gazette, Councillor Chapman, leader of Hammersmith Council dismissed complaints at the use of the Town Hall and defended the Council's policy of opening the Hall to all organisations. "We have even let the Town Hall to the Conservatives, which is bad enough!"

The same paper carried on its front page a four-column story, with a banner headline: "They're Sick of the Left", alleging that right-wing members of Hammersmith Town Council's Labour Group were moving out "because they are sick and tired of left-wing domination." The article also quotes Tory Alderman Smith as saying, "One prominent member of the Labour Party has told me there are six Trotskyists on Hammersmith Council."

The line is a continuation of the one followed by both local newspapers for many months, and it is healthy to see that Councillor Chapman has reacted by attacking the Tories. It is a lead which should be followed by those who are obviously more interested in publicly, though usually anonymously, attacking the left-wing policies which can give new life to the Party.

The story published last Sunday in the People claiming that mercenaries were being recruited for the Yemen and 'any under-developed country in the Middle-East or Africa where military help is needed demands serious investigation. The evidence gathered by the People reporters is quite considerable, and astounding.

Captain Richard Pirie, Adjutant of the 21st Special Air Service (Artist Rifles) Volunteers, a territorial unit in Chelsea, told the reporter that his office was used as a clearing ground for mercenaries. The mercenaries names are passed through Captain Piries, "to a man at a secret address". Before this, the military records of the mercenaries are forwarded, 'through the foreign office' - the mercenaries' wages of £250 per month are paid through the Foreign Office and the Ministry of Defence. Pirie said that the mercenary's main purpose was to train the regular army of the country they were in. To do this they actually took part in battle to show the local troops how to fight. Most of the recent volunteers, he said, 'have asked to fight for the Royalists in the Yemen'. 'We have to be careful, about this affair', he went on, 'the Government would blow its top if too much news came out about our hiring mercenaries. Why it should be secret I don't know. The Egyptians must know that the Yemenis are being supported by Britons or British Dominion troops. So why keep it under the hat?'

Why indeed ! If the recruitment of mercenaries is going on through the Foreign Office, and the evidence strongly indicates that this is the case, then Wilson and Healey certainly don't want it known publicly throughout the Labour Movement. It exposes their whole rotten pretence to be arbiters in world affairs. How can anybody believe the government's claim to have banned Stokely Carmichael from Britain in the interests of good race relation, while they provide a recruiting ground for gangs of racist thugs to reinforce the counter revolution against the colonial struggles. How does this add up with the recent banning of student representatives of North Vietnam who were invited to Britain by the 'Youth for Peace in Vietnam' committee?

Labour members of parliament and all socialist should demand an immediate enquiry into the reports of mercenaries being recruited by a department of the army and press for the immediate cessation of recruiting activities by private or government agencies, coupled with a renewed effort to gain entrance for representatives of the NLF, and a campaign against the banning of Stokely Carmichael from Britain.

* * * * *

ADVERTISERS' ANNOUNCEMENT

International Socialist Review - Contents of the July-August Issue

1. The Case for a Neo-Marxist Theory by David Horowitz, and 'Monopoly Capitalism' and the Labour Theory of Value by Ernest Mandel.
2. Is Marxism-Leninism Obsolete? by Joseph Hansen.
3. "The Last Year of Malcolm X: The Evolution of a Revolutionary" by George Novack.
4. The Last Year of Malcolm X: The Evolution of a Revolutionary" by George Breitman.

Price (1-3) 2/6 plus 6d post per single copy. (4) 14/6 per copy.
Obtainable at Pioneer Book Service, 8, Toynbee Street, London, E.1.

Strike Action on London Docks.

Men working on the West India Dock have decided to continue their week-old unofficial strike over quayside manning arrangements. Dockers walked off the MV Benledi last week after complaining that one gang on the quay was having to unload handle cargo being unloaded by two gangs on the ship. The normal method is for one gang on board to unload to one gang on the quay. More than 1,000 men are now on strike and 13 ships are idle.

Work was further disrupted in the Port of London on Tuesday when more than 3,000 men in the Royal Group of docks stopped work for a two-hour unofficial meeting at which they demanded a better deal for older dockers. The meeting was the biggest in recent times and ended with a unanimous vote not to accept decasualisation until the employers met demands for a voluntary early retirement scheme at 60, with severance pay of £5,000 and a pension of £8 10s. a week at 65, with the option of taking it at 60. The Minister of Labour, Ray Gunter, was unable to confirm that decasualisation will be implemented on September 15 before Parliament rose last week because of the pension issue. Some 5,000 dockers are expected to be made redundant in London within the next three years and in order to help ease the situation the employers want to reduce the retiring age from 68 to 65. A dockers' national delegate conference recently rejected their offer of lump sum payments - ranging from £150 to £600 to men between 63 and 67 - in compensation for earlier retirement, unless they were to be made on a voluntary basis. The union is pressing for a much larger sum on the ground that a docker simply reporting for work would get more than £2,000 in three years. The conference also decided to continue pressing for a minimum pension of £5 a week at 65. The very generous terms recently announced by the government for members of the armed forces who will become redundant over the next few years clearly shows the way members of the working class such as miners and dockers are being discriminated against. Schemes for rationalisation, whether they be in the mines, the steel industry or the docks, must be not be accepted unless realistic compensation is offered to those made redundant.

Roberts-Arundel 'Blacked' by Railwaymen.

The campaign to 'black' the American-owned textile machinery company of Roberts-Arundel at Stockport, took an upturn last Tuesday when railwaymen in the greater Manchester and Stockport areas agreed not to handle the firm's goods. The decision follows a resolution by the Manchester district council of the National Union of Railwaymen, declaring their intention to redoubles their efforts to make action against the firm effective.

The unions have been in dispute with the company since last November when the management dismissed its work force, who were involved in a strike, and engaged non-union labour. Since then the firm has refused to recognise trade unions.

Building Strike in Hounslow.

Some 200 tradesmen on the Turriff Construction Ivy Bridge housing site for Hounslow Borough Council came out on strike on Tuesday. Fifty members of the A.S.W. have been out since Monday in protest against moves to replace the labour force with labour-only gangs.