

The Week

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS
13th Oct. 1966 Vol. 6, Nos. 12/13. 6^D

"SIGNIFICANT
LOBBY" FOR
DEMOCRACY
admits
Gunter on
Coates case

WILSON : THE TARNISHED IMAGE

CONTENTS

Page	1	Announcements.	Page	2	Editorial.
"	3	Lobby for democracy.	"	4	Scottish notes.
"	5	Briefing extracts	"	6	Briefing extracts
"	7	" "	"	8	" "
"	9	" "	"	10	" "
"	11	Agricultural workers against wage freeze	"	12	<u>New Society</u> slams part four.
"	13	Real causes of inflation	"	14	<u>Rebel</u> raises its voice.
"	15/17	Eichmann and everyman the moral challenge of Vietnam.	"	18	Andre Breton.

THIS WEEK'S ISSUE is a double one and includes a selection of the articles which appeared in Briefing, the daily bulletin issued to delegates at Birg Brighton. This selection is designed to bring out the way Briefing intervened in the affairs of the conference arming the delegates with facts and figures to back up their arguments. The selection will also illustrate the strengths and weaknesses of its policies - with an eye to improving it next year. Having said that the Week congratulates the socialists who did so much hard work on this project, and we are sure that their efforts were very much appreciated by the delegates to conference.

IMPORTANT C.S.E MEETING

The recently formed Coventry branch of the Centre for Socialist Education has asked us to publicise the following meeting:

A SOCIALIST SOLUTION FOR THE MOTOR INDUSTRY

Speakers: Jack Jones, assistant General Secretary, TGWU, and

Hugh Scanlon, Executive Cluncilman, AEU.

Both speakers in their personal capacity.

On Friday, 4th November, at 7.30 p.m.

at The Municipal Staff Canteen, Derby Lane, off Broadgate, Coventry.

Tickets available at 1/- each from Mrs. Patricia Knight, 9, ~~Thirlmere~~ Thirlmere Close, Hawthorn Lane, Coventry. Telephone 64320.

We are sure all readers of The Week will give whatever help they can to ensure the success of this meeting which could hardly be more apposite.

LONDON WEEK FORUM LONDON WEEK FORUM LONDON WEEK FORUM LONDON WEEK FORUM

This Friday, the 14th of October at the Lucas Arms, 245a, Grays Inn Rd. commencing at 8.00.

The Subject: The Brighton Labour Party conference.

There will be a panel of three speakers who will briefly outline their impressions - Pat Jordan, Geoff Coggan, John Palmer, and lots of discussion.

BRIGHTON: WILSON'S TARNISHED IMAGE

A comparison between the Blackpool and Brighton conferences of the Labour Party reveals British Labour's strengths and weaknesses. First, we have to note that despite the terrible anti-working class evolution of Mr. Wilson and his team since coming to power that the Brighton Labour Party conference in essence gave the Government a vote of confidence. It is true that there has been a small shift to the left when two major issues: incomes policy and Vietnam are considered. Both the votes against the incomes policy and the for disassociation from the U.S.A. on Vietnam were up. Somewhere in the region of up to half a million votes had changed sides on these issues. If this process continues, the platform will risk major defeats next year and almost certain defeat the year after; but is this the kind of perspective we look forward too? No indeed: if this were the only feature of the situation it would be gloomy beyond bearing. There were far more important processes at work illustrated by comparison of these two conferences.

The most startling difference, one which this journal predicted, was that of conference's attitude towards Mr. Wilson. At Blackpool he was king: when he came into the conference the only people not taking part in almost orgaistic demonstrations were the hard left and the TGWU delegation. This year the platform had to work hard to get any response at all. Last year he was the symbol of a deep feeling within the Labour movement: he had, in the eyes of millions of Labour supporters, not merely won the election of 1964 but kept Labour in power under very difficult circumstances and a tiny majority. This year even his friends would recognise that it is no longer possibly to convincingly argue that every^{thing} wrong is due to the 13 years of Toryism. The excuse of the tiny majority has gone altogether. While Labour's popularity in the country has not been lost decisively, the majority of people no longer regard Wilson as a super-politician.

The most important difference from the point of view of socialist stratgey was that whilst at Blackpool the conference carried every issue with a monotonous 2-3 million majority, this year the platform suffered defeats. These defeats arose from two factors: firstly the extremely skilful tactics of the TGWU; and secondly, the fact that although many delegates were prepared to vote for the Government in general when the extremes of Government policy were in question they voted against. Many delegates would vote for the incomes polciy as a whole, but when the TGWU pivot ed the question around work-sharing against deliberate sacking, the former won the day. Simil arly although there was a huge majority for the Government's foreign policy as a whole, when the FBU pinpointed the fact that this meant supporting US bombing of North Vietnam, conference voted the platform down. Many things flow from these facts but most important is that now we have some perspective of successes. We can appeal to the militants in the factories to come into the struggle in the Labour Party by pointing to these conference decisions.

Lastly there was the consolidation and almost institutionalisation of the TGWU and technical unions' as an official opposition to Wilson and his team. This factor has drastically changed the situation inside the Labour movement. All past oppositions to the right wing have been based upon individual socialists and/or the CLPs. It has been much easier to discipline such opposition and neutralise it, but the continued opposition of the TGWU and other unions will bring into question the whole structure of the Labour Party. The Week is to open its columns to a discussion on the question of how the left can link itself to the union opposition to the Government and the special problems this posses. Please tell us what your think.

The issue of democracy in the Labour Party came forward to the very centre discussion at this years' Brighton Conference. First, the platform showed in its speeches that it felt very jumpy about this matter. At the pre-conference rally, on Sunday evening, Dick Crossman went right out of his way to outline what he thought were the democratic norms which should govern the party. Mr. Wilson, not to be outdone, gave his peroration, in his Tuesday speech, to the subject of the growth of democratic freedom. From time to time other leaders made their verbal concessions to the spirit.

But it was John Palmer, the barred parliamentary candidate from Croydon, who, speaking at a meeting of 100 delegates on the Tuesday evening, on the subject of party democracy, pricked this bubble. The disciplinary outrages of Croydon and Nottingham, which were in every delegate's mind, had to be linked, said Mr. Palmer, with the fact that the Government was taking totalitarian powers against the unions, and launching an overall offensive against traditional labour rights. In the circumstances party democracy was bound to be a casualty.

The appeals of messrs Coates, Gregory, Price and Coggan against expulsion and suspension from office, were never heard by conference. Ray Gunter, speaking for the N.E.C., denied that they had any right to appeal. "There are literally hundreds of these cases every year" he said in a revealing slip. This frightening news scarcely reassured delegates, who came out of the private session even more troubled than they had been on entering it. Hundreds of delegates had signed an appeal that the Nottingham victims should be heard. Very incomplete returns to hand show that over one hundred constituency delegates wished to give a hearing to the expelled and disciplined persons, while even more trade union delegates supported the petition. Among those who signed were: 4 members of the Agricultural Workers delegates; all three of the Seamen's delegation; 15 of the N.U.M.; 6 of the Foundry-workers; and members of S.O.G.A.T., N.U.R., S.C.E.B.T.A., and many other bodies. Apart from the petition, which merely asked for a hearing, promises of support for the reference back of the Organisation Report were received from D.A.T.A., the N.U.S., the Tobacco Workers, and a substantial part of the U.S.D.A.W. delegation, and members of N.U.P.E., the N.U.R., the A.E.U. and other bodies.

A highlight of the conference was the Tribune rally on Wednesday evening, which was packed out to hear Frank Cousins, Stan Orme, M.P., Michael Foot, M.P., Tom Driberg, M.P., and David Pitt. Numerous references were made to the struggle for party democracy, and both Stan Orme and Michael Foot referred in detail to the Coates and Palmer cases. Both references were greeted with enthusiastic applause, significantly joined by Frank Cousins from the platform. Delegates began to feel that if a million votes were to be stacked for democracy in the party, perhaps the cause would not be lost.

Unfortunately, the votes were never counted. Mr. Gunter got his way. But it is fair to say that judging by the delegates' disquiet about these cases, and the ferment caused, the platform will not continue to get its way on such matters for very long.

Local Finance: The rating system in Scotland is admitted generally to be both inequitable and confused. The freeze has introduced another element of farce into the situation, putting all local treasurers, faced as they are with rocketing costs and ever-mounting responsibilities, into an impossible dilemma. Previous to July 20th government policy was that council house rents should go up, and to enforce this demand the threat was made that councils who refused to increase them to what was considered a satisfactory level would be deprived of their equalisation grant- the subsidy which covers the difference between the council's income and its commitments. Now, however, the call is for a freeze in council rents, but councils who do so are still subject to the equalisation grant penalty. The councils caught in this manner therefore have the choice of getting their grant- by increasing rents, or complying with the government's appeal, losing the grant and making up the difference by pushing up the rates. Either way the luckless citizens will have to dig deeper into their frozen pay packets.

In practice the tendency appears to be towards solving this ludicrous situation by the second alternative; the recent revaluation it has been calculated, will increase income from rates by 18%. This too, it appears, has been condemned by the brilliant planners at the Scottish Office.

The Highlands: The long survey of the Highlands and Islands contained in the issue of the "Economist" of 17-25 September was offensive and patronising in the highest degree. Two quotations, which in no way misrepresent the tone of the article, may be cited: "Wiggins Teape's management must dread the idea of having to act as nanny to a community." "It was started.... to relieve the unemployment of the natives. Often now there are too few natives left to do the necessary work."

It is undeniable that the Highlands present a serious problem to the British economy, and that a relatively unproductive area, surviving by subsidies represents a very unsatisfactory state of affairs. The "Economist" however, is unable to see beyond this, and ferociously attacks every aspect of Highland life as economically unjustified. This is the only criterion allowed, no effort being made to strike a balance between cost and social desirability. When it tries to indicate the roots of the problem its assessment is even worse. The over-riding drawback and curse of the Highlands is the fact that so much of it is preserved as a playground for the aristocracy, in the shape of gigantic hunting estates. The "Economist" does not ignore this completely- it would be impossible to do so- but it underplays it as far as possible and presses the entire responsibility onto the feckless, lazy Highlanders, and sentimental, muddled authorities. No mention whatever is made of the proposal by the crofters' unions for state control of land in the Highlands.

The writers of this survey display a zealous glee in emphasising the extent of the problems, the analysis is almost entirely destructive, responsibility is misplaced, such solutions as are proposed are entirely piecemeal, and any hint of understanding or sympathy for the Highlanders' predicament is completely absent.

WHAT HAPPENED TO STEEL?

(from Briefing)

Party Chairman Walter Padley's lay preacher exhortations to the newly opened Conference made no apology for reminding us about socialism. In fact there was a great deal of reminding - presumably he thought it was necessary - but not much evidence of progress.

Whilst Walter confirmed "All of us are impatient for the coming of real socialism", he made no mention of steel, nor of the nationalisation of insurance which he used to advocate in the union, USDAW, of which he is a member.

"The over-riding theme is the crusade for human justice" we were informed. What about justice for the steel-workers who were promised by Eirene White, speaking on behalf of the NEC at last year's Conference, that the Government would include worker's participation in its plan for the nationalisation of steel. Or has the High Tory, Lord Melchett, been converted to workers control?

And what about justice for the lower-paid workers? Labour spokesmen can rely on an easy round of applause with this ploy. But delegates should ask exactly how restraint by higher paid workers is going to benefit those with lower incomes. Is the money the Austin workers are no longer receiving being handed over to the employees of Birmingham Corporation?

And who are the 'lower-paid workers'? They are largely the 5 million government and local authority employees. If the Government thinks their wages are disgracefully low, then the remedy is in its own hands. It can pay them more.

CONGRATULATIONS.

(from Briefing)

Following the Frank Allaun/Philip Noel-Baker complaints about the short time accorded to the foreign affairs debate, the Arrangements Committee announced that Thursday's morning session has been extended by half an hour, and that the Rhodesian problem would be discussed on Friday morning.

We hope that sufficient time will remain for the important Emergency Motion of Hornchurch CLP on the vital question of South Africa's mandate over S.W.Africa. This appears at the end of the printed agenda of composited resolutions.

CORRECTION

We have given the address of the secretary of the Gloucester branch of the Centre For Socialist Education incorrectly. It should be:

John Ewers,
62, Frampton Rd.,
Gloucester.

BANKERS' CONTROL OR WORKERS' CONTROL ?

At last year's conference a resolution calling for workers' participation in the nationalised steel industry was moved by ASSET and accepted by the NEC. This year the Amalgamated Union of Foundry Workers raises the issue again.

The arrogant attitude taken by sections of industrial management is indicated by the current mass sackings at BMC. Workers are not inanimate objects without rights, to be hired and fired at the whim of management.

Social democracy demands the extension of political democracy to industrial democracy. A mature democracy in which every man and woman can develop their potentialities fully demands this condition.

The proposed appointment of Lord Melchett to be Chairman of the new Steel Board is a major error which can still be reversed. A progressive step would be to ensure the incorporation of forthright provisions for a workers' share in management in the new bill. This sort of legislation has been successfully implemented in Yugoslavia. Delegates may consider that it could be enacted in Britain too.

MANNY'S DEFENCE POLICY.

In the course of an interesting speech on Defence cuts, Manny Shinwell, Chairman of the Parliamentary Party, said:

"If the Germans want to fight the Russians and the Poles, let them do the job themselves.....I doubt very much whether our forces of the Rhine, in the event of aggression from Moscow - and I see no signs of aggression, now or in the future - I doubt very much but that in the event they would be liquidated."

On Defence cuts in general, Mr. Shinwell said that the only way to do it was to start at the top.....

"There are too many generals, too many air marshalls, and too many admirals. They are cluttering the decks....."

He concluded: "I was once Minister of Defence and I have come to the conclusion that I was the only Minister of Defence capable of doing the job."

Perhaps even now, he's not without some of the necessary qualifications for the job. He certainly has some right ideas.

WAS IT A BANKERS' RAMP ?

Yesterday we commented on Jim's denial in the economic debate on Wednesday that the Government had been forced to take the July 20th emergency measures by foreign bankers. A hard-hitting article by the Guardian's City editor William Davis yesterday critically examined that view. When he was in Washington last week, Davis put the point to M. Paul Schweitzer, managing director of the International Monetary Fund (whom he describes as Britain's Bank Manager). His reply was that an under-taking by the British Government to take "additional steps" was certainly part of the agreement reached. Davis concludes that although no formal strings were set out, it was made quite clear that the Government would have to embark on a deflationary policy. Was it a bankers' ramp? Delegates will make up their own minds.

WHAT DID CONFERENCE SUPPORT?

Conference endorsed the NEC's statement on foreign policy by a majority of ten to one. Speaking on television, George Brown claimed that this meant Conference had given unqualified support to all the policies of the Government.

This is not true. The policy endorsed by Conference on Vietnam is in advance of the Government's previous position. The job of the NEC - which is responsible to Conference, not the Cabinet - is to press the Government to adopt the views expressed by Conference.

Conference decided that the Government's intention to cut defence expenditure should be supported, but that the pace should be speeded up. The Party has now accepted the target of less than £1,750 m. by 1970. This should be endorsed by the Parliamentary Party and pressed upon the Government.

NEWSPAPER SCARE AGAIN

A nasty example of tendentious reporting was found in last night's Evening News' account of the defeat of the N.E.C. when the Transport & General Workers' Union motion calling for defence cuts was passed by Conference.

The report makes out that this might have been owing to an accident - the A.E.U.'s Delegate having put the wrong card in the ballot box by mistake, in the absence of Sir William Carron.

The facts are that the A.E.U. Delegation had a vote within the Conference Hall - a pad being passed round - and it was unanimously agreed to support the T. & G. W. U.'s resolution. The one fact that the News have got right regarding this particular incident is that Sir William was absent at the time.

That is not to say that 768,000 votes may not have been wrongly cast, in another direction, on other occasions.

Whether the Evening News' scoop was intended to enhance the prospects of the right wing candidates in the forthcoming elections is not clear.

Either way a nasty episode. Delegates will draw a moral.

BANK RATE EXCESSES

The British bank rate has been raised sky high in an effort to increase our reserves: The 'Financial Times' estimates that our bank rate excesses have cost the U.K. something like 2,000 million dollars in overseas interest payments during the past 10 years. This has been increased enormously by Government borrowings from the I.M.F. and central bankers.

Would the U.K. financial position be improved if we could detach ourselves completely from our international banking activities?

WHY I RESIGNED

by RICHARD PRYKE (from
Briefing)

Richard Pryke, a Cambridge economist, brought in by chief economist Thomas Balogh as one of Wilson's economic advisers, recently resigned from this position when he found himself in complete disagreement with government policy. In an article in the new number of New Left Review, on sale at the Conference bookstall, he spells out the reasons for his disagreement in a telling indictment of the economic policies followed by the government since they came to power. His central criticism is that they failed entirely to stand up to the City, and that most of their mistaken decisions stem from this. Pryke concludes his article:

"At the end of July, after a run on the pound which cost several hundred millions of pounds and a period of disastrous government confusion, during which it was stated that no deflationary measures were necessary, Wilson announced the most severe stop-go measures since the war. The government calculated that the direct effect of this would be to reduce domestic demand by £500 million. This was a stop with a vengeance. Unemployment will rise; production will stagnate or fall; the amount of idle machinery will increase; and productive investment, so necessary for the future, will dwindle. While this tragic waste of resources takes place, the balance of payments will improve temporarily as imports fall away. Once again the economy is being sacrificed on the altar of the pound sterling, but this time it is a Labour high priest who is performing the ceremony."

Why did the government act as it did, in defiance of all economic reason? The decision was in reality a political one: to maintain the highest arms expenditure relative to national income in the world, as part of a bargain in which military support for the United States is exchanged for American support for the pound; to buy the cooperation of the City; and to search for an 'economic solution' in the greatest assault on the trade union movement in this century by any government.

A MINER'S QUESTION

(from Briefing)

Sid Ford, Miners' President made a forthright declaration against work sharing in yesterday's debate.

But did he really know what the N.U.M. delegation was thinking?

Angry noises overheard from that ~~quarter~~ of the hall suggest that miners were complaining no delegation meeting had been held to discuss the issue..... Could that be true?

THE TWENTY FIVE YEAR WAR (from Briefing)

The Vietnamese people have been fighting for independence for more than twenty five years, first against the Japanese, then against the French, now against the Americans. Their leader throughout has been Ho Chi Minh, a communist whose position has been likened to that of Marshal Tito.

Is this a Communist plot - or a civil war in which the great powers have intervened?

In the Geneva Settlement of 1954 it was agreed that Vietnam was ONE COUNTRY and that free elections should be held within a year. President Eisenhower said that if these elections had been held throughout the country Ho Chi Minh would have won.

Instead General Diem seized power in the South with U.S. assistance and refused to allow elections to be held - the United States then recognised his puppet government which in turn invited the Americans to intervene.

The nearest parallel is the Russian re-occupation of Hungary after establishing a puppet government in opposition to that of Imre Nagy.

The U.S. has not declared war on the North; its bombing is illegal. Its intervention in the South conflicts with the Geneva agreement. The use of napalm and fragmentation bombs is totally contrary to international and moral law.

All foreign powers should withdraw from Vietnam so that its people can settle their own future in peace.

SHORT SHRIFT? (from Briefing)

4,000 Short's aircraft workers are faced with the loss of their jobs. 550 are to go this month. And Short's is 69 $\frac{1}{2}$ % Labour Government owned. There is no alternative work in Northern Ireland. Unemployment averages 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ %.

In a leaflet addressed to Conference delegates Short Workers ask that the Conference and the Government honour pledges made that the Short workers will be secured in employment.

"Safeguard Short's future and Northern Ireland's Future" says the Short's leaflet. Delegates may wish to approve.

THE FEW OWN THE MOST (from Briefing)

Seven per cent of the nation's population own 84% of the nation's wealth. Those owning over 250,000 pounds hold 56% in industrial equities which multiply fast; those with less than 210,000 own only 5% in equities, with 45% of their assets in cash. So the average capital appreciation of the wealthiest group was 114% between 1950 and 1964, while the assets of the least rich group appreciated only 48%.

THE TWO FACES OF PARTY DISCIPLINE: (from Briefing)

Coates case suppressed?

Coates case to be discussed?

Yesterday morning Conference Chairman Walter Padley gave an assurance that the Nottingham case would be discussed later. Delegate Fred Lindop, who went up to ask about the matter, said before he reached the rostrum "I want to ask about the question of expulsions and discipline." "This matter", said Walter Padley, an old ILP rebel who knows all about problems of discipline, "can be raised another time."

Unfortunately, powerful forces are pressuring in the opposite direction. Miss Sara Barker, chief watchdog over disciplinary matters, has written once again to Ken Coates to inform him that the NEC wish to refuse him a hearing.

Who is right, conference Chairman, or Miss Barker? Very many people are watching to see that justice is done in this matter. As the New Statesman said last Friday, "When delegates applaud bold declarations on the party's sense of justice and tradition of tolerance, let Ken Coates' name be remembered....His case will be raised at Brighton. Without supporting all his views, delegates might well feel that there are grounds for reconsideration."

GEORGE BROWN'S "FRAGILE PEACE" (from Briefing)

Those who had hopes of a change in Labour's foreign policy when George Brown took over from Michael Stewart have had their illusions dispelled. In his first major statement on Vietnam over the weekend, George Brown spoke in the language of the U.S. State Department.

His call for the North Vietnamese to abandon the guerilla war in the South, totally ignores the facts as reported by impartial American and European observers: namely that the war in the South started spontaneously, and that the North did not send troops until after the bombing of the North started. George Brown's statement is in sharp contrast to that of Harold Wilson at the May Day demonstration in Manchester in 1954.

"It was right to issue a warning to the Government not to go any further in the subordination of British policies to the United States... I believe at the moment the danger to a negotiated settlement in Asia is provided by a lunatic fringe in the American Senate ... Asia, like other parts of the world, is in revolution, and what we have to learn today is this country is to march on the side of the peoples in that revolution and not on the side of their oppressors."

This year's Conference should make sure that we return to Harold Wilson's old policies.

RANK AND FILE AGRICULTURAL WORKERS AGAINST INCOMES POLICY

This month's issue of Landworker, the journal of the National Union of Agricultural Workers, has an editorial supporting the Government's incomes policy. However in the letters' section the following two letters put a different view:

"Your editorial in the September issue of the Land Worker seems to suggest that as the gap between agricultural wages and other wages is getting wider the only way to halt it is a wages freeze. I would suggest that the only way is to follow the instructions of the Biennial Conference and get on with the job.

We were told that the Rent Act would help the farm workers considerably. Why then within five weeks of a case being heard in the county court has a member in the North Riding of Yorkshire been evicted from his tied house? I wonder how long we are going to sit down and allow the so-called Labour Government to interfere with Union privileges."

B. Waind,
Northallerton, Yorks.

"After reading in the August issue of the Land Worker, the messages from top Labour Government ministers on the occasion of the Union's Diamond Jubilee, I was most unfavourably struck by the difference between these flowery protestations of support for agricultural workers in their fight for better pay and conditions and the treatment they receive. When we come to the realities of the situation these politicians must have a poor opinion of the intelligence of land workers.

Has the time come for trade unions in general and the NUAW in particular to discontinue the support for the Labour Party which they have hitherto shown?"

P. Norman,
Hurstpierpoint, Sussex.

--- IMPORTANT MEETING ---

Jointly sponsored by the Hull Labour College and the Centre for Socialist Education.

WORKERS AND THE WAGE FREEZE

On Sunday, October 16th, 1966;

At CARRON HOUSE, 78, Beverley Road, Hull.

At 3 p.m.

Admission 1/- Tea & Biscuits.

SPEAKERS:-

John Prescott, N.U.S.

Geoff Carlsson, Secretary of Shop Stewards' Defence Committee
in London.

T. Sinclair, T. & G.W. (Fibres Division, ICI) Doncaster.

"NEW SOCIETY" SLAMS PART FOUR

The latest issue of New Society had this to say about the Government's decision to bring in Part Four of the Prices and Incomes Act:

"If the government has made up its mind about Part Four, it is the most retrograde step that they could ever take." The words were Dan MacGarvey's, the left-wing leader of the Boilermakers' Union, but they will be on many lips in the coming weeks, of the government's friends as well as its enemies.

The danger and tragedy of Part Four of the Prices and Incomes Act lies in the instruments of government it creates. The political question - whether or not the current economic crisis justifies the use of legal sanctions - is of passing significance. So too are the arguments about the transitional provisions of the Act, ill drafted as they are. It is a truism that a government, every time it interferes with existing contracts in any sphere, draws heavily on its credits of public confidence at home and abroad, and must be satisfied that the risk is worthwhile. But it is nonsense to say that the sanctity of contracts must always be upheld.

More important, and of lasting significance, is the cumbersome system of prices and wages control that Part Four introduces. It is a system which cannot be justified by any acceptable arguments of political expediency. Dan MacGarvey dislikes it because of the straitjacket it imposes on union bargaining; but equally important are the breaches with the British tradition of constitutional government.

It is absolutely wrong, for instance, that the power to impose a prices freeze at the level of 20 July 1966 should be exercisable without any reference whatsoever to parliament. All other powers under the Act are to be exercised "by order", which means that in each case there must be a statutory instrument laid before parliament in the usual manner. In the single isolated case of a retrospective prices standstill (one of the most controversial measures), the minister may proceed "by direction," which bypasses parliament; the corresponding wages standstill must be introduced "by order." This exclusion of parliament is wrong.

It is also absolutely wrong that the minister should be enabled, in drafting his restrictive orders, "to include or exclude named undertakings or named persons." The democratic tradition that a government should proceed by laying down certain general rules and allow its subjects to arrange their affairs within the framework of those rules, is sound - it is, in part, what "the rule of law" means. A government which descends to the level of exchanging blows with named individuals and organisations, as if it merely represented a sectional interest in society, is pursuing a profoundly wrong course....."

THE REAL CAUSES OF INFLATION (1)

The following letter appeared in the Financial Times of 6th October.

"Re rewards for industry and the letters appearing in your issue of October 4, I am a shareholder in quite a large number of companies, and although my holding in each tends to be on the small side it does mean I receive each of their annual reports of the directors.

I therefore cannot help noticing that in most reports the directors' fees, emoluments, etc., adding up to their total remuneration increases year by year, irrespective of whether the profits are up or down.

For instance, only this morning I received a report, where the profit is down 20 per cent, but the directors' remuneration of seven is up over £5,000 from the year ending 1965. I wrote a few companies earlier this year asking for more detail, only to be told (and they were within their rights) that they gave all the information in their reports according to the law of the land.....

G. A. HARTLEY."

The real causes of inflation (2)

The Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin had this to say in its September issue (pages 222 & 223).

"In the first quarter of 1966 the saving of companies, including financial institutions, was negative (in other words, after paying dividends, interest and taxes and deducting profits due abroad, they had a deficit) for the first time since the severe winter of 1963. Gross trading profits were lower than a year earlier, while tax payments were greater, because of the higher rate of income tax, which was mainly paid on the large profits earned in 1964. But the chief cause of the deterioration in company saving was the exceptionally high level of dividends: payments were some £200 million more than a year ago because companies brought them forward to take advantage of the transitional arrangements in the Finance Act 1965.....

The exceptionally large dividend payments by companies were the main cause of a sharp rise in personal income in the first quarter: although tax payments were heavy, disposable incomes were $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ higher seasonally adjusted, than in the fourth quarter of 1965. Consumers' expenditure, after seasonal adjustment, rose by rather less than this (3%), and personal saving increased by some £110 million. Capital expenditure and capital transfers also increased, but the seasonally adjusted financial surplus was still some £90 million larger than in the previous quarter."

'REBEL' RAISES ITS VOICE AGAIN by Geoff Coggan

Six years after its demise, Rebel is again published as the authentic voice of the Labour Party Young Socialists. With the advent of Focus, the unbelievably insipid paper which Transport House has foisted on its long suffering youth movement, the regular publication of such a paper written for youth and by youth is an absolute necessity if the Young Socialists are to attract the attention of the politically conscious - or, for that matter, the politically curious.

It is the latter who are in danger of being weaned away into the Young Liberals, where they will be able to pursue the right policies in the wrong organisation, and where they will be suffered for just so long as their influence is negligible - admittedly a long term prospect in the Liberal Party. Rebel should convince them that the fight is still very much alive within the Labour Party.

Now that we have entered the phase when socialism itself is openly proscribed by Transport House (for that is what the expulsion of Fen Coates and the disciplining of John Palmer and others really amount to), it is obvious that the Young Socialists will be under constant pressure. Unlike the abstentions of the traditional left spokesmen, their activities are likely to be high on the list of luxuries which Sara Barker cannot afford.

That Rebel will speak out fearlessly for socialism is self-evident by its first issue: that it will support others who are under attack goes without saying. Whether or not it, in turn, will be supported depends upon the extent to which the left has learnt that it cannot afford to be picked off one by one. The new, tough Wilson line should have made it clear to all that Sara Barker has a list as long as Ko-Ko's in 'The Mikado'. As with Ko-ko's list, "there will none of them be missed". It is simply a matter of priorities, in which the purge will eventually seep down into the corridors of Westminster.

Brighton indicated that the lesson was being swiftly, if belatedly learnt in many quarters; and one hopes that Rebel has arrived at the right moment to be assured of the support which it deserves and which it will most certainly need.

+ + + + +

REBEL : monthly, price 6d. Orders and enquiries to Mike Petrou, Business Manager, 20, Thurlow Park Road, London, SE.21.

FOCUS : monthly, price 4d. Transport House. Strongly recommended as a journal of recruitment to the Liberal Party.

"He who witnesses a crime in silence, commits it", wrote Jose Marti, the Cuban revolutionary leader in the struggle against Spain. "We," said Eichmann, "only provided the lorries". These two men, both in their lives and in their words, man the barricades of a moral divide. It does not matter whose is the authority or the State power concerned. The authors of particular injustice or the identity of those hypnotised and helpless before horror do not affect the issue: there are not two sides in this matter. There is only one. There is no neutrality or "non-alignment" between Marti and Eichmann, there are only those who move from passivity, in the face of horror, to resistance, and those who shrink from resistance, no matter what camouflage they contrive to disguise this from themselves and from the world.

Which struggle, then, historically, can equal that of the Vietnamese peasantry in our time, and which oppressor has enjoyed such power in relation to his victim as that cultivated and boasted of by the rulers of the United States? Vietnam is a poor country. A peasant there can expect to live for less than thirty years. They have known death very intimately. They have known war for three generations. They know their powerful enemies as only those who must live within the reach of people pathologically determined to do great injury know their enemies. They are aware that the absentee landlords who have served the Japanese, the French and now the American may be inconstant in their choice of foreign master, but never, under any circumstances, alter their rapacious extortion of rent, usury and endless labour from the mass of people, who groan under the weight of their rule.

This is the Vietnam that people who live in the belly of that beast which is Western capitalism know, at best, in an abstract way. Who, in our midst, understand intimately what gives the strength to illiterate and emaciated peasants in Vietnam to hold out against that military colossus, which is United States imperialism today? These Vietnamese peasants receive half the calories (1,700) consumed on the average in Western Europe and North America. There is not one large industry in Vietnam, such as can be found in any of the dreary merchant towns of the capitalist West.

But truly everyone in the West is aware of this. Who can say that he is unaware that Vietnam is a poor country, desperately poor? Who can say that he is unfamiliar with the torture and mutilation of Vietnamese captured by the United States forces and the Saigon Government, for the pictures depicting these incredible scenes have filled our newspapers, our television screens and our newsreels? Who, now, does not know that a small people, without an air force, has endured bombing for nearly two years, with tonnages in excess of those used during the Second World War and the Korean War, for the United States Government boasts of its kill ratio and the performance of its air force frequently and loudly. Three million pounds of bombs daily fall in North Vietnam, according to Robert McNamara. The weapons include napalm, which burns unremittingly, causing the victims to turn into a bubbling mass. Napalm's purpose is not only to inflict agonising death on the victims, but to cause terror in the observers, who find it impossible to extinguish the torch-lit Vietnamese peasants. Neither dirt nor water will

stop napalm.

Chemicals and gas have been used, with the full approval of the United States Department of Defence, since 1961 and 1962, respectively. Gas, said Robert McNamara, is a basic weapon of the U.S. forces in Vietnam. The United States army has issued a field manual, which states:

"The United States is not a party to any treaty in force that prohibits or restricts the use in warfare of toxic or non-toxic gases, of smoke or incendiary materials, or of bacteriological warfare."

Washington officials stated:

"Arsenic and cyanide compounds are being used in the southern part of Vietnam, but not yet in the North."

I have been to North Vietnam, and travelled in five provinces. I have seen personally the victims of lazy dog fragmentation bombs - those cylinders containing slivers of razor-sharp steel, causing all in their path to be sliced, as a machete slices cane. I have seen the victims of chemical agents and nerve gases, which cause convulsions, paralysis, blindness and perforation of the lungs. I have spoken at length to people who endured the forced labour camps of the South which, according to Time magazine and the London Observer, held eight million peasants - fifty-nine per cent. of the rural population.

It is important to note that more Vietnamese died between 1954 and 1959 than since 1960, the date when the National Liberation Front began armed struggle in the South. This is an incredible fact, for despite the vast and unrelenting bombardment of the North and the horror perpetrated by American forces in the South, more died during the so-called "years of peace", at the hands of America's puppets in Saigon and their American advisors, than during full-scale armed conflict.

What, then, do we do? The people of Vietnam are conducting alone a national struggle for survival, breathtaking in its daring and daily heroism. What can we do which can really help them in their struggle? What ought we to be doing, in order to struggle with them in a manner worthy of their sacrifice and on a par with their human commitment? I pose this question seriously and concretely.

The United States controls sixty per cent. of the world's resources, while containing only six per cent. of the world's population. The United States maintains over 3,600 military bases to protect this empire against the revolution sweeping the victims of American capitalism. That capitalism transmuted now into an imperialist system is prepared to use any means to crush those who rise up on behalf of decency and the most elementary necessities of life. I believe the most telling and serious help to be provided the people of Vietnam is to open as many fronts against American imperialism as possible. Wherever conditions favour struggle, struggle should be undertaken, and assisted by those who are in a position to do so. Whether in Peru or Thailand; whether in Southern Africa or in Western Europe, struggle against American imperialism is the most concrete and serious form of solidarity possible.

The Vietnamese are carrying the whole burden for the cause of oppressed peoples in the world. A real revolutionary international would waste no time in opening up new fronts. The true resistance in the spirit of Marti would lose no time in blowing up the pipelines in Iraq or the locks of the Panama Canal, or whatever strategic installation of American imperialism afforded itself as a target to those conscious of their duty to the Vietnamese and to the victims of oppression everywhere.

In Western Europe and in North America, the working class is being asked to finance the military apparatus and the corporate means of exploitation and oppression in the theatre of revolutionary struggle today - Asia, Africa and Latin America.

We, then, who conceive our responsibility without mistiness or rationalisation, must enter consciously into political and revolutionary struggle in the West. Wherever workers are exploited or made to experience hardship, it is our task to pose the relation between their suffering and the oppression waged by Western capitalism in Vietnam.

This is the true setting for the international War Crimes Tribunal which has been proposed by Bertrand Russell and which is under full and urgent preparation. This Tribunal commands no State power and cannot compel the accused to give evidence or to submit to the findings of its members. This, however, is not a disadvantage, for if this international War Crimes Tribunal is to play the historical role available to it, it will serve in a true sense as a revolutionary Tribunal of justice, voicing the powerless but morally strong feelings and convictions of those who know what oppression is in the world. I believe that this War Crimes Tribunal can set new standards, departing from the tired precedents of Nuremberg and other attempts at legal precepts which, in reality, conform to the real-politik of the State powers providing them.

The war in Vietnam - that incredible war of aggression - has historical and sociological roots which must be dug out, examined and put on display. The Tribunal's authority will derive from the eminence of their procedures and the thoroughness with which they prepare and present the full evidence of what the United States has done to the people of Vietnam. All mass organisations who claim they are in solidarity with the people of Vietnam, who profess to value the absence of war and a peace worthy of the name, will be tested by their response to this Tribunal. I believe that the truth about Vietnam, when assessed by a body of eminent and qualified people and exhaustively set out, will afford all engaged in serious struggle with basic tools for the task before us. The Vietnamese revolution is a cry from the depths. It appeals to us to see in it our own future, and it warns us of our own fate if we fail.

Ralph Schoenman
4 October, 1966.

ANDRE BRETON from a special correspondent

Andre Breton, the foremost exponent of surrealism, has died in Paris at the age of seventy. Greatly influenced by Sigmund Freud in 1921, he became a protagonist of psychoanalysis and the implications of its discoveries to the world of art. In 1938, when socialist art was being distorted by the bureaucratic insistence on idealisation of the present, Breton was in Mexico with Trotsky and Diego Rivera, with whom he collaborated in the issuing of a manifesto devoted to the independence of art within a socialist society, and the relationship of art to social reality.

Throughout his life Andre Breton never ceased to use his name and influence on behalf of the victims of political persecution, and his last public act was to join in denouncing the court martial of the Peruvian peasant leader, Hugo Blanco.

TERRORISM IN NEW YORK PLIES TO INTIMIDATE VIETNAM WAR OPPOSITION
from an American correspondent

On September 29th the Socialist Workers Party national headquarters in New York was set alight by right wing terrorists who threw four Molotov cocktails through the windows of the building. Other petrol bombs were thrown at the windows of the adjoining offices of The Militant but failed to penetrate.

The raid was similar in character to the wrecking of the New York Communist Party headquarters on September 4th, and the earlier attacks on the DuBois Club offices in San Francisco and the Berkeley headquarters of the Vietnam Day Committee.

It is also only last May that the Socialist Workers Party headquarters in Detroit was the scene of the assassination of a party member, Leo Bernard, and the wounding of two others.

Judy White, who is the SWP candidate for governor of New York, was interviewed on television. "Possibly a single right-wing or fascist organisation is responsible for all these outrages," she said. "The violent means are evidently meant to intimidate organisations and individuals that oppose the war in Vietnam. It is part of the general climate of violence in the United States which is being given continual impetus by the Johnson administration's escalation of the war. But we intend to continue our opposition to American intervention in the war in Vietnam. We will continue to demand the immediate withdrawal of American troops."

Judy White ended her press conference with an appeal to all opponents of the war in Vietnam to close ranks and to rally round with expressions of solidarity against the pattern of violence aimed at stifling opposition to Johnson's drive towards war with China. Since the fire raid, many such messages of solidarity have been streaming in.