

# The Week

6<sup>D</sup>

- DOMINICA
- WORKERS' CONTROL
- STEEL NATIONALISATION
- COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOLS
- GEORGE BROWN, FRANK COUSINS,  
AND THE T.G.W.U.

# LINER TRAINS

The N.U.R.'S CASE

THE WEEK - A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS

Subscription rates: 13 weeks: 10/-  
                          26   "    £1  
                          1 year  £2

Students 25% discount.

Business address: 54, Park Rd.,  
Lenton,  
Nottingham.

Volume 3. No. 18. May 6th, 1965

CONTENTS

Page 191:.	The Economist and Mr. Brown.
" 192:	Incomes policy.
" 193:	U.S. unions say "nationalise"
" 194:	Manchester May Day storm.
" 195:	Workers' Control conference.
" 196:	Liner trains.
" 197:	Support the N.U.R.
" 198:	Landlords V. tenants.
" 199:	Africa School.
" 200:	Comprehensive schools.
" 201:	Harold Wilson in Hull.
" 202:	Dominica: the facts.

Professor E.A. Thompson joins The Week

Professor E.A. Thompson of Nottingham University has agreed to become a sponsor of The Week. He has been associated with many progressive causes and is a life-long socialist. Professor Thompson is also a sponsor of Voice of the Unions.

STOP PRESS: S.A.C.U. INAUGURAL MEETING

The inaugural meeting of the Society for Anglo-Chinese Understanding will take place in London on Saturday, 15th May, at Church House, Great Smith St., Westminster at 2.00 p.m. For full details write to: S.A.C.U., 4, Cavendish Place, London W.1.

EDITORIAL: STEEL AND THE MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

Readers of The Week understand their duty in the Labour movement quite well and do not require this journal to harangue them to work in the municipal elections. However, this year it is important to understand that there is more than usual significance in the municipal election results. Coming just after the first real clash between the Labour Government and the Tory and Liberal opposition over steel, the results will be considered an indication of public opinion on this vital matter. A swing to the Tories will be interpreted by them as a vote against steel nationalisation and their morale will be boosted.

A contrary development, and as Labour did very well in 1962 this could be achieved by Labour merely holding its own, would greatly assist the struggle to improve the Steel Bill.

....AND NOW DOMINICA

Compared with Johnson, Hitler, Genghis Khan and Tambovane were small time operators. They confined their operations to a continent at a time, but President - remember, he was supported by many as the "peace" candidate! - assumes the right to send troops anywhere in the world, at a moment's notice, without reference to anyone. This is not accidental nor a reflection of the psychology of the American leadership. This is the behaviour of a frightened ruling class, afraid of the growing movement for national and social liberation all over the world. It seeks to hold back history in the name of combatting communism. Can there be any doubt whose side we should be or? The ending of Britain's status as junior partner to U.S. imperialism becomes a most urgent task. It is good to see a growing realisation of this in the unions, in Parliament and the Labour Party. The Week will do all it can to achieve this end.

Business address: 24, Park Lane,  
London,  
W.1.  
Volume 2, No. 10, May 1953

Subscription rates: 15 weeks 10/-  
26 " 20  
1 year 35  
Students 25 discount

Professor E.A. Johnson joins the book

Professor E.A. Johnson of Nottingham University has agreed to become a sponsor of the book. It has been associated with many progressive causes and in a 10-page booklet Professor Johnson is also a sponsor of Vote of the United

THE FUTURE OF THE BRITISH ECONOMY

The book is a study of the future for the British economy. It is a book for those who are interested in the future of the British economy. It is a book for those who are interested in the future of the British economy. It is a book for those who are interested in the future of the British economy.

CONTENTS

Page 1	The Book and its Authors
" 2	Introduction
" 3	1. The Book and its Authors
" 4	2. The Book and its Authors
" 5	3. The Book and its Authors
" 6	4. The Book and its Authors
" 7	5. The Book and its Authors
" 8	6. The Book and its Authors
" 9	7. The Book and its Authors
" 10	8. The Book and its Authors
" 11	9. The Book and its Authors
" 12	10. The Book and its Authors
" 13	11. The Book and its Authors
" 14	12. The Book and its Authors
" 15	13. The Book and its Authors
" 16	14. The Book and its Authors
" 17	15. The Book and its Authors
" 18	16. The Book and its Authors
" 19	17. The Book and its Authors
" 20	18. The Book and its Authors
" 21	19. The Book and its Authors
" 22	20. The Book and its Authors

REVIEWS OF THE BOOK

Reviews of the book... The book is a study of the future for the British economy. It is a book for those who are interested in the future of the British economy. It is a book for those who are interested in the future of the British economy. It is a book for those who are interested in the future of the British economy.

THE FUTURE OF THE BRITISH ECONOMY

The book is a study of the future for the British economy. It is a book for those who are interested in the future of the British economy. It is a book for those who are interested in the future of the British economy. It is a book for those who are interested in the future of the British economy.

## "THE ECONOMIST" LIKES MR. BROWN

The first editorial of the May 1st issue of The Economist is entitled "The necessity of Mr. Brown"; and as can be expected from its title it goes on at great length to defend Mr. Brown and his Department of Economic Affairs. For Labour Party members it is the conclusion of the article which is most relevant:

"There remains a final danger. It is the danger hanging over the personal position of the First Secretary of State. He has remained some kudos this week, as he has persuaded some big unions formally to align themselves with his policy. He attracts real loyalty from a wide section of the Labour movement, and a real degree of affection from quite a wide section of the electorate outside it. But some grounds persist for the suspicion that Mr. Brown is not personally beloved by the Prime Minister.

"The political world is buzzing with rumour that if Mr. Brown commits any more personal indiscretions, Mr. Wilson will be only too happy to drop him. If Mr. Brown did disappear, a lot else might disappear with him: the idea of an incomes policy, the (generally) reformist influence of the D.E.A. in many fields of policy, perhaps even the D.E.A. itself. This would be a great misfortune, both on personal and institutional grounds. However infuriating and unstable Mr. Brown can often be, he is still at present an indispensable figure to all reformers who hope that some good may still come from this Labour Government. No other minister is so likely to bang the table, and speak up for his backroom staff's reformist and forward-looking ideas - even when those ideas clash with the double-jointed political manoeuvring which is too many other Labour ministers' interpretation of a statesman's natural role. The disappearance of this minister and this ministry are things that must not be allowed to happen..."

## WHY "MIK." IS MAD

The Financial Times published, the day after the Government's White Paper on steel nationalisation was made public, a table giving the proposed compensation prices of the shares of the nine companies which are to be taken over in toto (the other five consist of one already nationalised, and four subsidiaries.) It also gave the price of these shares on the Thursday prior to the announcement. The comparison is revealing:

Company	No. of shares (in millions)	Proposed Compensation Price		Thursday's Price	
		s	d	s	d
Colvilles	19.51	47	6	28	0
Consett	10.00	19	10	15	6
Dorman Long	22.50	29	10	23	9
Lancashire	9.00	34	3	21	4½
South Durham	13.87	26.	3	19	9
Steel of Wales	40.00	32	5	19	9
Stewart & Lloyds	49.50	32	5	29	9
Summers (John)	30.48	36	0	29	3
United Steel	50.00	38	3	27	6

No wonder the Financial Times commented in its editorial: "It must be admitted at once that the basis chosen for compensating shareholders in quoted steel companies is fair and that the terms are better than expected. The Government, which clearly has its eye on foreign opinion as well on the strength of the opposition to its proposals, may even be criticised by Labour's left wing for being unnecessarily generous..."

## FRANK COUSINS' UNION HOLDS THE LINE !

by a special correspondent

Things went largely as we feared. By Friday morning, most of the major unions had agreed to endorse Mr. Brown's incomes policy. At the shopworkers' conference and the AEU national executive committee, despite left-wing appeals of varying degrees of passion and cogency, the platforms were able to carry overwhelming support. As we expected, the appalling conditions of the low paid workers were used as a pretext for supporting the policy. When Mr. Best, of USDAW, held up his payslip, revealing a take home pay of £9 12s 9d, Mr. Allen's reply from the rostrum was: "I thought one of the reasons for an incomes policy was because our wages are too low". That same day Mr. Roy Jenkins was sternly heckled at Hall Green at a bye-election meeting, where "a man in the audience angrily suggested that it was a mockery to pay Mr. Aubrey Jones £300 a week to keep other people's wages down". Over in the AEU gathering, Sir William Carron had another field day, in which, in spite of the reservations of a number of delegates, the incomes policy came out on top. Will Paynter's reservations did not prevent the miners from lining up, either.

Once again the redeeming influence among the big battalions has proved to be the Transport and General Workers' Union. After a searching discussion, tensely unresolved until the very last moment, Frank Cousins' legions delivered their verdict. And a wise one it was, too. At Friday's conference, Harry Nicholas made a strong appeal that it would be most dangerous to decide too hastily. To switch on Mr. Brown's "guiding light" whilst dozens of outstanding claims were awaiting a decision could be most harmful. And the proposed machinery required serious attention before it could be set in motion. As The Week has repeatedly said, and Harry Nicholas made extremely plain, the price review body proposed is totally inadequate to ensure real control of profits. It can only deal with price increases after they have been implemented, while wage claims can be investigated before they are granted. "In other words, prices come after and wages can come before" said Mr. Nicholas.

Some shrewd points were made in the debate by Jim Mortimer and Clive Jenkins. DATA's spokesman stressed that 16,300 companies had declared their returns since the Statement of Intent had been ceremonially signed, and the result had shown distributed profits considerably inflated. Dividends after tax and depreciation had gone up by 20%, from £125m. to £150m. In this context hourly earnings and earnings per unit of output were still at the bottom of the West European league table. For ASSET, Clive Jenkins said that British labour costs were too low, and likely to remain too low. ASSET did not want an incomes policy as a sub-structure to Britain's role "East of Suez", which was a most damaging hindrance to our balance of payments.

In spite of the factual ammunition possessed by the left delegates, and in spite of the fact that none of Mr. Wilson's three basic conditions for an incomes policy (rising production, equity and social justice, and an effective control over rentier incomes as well as wages) have yet been met; the conference accepted the policy by 6,649,000 votes to 1,811,000.

But the last word has not yet been spoken. Up to now, executives have been feeling their loyalty to Mr. Wilson's administration far more effectively than their members' disquiet. But the need for a left turn by

Frank Cousins' union holds the line continued/

Mr. Wilson remain paramount, and it is beginning to be sharply felt at the grass roots. The NUR's difficulties, Ian Mikardo's very proper dislike of the exorbitant steel compensation, and the large warning letters which the T & GWU wrote on the wall at this conference, these things are only harbingers of much, much more to come.

Mr. Wilson's right wing, ably represented by the estimable Mr. Gunter, have begun to show their teeth. The Minister of Labour's appeal to the National Society of Metal Mechanics, last Sunday, took the form of an attack on skill differentials and a demand for a halt at the top of the wage scale while the low-paid workers clambered up. Of course, in practice, the militant best paid workers have up to now set the pace in wage breakthroughs, often to be followed by much wider strata. But the skilled men and the low paid man (who in real life are often not two separate categories) will both quickly learn that the real teeth of the incomes policy, the attack on "restrictive practices" will bite far more uncomfortably than the attack on wages. Whilst full employment lasts wages will in any case be maintained by employers' competition for labour. But "restrictive practices" are very often only "restrictive" of the employer's authority: they represent an important part of the element of workers' control which has been growing up in British Industry since the war. Neither Mr. Gunter nor old Nick will make very speedy incursions into such fields as this: but their very attempts to do so will provoke a reaction which could quickly revalue last Friday's line-up.

The attacks will mount, But the left can fight back, and may well be able to impose new goals and priorities on Mr. Wilson, who appears an uneasy captive at this moment. What Labour needs here, above all, is, we must repeat, an offensive strategy. The argument about incomes policy must be turned against the employers, by calling for greater areas of workers' control and union power, rather than defending existing controls and powers in a half-hearted way. Open the books ! Prevent profit inflation by a trade union inspection of accounts! We must evolve an aggressive incomes policy, which on a base of expanding structural reforms, nationalisation and workers' self-management, will speedily ensure a rapid redistribution of wealth towards our own people.

#### U.S. RAILWAY UNIONS CALL FOR PUBLIC OWNERSHIP

According to latest issue of the Journal of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Attendants, Mr. G.E. Leighty, chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, made the following statement about the unions' attitude to public ownership of railways in the United States:

"The situation in the railroad industry has reached such a critical point that a majority of the Chief Executives of railroad labor voted unanimously that we should <sup>have</sup> Government ownership and operation of the railroad industry." Leighty said that the action followed a week of discussions by heads of the 22 Standard Railway Labor Organizations on the current problems of the railroad industry. "This action taken after these discussions means that, in our view, the present management of the railroad industry no longer has sufficient concern for the interests and needs of the general public to be entrusted with the most essential part of our nation's transportation system." he added. Failure to provide adequate services, lack of concern with safety, and a bad attitude towards labour relations were the main reasons given for the unions' views.

This year's May Day in Manchester, organised by the Manchester City Labour Party and Trades Council, was quite a stormy affair. There were large contingents from C.N.D. and the Communist Party. After the Sunday afternoon march through the streets, the speakers at the Free Trade Hall meeting had to contend with strong heckling at times. It was not true that the only opposition came from 'irresponsible anarchists' who made up only a small fraction of the 400 strong audience. Perhaps the most significant aspect of the meeting was the failure of some of the speakers, and especially Mr. Callaghan, to capture the imagination of the high proportion of young people in the audience. It is probably not untrue to say that the people present were not, in the main, carried away with the Chancellor's talk of the "revolutionary" Finance Bill. He drew attention to the Corporation Tax which, he claimed, made great strides forward by distinguishing the rate of tax on the company from the rate of tax on the shareholders. Overseas investments would not be helped as under the Tories. George Brown will be examining prices and he added about the Government's incomes policy that, "until someone can find a better answer, George Brown is right, right, right."

Heckled to cut the arms bill, Mr. Callaghan implied that Labour had done this by cutting the TSR-2, despite shouts of "it's up £120 million." When someone shouted "Cut it by half", the Chancellor said that the facts were that this would not pay for Britain's social welfare programme. Another shout "What about Clause Four" from the gallery was countered by Mr. Callaghan with "Dogs bark while the caravan moves on." He got his best clap for this. But even then someone shouted back with "the trouble with your caravan is it's standing still", which also went down well.

Paul Rose, M.P., faced the fiercest shouting. He attempted to give an all round survey of Labour's achievements since taking up office. He did not emphasise his known opposition to U.S. policies in Vietnam and made no adverse comments on the Government's incomes policy. A scuffle broke out during his speech and the police were called in. Hugh Scanlon, A.E.U., had the best hearing. He was loudly applauded when he voiced his strong individual views against the present incomes policy, against colonialism and especially against U.S. policy in Vietnam. However, he felt obliged to remind the audience of the official views of his union.

In summary, it seems that the local Labour Party misjudged the kind of event that May Day is. Last year Bessie Braddock didn't go down well. And Mr. Callaghan after taking his audience through his dull remarks on taxes, and finding that people were still shouting about Vietnam and Malaysia, held up his hands and said that he could not understand why people were more concerned with foreign affairs than with domestic issues.

#### LEICESTER VIETNAM DEMONSTRATION from Alec Acheson

The Radical Club of Leicester College of Education organised a March and meeting on May Day to protest against American intervention in Vietnam, and to demand the withdrawal of American troops. An ad hoc committee has been formed out of the supporters of the demonstration in order to step up the campaign in Leicester. The secretary is Miss Vicky Rooney, 45, St. Barnabas Rd., Leicester. About 100 demonstrators took part with many posters, made up of various political groups and peace organisations (Communist Party, Labour Party, Young Socialists, Anarchists, C.N.D., Anarchists, War Resisters)

Applications and proposals received during the last few weeks make it clear that the London conference on Social Ownership and Industrial Democracy will be a most important event in the development of socialist thought on this vital question, and will provide a unique opportunity to discuss such urgent topics as the Government's White Paper on Steel Nationalisation.

So far, over fifty representatives of a wide-ranging variety of labour movement organisations have been issued with credentials, and have received a copy of the special issue of Left containing papers prepared for the conference.

They include delegates of the Derbyshire and South Wales areas of the National Union of Miners, a spokesman for the Sheffield conference on Steel Nationalisation which earlier this year produced a draft plan for the industry, many representatives from co-operative societies, (the conference is devoting a special section to democracy in the co-ops) and from U.S.D.A.W., delegates from the London District Council of A.S.S.E.T., representatives of university Labour clubs, a group of London dockers, a representative of a co-ownership firm, etc. Observers from the Swedish and West German socialist 'lefts' will be present. There are several constituency Labour parties represented amongst the applicants, and a number of socialist writers and journalists intend to be present, or have sent their good wishes for the conference.

Apart from the session on Co-operative Democracy, it is planned to hear and discuss a report on the steel situation following the White Paper (readers will no doubt have noticed that the White Paper makes no concession in the direction of worker representation, and repeats instead the old formula of "Joint Consultation"), to receive and discuss a comment by the editor of Docks' Voice on the situation in that industry, and to discuss a Plan for Mines, to be presented by Walter Kendal. A Brains Trust to answer questions on the whole range of Industrial Democracy will also take place.

It is still possible for readers to register for attendance at the conference by sending a postcard to Richard Fletcher, 71, New Kings Rd., London S.W. 6. Credentials for late applicants can be issued on arrival at the conference venue - The New Ambassadors Hotel, Woburn Place, London W.C. 1.; the conference commences at 2.15 p.m. on Saturday, May 8th.

Preparatory work for the Manchester conference on June 19/20th, which will highlight the developing situation in Steel, Docks, Aircraft, and around the incomes policy issue, is well in hand. Apply for details to Labour's Voice, 8 Ashkirk Street, Manchester 18.

Copies of the special issue of Left containing conference papers can be obtained, (price 2/6; not 10/- as previously announced) from 1, Plantation Drive, Anlaby Park, Hull.

EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENT: We are constantly expanding our circulation each week even though money problems bother us all the time. We are consulting opinions of the role of The Week and we are interested in an attempt to rationalise a division of labour between different socialist periodicals - especially with our colleagues in the Voice chain. This will imply changes in our structure, the working out of a functioning division of tasks and a reorganisation of our editorial work.



## LINER TRAINS: THE N.U.R. CASE

The following statement was issued by the Executive Committee of the National Union of Railwaymen on April 22nd, that is, before the Government announced its decision that it is giving British Railways the go-ahead to proceed with introducing liner trains.

"That having given the most serious consideration to the memorandum of the meeting with Dr. Beeching and the British Railways Board on April 1, and the meeting with the Minister of Transport on April 13, we are convinced that to proceed with liner trains on the basis of accepting sub-contracts from private road hauliers, which is essentially what open terminals means, would be against the best interests of the country, the proper integration of transport, and detrimental to British Railways. We therefore decline to co-operate with the B.R.B. in furthering a project which, in our opinion, would have these effects. A fair assessment of the position could be obtained were the the B.R.B. to start the first route on the terms offered by this Union.

"In order that our members will be fully conversant with everything involved, special District Council meetings must be convened at a very early date; such meetings to be addressed by officers and members of this National Executive Committee. The Minister of Transport and the Chairman of the B.R.B. are to be informed of this decision and any developments reported to this Executive Committee. We instruct the General Secretary accordingly."

Commenting, Railway Review, the Union's journal, said:

"It is certainly difficult, in the interests of efficiency and economy, to find good reason why the Railways Board are so adamantly insistent that our nationalised railway industry should sub-contract to private hauliers. Surely, the success of the liner train project cannot depend on such a vulnerable arrangement?

"Having spent millions of pounds on it already the Railways Board must be more than confident that they have a winning system. This being so, what is stopping their traffic canvassers from "bringing home the bacon." Surely not a difficult task when, as we are told, all the aces are in the Board's hand? And particularly as a flying start could be made with traffic already promised. So what is wrong with getting on with the job, using railway cartage staff? They have the experience, equipment and facilities. Why pay a middleman's profit unnecessarily?

"Why should a nationalised industry like the railways go cap in hand to private hauliers, seeking traffic on their terms? The Railways Board have all they need to canvass, win and retain on merit all the long-haul traffic available. So who or what is stopping them? It is not the Union. The Executive have urged them to introduce liner trains without further delay, using railway cartage. This can be done and should be done."

N.B. Reprints of this article (with or without the two following ones) can be obtained for 4/- per 100 (and pro rata). Please write to the business address specifying number and articles wanted.

Behind the technicalities involved in the dispute between the N.U.R. and the British Railways Board over liner trains there are clear issues which are of fundamental importance. Firstly, there is the fact that the B.R.B. plans for opening up the proposed terminals to private hauliers amount to a partial denationalisation measure. It was not so long ago that the Labour Party programme included the renationalisation of road haulage (this seems to have been quietly dropped) and the Government is indeed committed to bringing about an integrated transport system - yet it now supports the erosion of an established nationalised industry's role in transport. This, unhappily, is not an isolated incident; the sale of British Railways assets continues on many fronts. It seems that we have Beechingism without Beeching!

Secondly, the British Railways Board proposals amount to the almost complete subordination of the interests (and opinions) of the workers to those of 'efficiency' and/or profitability. This again is a policy indistinguishable from the Tory attitude towards the nationalised industries - no wonder the whole capitalist press praised the Government for its "courage."

Rank and file trade unionists and Labour Party members must see this dispute as being of vital concern to them. If we are engaged in a struggle to extend social ownership with workers' self-management we cannot idly stand by while an existing nationalised industry is eroded and, what's more, the whole idea of the workers having a say in the running of industry gets a kick in the teeth. Obviously we must support the N.U.R. in its efforts to get the Government to change its mind on the liner train decision. Even from the point of view strengthening and defending the Labour Government's efforts to implement its pledges we must take action. In the coming months it is certain that the Labour Government will be involved in a tremendous struggle over the question of steel nationalisation. The Tories and their allies will use to the full the capitalist press to discredit the idea of nationalisation. What could be more important than the Labour Government having the full and enthusiastic support of workers in existing nationalised industries?

The N.U.R. is commencing its campaign on this dispute by organising a lobby of Parliament Thursday this week. The Week will publicise other activities as and when they are announced. Readers of this journal should support these activities and make the railwaymen's case widely known. A good start could be made by inviting N.U.R. speakers to address trade union branches, Labour Parties, and Young Socialist branches.

BUILDING OF LINER TRAINS FORGING AHEAD from a special correspondent

Work is going ahead at full speed on the production of wagons for British Railways' liner trains at the B.R. Carriage and Wagon works at Derby. This works has orders for 146 of the 27-foot long containers, each able to hold 20 tons of goods. It is reported that some 60 men have now been placed on to the production of 15 of the containers each week. This being enough for about five freightliners. Thus it appears that the British Railways Board, now they have Government backing, have decided to ignore the opposition of the N.U.R. nationally and the decision by North West railwaymen to black the trains (which will almost certainly be emulated by other important sections).

Dick Crossman, the Minister of Housing, has now published his Rent Bill. It is a serious attempt to tackle the tragic situation, described by Sir Milner Holland in his committee's report, the situation created by the Tory Rent Bill of 1957. A child should have understood that, if you remove rent restrictions in the middle of an acute housing shortage, then landlords will exploit that shortage. With a handful of honourable exceptions they certainly did. Sir Milner may have reported that only a small percentage of landlords were guilty of some of the acts of intimidation he describes. Maybe, but there can be little doubt that the overwhelming majority doubled, trebled or quadrupled their rents as soon as a change of tenant..permitted them to do so.

Half of the solution is vastly to increase the number of houses available. Labour is pledged to a building programme of 400,000 a year as an immediate aim, and of 500,000 subsequently. The other half of the solution is this Bill. It contains several vitally important features:

- (1) All tenants (except those in the luxury class) will enjoy security of tenure, and eviction, without a landlord securing a court order, is prohibited from premises of any value.
- (2) Harassing or intimidating tenants becomes a criminal offence, punishable by a fine up to £100 (£500 on a second offence) or six months' imprisonment or both.
- (3) For the time being, 2,250,000 families living in properties still under rent control will remain there at controlled rents.

But what is to happen to the houses now decontrolled? What will the new controlled rents for such houses be? (this affects 1,500,000 families right away, plus the other 2,250,000 in due course as they, too, become recontrolled.) This brings us to the all-important Clause 22. The Government has decided that, in determining what it considers to be a "fair rent" rent assessment, committees are to consider "all circumstances, including the age, character, and locality of the house, and its state of repair. Consideration of scarcity is to be eliminated" by assuming there is no scarcity of housing in the area. My fear is that unscrupulous landlords, assisted by skilful lawyers, will drive a coach and houses through this vague clause, in the way they have already done through the Protection from Eviction Act, passed only three months ago.

If they can get one or two favourable decisions through the tribunals (consisting of a valuer, a lawyer, and a third person, who will probably be a man remote from the pressing problems of poor tenants) they will create precedents for raising rents everywhere. The alternative, I would propose, is this: by all means let the tribunals take into account all the factors mentioned in the clause, but let the main basis be the 1963 rateable value of the property. This would mean an increase of about one-third in the rents of controlled houses in the provinces and about three-quarters in London. That is quite enough. On the present formula I have suspicion that the tribunals will take a rent which has been increased from, say, £2 to £5, knock off four or five shillings, and say "justice has been done."

As an incentive to landlords to do necessary repairs the tribunals might also be authorised to consider receipts for sums paid out by landlords to their property repairers. What I would insist on is this: Whatever formula is adopted our main aim must be absolutely clear - to keep rents down. Labour M.P.s must stand firm against those gentlemen who talk airily about "rent increases being continued over/

Landlords v. tenants continued/

inevitable. Why is that so? That was not what the electors returned us to Parliament to do. It would be utterly unfair to controlled tenants, who have already had their rents raised by roughly two-thirds under the 1957 Rent Act, and also to decontrolled tenants, whose rents have been doubled, trebled, or quadrupled. It would be political dynamite. It would be doing the Conservatives' dirty work for them.

If it is argued that the landlords need this money to do repairs, it should be pointed out there is no guarantee the property owners will do them even if rents are increased. And most of them are not doing too badly, even after paying repairs, seeing their properties have, in many cases, been paying rents for 80 or 100 years. If it is argued that the landlords will put up their houses for sale, and thus further reduce the number of houses to let, many of them will, in my view, do this in any case. High rents will merely mean that they will obtain even higher selling prices for their houses.

If it is argued that tax concessions should be granted to landlords (see the rumours in the Observer...) then I say that such a policy would be completely intolerable - particularly after the huge rent increases, Rachmanism, and the Milner Holland Report. Because the other features of the Bill will be so popular with the electorate, it puts the Conservatives in difficulty about opposing it outright. Instead, I think they will try to water it down in the long committee stage, and in particular they will aim to see that Clause 22 leaves open the door for big rent increases.

\* This article first appeared the April issue of The Foundry Worker.

#### MORE DETAILS OF "WEEK" SCHOOL ON AFRICA

The school will be held at Whitsun, i.e., the 5th, 6th and 7th of June. The venue will be at the Africa Unity House, London. The preliminary schedule is:

- Saturday, 5th June, Morning, 10.00 - 1.00 p.m. Achievements of the Algerian Revolution and the problems facing it.  
Afternoon, 2.30 - 6.00. Neo-colonialism, speaker Ernest Mandel, editor of La Gauche.  
Evening, 7.30 - Midnight. Social in aid of the Alexander Defence Fund at Unity House.
- Sunday, 6th June, Morning, 10.00 - 12.30 p.m. The South African Revolution, its character, driving forces and prospects.  
To be introduced by representatives of the ANC & PAC.  
Afternoon, 2.00 - 4.15 The situation in South Africa.  
4.45 - 7.00 A Socialist programme for South Africa, speaker, Ken Jordaan.
- Monday 7th June, Morning, 10.00 - 12.30 p.m. The role of the British Socialist Movement in aiding the African Revolution.  
Afternoon, 2.00 - 4.30. Prospects for Socialism in Africa.

Readers who wish to register for all or part of the school should send 5/- fee to Connie Kirkby, 27, Thursley House, Hednewood Gardens, London S.W.2. The overall cost will be 5/- per day or 10/- for the whole school.

The title "Comprehensive School" covers a wide variety of establishments varying from very large schools containing the full age range from 11 upwards, essentially bilateral schemes in one building and the two-tier comprehensives. The Leicestershire Plan is in many ways the most developed of the two-tier comprehensive schemes. Its main feature is that the children attend High School until they are 14, when they decide whether to transfer to Grammar School or to stay at the High School until they are 15.

This system has recently come under heavy fire from educationalists such as A.B. Clegg, education officer of West Riding, because middle-class children will take advantage of the transfer but working-class children tend not to. The Leicestershire Education Committee asked the Leicester University School of Education to carry out a survey, some of the results of which have recently been published in New Society.

One of the most striking things to emerge has been the tie up between the social status of an area and the transfer rate. Some examples will illustrate this:

% transfer	1960	1964	Juror Index
Oadby	50	85	26.6
Wigston	33	50	25.7
Hinckley	30	38	15.5

A vast difference can be seen in the transfer rate between the new middle-class suburb of Oadby and the older industrial area of Hinckley. It was found that 95% of those in Oadby who decided not to transfer to the Grammar School were working class children.

A further point that caused considerable disquiet was the drop out rate of above average children. 95% of middle-class children in "A" streams transferred at 14 in the plan area, while only 75% of working-class children in "A" streams stayed in full time education until 16. This drop out rate for exceptionally talented working-class children is above that registered in many tripartite schemes!

Mainly as a result of these findings, on the 15th of April the Leicestershire Education Committee decided to move all children at 14 into the Upper High Schools (Grammar Schools) and then allow them to decide after the transfer whether they wish to stay on or not. The clear lesson for socialists from these findings is that careful scrutiny of any proposed comprehensive scheme is essential and the mere title "comprehensive" is no guarantee that the grosser inequalities of a class-biased educational system will be alleviated.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT

Owing to continuing demand we have reprinted a limited number of the Educational Supplement of The Week which contained a whole range of articles surveying the fight for comprehensive education. If readers wish to obtain copies they should write to the business address and enclose 1/-.

Harold Wilson's visit to Hull for a May Day Rally at the City Hall was accompanied by an impressive demonstration of the hostility felt towards American aggression in Vietnam, and the Labour Government's support for this. For two hours before Mr. Wilson's arrival, whilst crowds were queueing for admission to the hall, and many onlookers gathered to see the Prime Minister, members of the Hull Movement for Colonial Freedom, supported by trade unionists, Young Socialists and ordinary members of the Labour Party, stood in silent demonstration before the entrances to the hall. They carried the now familiar messages on their placards, which demanded a complete dissociation between British and American policy, and the removal of the Americans from Vietnam. The crowd received a leaflet explaining the facts behind the Vietnam situation (reprinted from The Week) listing the action which has already been taken inside the labour movement in Hull, and calling for more pressure to be brought for a change of Government policy.

Inside the meeting, Harold Wilson's speech was effective and confident until he reached the question of foreign affairs. He was then interrupted by a continuous series of questions and protests relating to Vietnam, by the demonstrators. His replies relied on the wearisomely familiar argument that he was interested in a peaceful solution, not in striking attitudes. He said that it was an easy thing to pass resolutions, "both outside and inside the House of Commons", and when he claimed that the Government's policy had been responsible for the Johnson speech offering so-called "unconditional" acceptance of talks, the protests grew in volume and indignation, and he was clearly disconcerted. As he left the hall for his car, he raised his hand in expectation of loyal cheers, but received instead the placards, and cries of Vietnam.

It should give us no pleasure to record that a May Day Rally was the occasion for public protest against the Labour Government's foreign policy, but clearly two things emerged. One, that there is a strong growing disquiet which now finds firm and principled expression from within the Labour movement, and two, that Harold Wilson has nothing new to say in defence of his present policy. The coupling of Johnson's phoney offer of talks with the British Government's initiative showed how thin the Wilson line has become.

BRISTOL COLOUR BAR INCIDENT

by Tom Nicholls

The charges against Mr. Paul Stephenson, a social worker and secretary of the West Indian Development Association, were dismissed on Friday 30th April. The Bench also awarded Mr. Stephenson 15 guineas costs against the Crown. The charges of behaving in a disorderly manner and thereby disturbing the peace arose out of a colour bar incident in the Bay Horse on 10th April when Mr. Stephenson refused to leave.

Summing up for the defence, Mr. Roberts said "In this case we are faced with a colour bar. And it is my submission that it was the colour bar which made Mr. Stephenson angry, and it made him argumentative." Stephenson was fortunate that on the second day of his trial some very effective evidence was given by a surprise witness, an Irishman, Mr. Patrick O'Connor. Previously to that, the case had seemed to be weighted against Stephenson. Mr. O'Connor said that he was so disgusted with the landlord on the night of the incident, that he walked out...Subsequently he went out of his way to turn up during the trial to give evidence. He said that he had offered himself as a witness at the police station but not much interest was shown.

The Daily Telegraph reporter Jeremy Wolfenden has been sending a series of articles from Santo Domingo, capital of the Dominican Republic, to his paper. These articles reveal the complete hypocrisy of the U.S. claim that their forces went to that country to preserve human life and to protect U.S. and other civilians. A few extracts from his article which appeared in the May 3rd issue of the Daily Telegraph typify the information he has been sending back: (sub-headings are ours)

Difficult to pretend U.S. forces are protecting anybody

"..it has been the American forces who have been bearing a heavy burden in the fighting in the streets. The 82nd Airborne Division, coming up from the San Isidro air base, have not linked up with the Marines, who came in by sea. Officially, the function of these forces is to protect American citizens and other foreigners, who certainly have been in some danger for the last week. But it becomes more and more difficult to pretend that American forces are not taking a direct part in putting down the rebellion.

"For instance, an airborne patrol from a bridgehead to the east of the city drove right round the north of the rebel positions to join up with the Marines. It is difficult to see what this manoeuvre had to do with protecting anybody, since there is no suggestion that this route will be used for evacuating anyone. The position of the Marines is more defensible, in both senses of the word. They are holding a line facing the rebels to the east of the American Embassy. But even they send patrols beyond this limit to try to suppress snipers.

"Most suspicious of all, there is a tremendous American military build-up at the San Isidro air base, 20 miles from the capital. In two hours there today I saw no less than 10 heavy troop transports roll in and deliver men and material...."

Women and children machine gunned

"Since the arrival of the Americans, the loyalist Air Force has more or less ceased its attacks by Vampire jets and rockets on the streets held by the rebels.....These have caused real bitterness, especially when the aircraft machine gunned streets full of women and children. The worst of the attacks was that at the Duarte bridge, over the Ozoma river. About 250 people are estimated to have been killed in that attack alone. Rebel civilians were shouting "Bring to the bridge the wives and children of the pilots" - and the people were doing so...."

The report goes on to describe how the working-class quarters are defended by barricades "rather like those of Paris in 1870." These facts, plus the vote which the Dominican Republic Party, the political wing of the rebels, received before it was forcibly overthrown by U.S.-backed generals, fill the picture in. It is clear that here we have a popular, broadly-based, movement for reform which is being suppressed by a combination of U.S. forces and reactionary militarists. The British Labour Government should not support this latest act of American aggression; instead it would do better to line up with those protesting. Silence would be both complicity and encouragement.