

The Week

4106 W

WORKERS' CONTROL

- INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY CONFERENCE
- PLANS FOR STEEL, DOCKS.
- OPEN THE BOOKS!
- INCOMES POLICY FRAUD



THE DOUBTING ATLAS

WEST NOTTINGHAM C.L.P. YOUNG SOCIALISTS

16, Greendale Gardens,
Aspley Park Drive,
Nottingham.
June 12th, 1965.

Dear Colleague,

On Sunday 27th June, Ernie Roberts, the Assistant General Secretary of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, will address a Young Socialist day school on;

"Labour's first nine months"

The school will be held in the Guild Room, Co-operative Education Centre, Heathcote St., Nottingham, from 2.00 p.m. to 5.00 p.m..

Ernie Roberts is the Assistant General Secretary of Britain's second biggest union, in which he has special responsibility for recruiting young people. His record of service to the working class is a long one. He has attended and spoken at many Labour Party conferences and became well-known for his progressive views. For a number of years he was chairman of the Finance Committee of the Coventry City Council and became prominent for the part he played when that city was being reconstructed after the war. In the 1955 general Election he fought Stockport for Labour.

The school is primarily intended for Young Socialists, but other interested people will be welcome. Please let us know if you are coming. Fill in the form below, send it to us, and we will send further information.

Please note that a social is being organised for the Sunday evening and all participants will be given the necessary information when it becomes available.

Yours fraternally,
John Daniels (Acting Secretary)
Dave Ablitt (Chairman).

West Nottingham C.L.P. Young Socialist School 27/6/65.

Name.....

Address.....
.....
.....

Organisation.....

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

Volume 3. No. 24, June 17th, 1965.

Students 25% discount.

CONTENTS

Page	269	Editorial.
"	270	Vietnam campaign.
"	271	Campaign for Democracy in Ulster.
W	272	British writers support Portuguese colleagues.
"	273	U.S. whites less racist.
"	274	Dr. Beeching's departure.
"	275	Should the Beatles send back their medals?
"	276	The Confed. has a militant agenda.
"	277	Workers' conditions in Tanganyika.
"	278	Strikes in 1964.
"	280	Press barons extend their tentacles.

ALL ROADS LEAD TO MANCHESTER THIS WEEKEND

This weekend, the third Voice seminar on workers' control to take place in just over twelve months will be held in Manchester. From all possible advance accounts, this will be the most imposing meeting yet. It will certainly be large. Big delegations of trade unionists from Hull, Nottingham, Sheffield, Manchester and London are expected. Scottish socialists have expressed a keen interest in the proceedings, and propose to convene their own gathering. In Manchester representatives of the steel industry will discuss the detailed programmes for workers' control and self-management which have been elaborated by study-groups drawn from both industries. At the same time, the rapidly evolving discussion on incomes policy, will be carried forward. More and more people are expressing an interest in the proposals which have been canvassed at previous seminars: that no incomes policy discussions can begin to bear fruit until the employers' accounts are fully available to union inspection. This argument will be seriously extended this week end.

The Week has already prepared pamphlets on the first two seminars. We hope to provide the same service for the third. But what are the next moves? There must be serious and sustained efforts to carry the whole discussion onto the floor of the Labour Party Conference and the T.U.C. Already ^{the} workers' control campaign has begun to move into the mainstream of politics. It must occupy its rightful place at the centre of the discussion of organised Labour this Autumn. (Enquiries about the workers' control conference should go to: Alan Rooney, 241a, Dickenson Rd., Manchester 13)

STOP PRESS: A LETTER TO THE WEEK FROM N.A.L.S.O.

"N.A.L.S.O. is organising a public meeting at the Conway Hall, London on June 27th (Sunday) at 2.00 p.m. Ian Mikardo has already agreed to speak. We want to make this discussion meeting with emphasis on questions and speeches from the floor, rather than set platform speeches. We have asked Union Voice to co-sponsor it with us...The subject would be: the Labour Government so far and what the left can do. We would like The Week to co-sponsor it with us, and help us with publicity. Could you mention it in The Week and push it? Would some representative of The Week chair the meeting and join in the discussion?...". Our reply said that we would enthusiastically support such a venture. We hope all readers will attend and publicise the meeting.

AUSTRALIAN DOCKERS FINED £74,000 FOR VIETNAM STRIKE from a Sydney reader

On June 9th more than 22,000 Australian dockers went on strike at six ports to protest against the Menzies Government decision to send troops to South Vietnam. In Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane and other ports, the strikers protested in particular against Judge Gallagher's statement that dockers who stopped work on such issues as Vietnam were "unfit to work and were liable to prosecution for conspiracy." At a meeting in Sydney, the dockers heard a message from their counterparts in Saigon saying that they were "very happy to learn that you went on strike on April 21 to protest against your Government's policy on Vietnam." It is estimated that more than 135 ships were affected by the strike.

The following day, June 10th, the Australian Stevedoring Industry Authority fined the dockers more than £74,000 for taking part in the strike. The authority claimed that the strike was ^{not} authorised and had ^{not} gone through the correct channels. The general secretary of the Waterside Workers' Federation, said that all members who took part in the strike had been fined. The fine takes the form of withholding attendance money. The dockers, however, are determined to make their views known and the fines have had the effect of increasing militancy rather than intimidating anyone. It would be very good indeed if there were more examples like this (and the refusal of Japanese seamen and dockers to handle Vietnam-bound U.S. ships) in the struggle against U.S. aggression.

VIETNAM COMMITTEE FORMED IN GLASGOW

from Tony Southall

Following the initiative taken in London by Fenner Brockway, a Glasgow "Peace in Vietnam Committee" has been formed with representation from a broad section of public life. Its immediate objective will be to focus attention on and raise support for the lobby of Parliament on 30th June. To this end it is planned to give Glasgow delegates a good send-off with a demonstration at North Hanover Street at 8.00 p.m. on the evening of Tuesday, June 29th. Support is being sought from the Labour and trade union movement. Information on this and future activities can be obtained from the secretary, Ron Clydesdale, 79, Otago St., Glasgow W. 2.

LABOUR PARTY SUPPORT FOR "TEACH-IN"

by Rod Kreizman

A telegram of support was sent to the London School of Economics "teach-in", by the officers of the South Nottingham Constituency Labour Party. The telegram informed the participants that the South Nottingham Labour Party had passed many protests against U.S. policy in Vietnam and British support for this policy. It called for the maximum campaign on the question and said the whole matter was one of the greatest urgency.

Mr. Paul B. Rose, M.P., - a correction

In a recent edition of The Week a report of the Manchester May Day Rally conveyed the impression that Paul Rose, Member for Blackley, did not emphasise his opposition to American action in Vietnam. Mr. Paul Rose informs us that he indeed made a categorical and unequivocal statement that the Government ought to be ready to criticise American action and he further dealt with the question of reducing arms expenditure. He has asked us to correct any false impressions that might have been conveyed by the report since he has been particularly active over the questions of Vietnam and Dominica both in the House and outside.

This coming Sunday, the 20th of June, will see the first major activity of the Campaign for Democracy in Ulster. This organisation has called a march from Hyde Park Corner at 3.00 to Trafalgar Square, where a meeting will follow at 4.00. Among the speakers will be Fenner Brockway, Maurice Orbach, William Molloy, and two Irish speakers: Anthony Coughlan (Dublin) and Jack Bennett (Belfast).

The organisation has stated its aims to be:

(1) To secure a full and impartial inquiry into the administration of government in Northern Ireland, and into allegations of discrimination in the fields of housing and employment.

(2) To bring electoral law in Northern Ireland into line with that in the rest of the United Kingdom and to examine electoral boundaries with a view to providing fair representation for all sections of the community.

(3) To press for the application of the "Races Relations Bill" to be extended to Northern Ireland and to include religious discrimination and incitement.

The Campaign for Democracy in Ulster seeks to further these aims by enlisting support in the Labour, trade union and Co-operative movements. Readers wanting further information should write to: Campaign for Democracy in Ulster, 195, Leigham Court Road, Streatham, London S.W. 16.

MILKING THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE

by a Health worker

From next October the Ministry of Health will not advertise for tenders for some of the most widely used antibiotics in British hospitals. The scheme comes into force from October 1st and, initially, will apply for twelve months. The Ministry have made it understood however that the scheme is almost certain to be renewed. The ban will hit a number of foreign companies, notably from Italy and Poland, who have been supplying the drugs at much cheaper rates. These firms will not be invited to supply them when their existing contracts run out in September. The drugs concerned - the most important of which are chlorothiazide and hydrochlorothiazide - are widely used to treat infections like pneumonia and bronchitis. Thus the British based drug firms have won their struggle for protection.

This protection will further inflate the huge profits that these firms are making out of the National Health Service. Some indication of the position was given by Mr. Bob Edwards, M.P., president of the Chemical Workers' Union, when he spoke at his union's annual conference last weekend. "The average dividend for four large American firms operating in Britain was 70%," he stated, adding that such high dividends were due to their monopoly position particularly in antibiotics. Now this monopoly has been further strengthened by a Labour Government!

The union went on to pass, unanimously, an executive-sponsored resolution urging an enquiry into the drug and pharmaceutical section of the chemical industry. It is to be hoped that a campaign will be mounted for the nationalisation of this industry and its integration into an overall health and welfare scheme, with effective democratic control by the workers and technicians concerned.

WRITERS SIGN PROTEST

A number of famous British writers have signed a protest against the Portuguese Government's action in banning the Portuguese Society of Writers. We reprint the text of this protest here:

"The Portuguese Society of Writers has been banned by the Salazar Government. Five distinguished members of the jury which awarded a prize to the Angolan writer Luandino Vieira have been arbitrarily arrested and interrogated by the Portuguese political police (PIDE). The Government press has undertaken a campaign to discredit the Portuguese Society of Writers. This created an atmosphere which led to the destruction of its headquarters by unknown persons.

"We writers and poets in Great Britain are appalled at these actions by the Portuguese Government. They constitute a serious infringement of freedom of expression in Portugal, in clear violation of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. The Portuguese Society of Writers has our warmest support. It should be permitted an existence free from Government interference."

Up to now the signatories of this protest have been: John Harvey, Jacquetta Hawkes, David Holbrook, Sir Julian Huxley, Mervyn Jones, Laurie Lee, Hugh MacDiarmid, Christopher Middleton, Harold Pinter, J.B. Priestley, Bertrand Russell, Alan Sillitoe, Ted Willis, Angus Wilson, Colin Wilson.

It is obvious that this award was used as an excuse to ban the Society. Luandino Vieira was not condemned for terrorism, as stated by the Portuguese press, but for activities aimed at achieving independence for Angola, that is, its separation or disintegration from the mother-country. He had already won in previous years four literary prizes, the last one being for the same novel and awarded last year in Luanda, Angola. This prize, awarded when the author was already serving his sentence, was officially presented to his wife by the Governor of Luanda.

Even so, the Society was apparently aware of its precarious position: its executive issued a statement explaining that the award was 'exclusively based on the literary merit of the work and in no way meant to be a judgement on the activities of which the author was accused'. In spite of this statement the Minister of Education justified his ban on the society by saying that it had failed to repudiate the jury's decision after it was announced that Vieira was a convicted terrorist. This, he stated, deeply offended national feelings at a time when Portuguese soldiers were falling overseas, victims of such terrorism.

The banning was immediately followed by the ransacking of the Society's premises and a violent campaign on the part of the press, radio and television. The Society was accused of being 'an accomplice of the enemies of the nation' and of 'treason'. Several newspapers which did not participate in the campaign were 'advised' to do so, and one was even temporarily closed down. Three of the jury of five (all of whom were arrested, but two of whom were released) were detained for a week, and their release then was a direct result of the many telegrams of protest which were sent to the Minister of Education by writers, artists and university professors.

This coming Sunday, the 20th of June, will see the first major activity of the Campaign for Democracy in Ulster. This organisation has called a march from Hyde Park Corner at 3.00 to Trafalgar Square, where a meeting will follow at 4.00. Among the speakers will be Fenner Brockway, Maurice Orbach, William Molloy, and two Irish speakers: Anthony Coughlan (Dublin) and Jack Bennett (Belfast).

The organisation has stated its aims to be:

(1) To secure a full and impartial inquiry into the administration of government in Northern Ireland, and into allegations of discrimination in the fields of housing and employment.

(2) To bring electoral law in Northern Ireland into line with that in the rest of the United Kingdom and to examine electoral boundaries with a view to providing fair representation for all sections of the community.

(3) To press for the application of the "Races Relations Bill" to be extended to Northern Ireland and to include religious discrimination and incitement.

The Campaign for Democracy in Ulster seeks to further these aims by enlisting support in the Labour, trade union and Co-operative movements. Readers wanting further information should write to: Campaign for Democracy in Ulster, 195, Leigham Court Road, Streatham, London S.W. 16.

MILKING THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE

by a Health worker

From next October the Ministry of Health will not advertise for tenders for some of the most widely used antibiotics in British hospitals. The scheme comes into force from October 1st and, initially, will apply for twelve months. The Ministry have made it understood however that the scheme is almost certain to be renewed. The ban will hit a number of foreign companies, notably from Italy and Poland, who have been supplying the drugs at much cheaper rates. These firms will not be invited to supply them when their existing contracts run out in September. The drugs concerned - the most important of which are chlorothiazide and hydrochlorothiazide - are widely used to treat infections like pneumonia and bronchitis. Thus the British based drug firms have won their struggle for protection.

This protection will further inflate the huge profits that these firms are making out of the National Health Service. Some indication of the position was given by Mr. Bob Edwards, M.P., president of the Chemical Workers' Union, when he spoke at his union's annual conference last weekend. "The average dividend for four large American firms operating in Britain was 70%," he stated, adding that such high dividends were due to their monopoly position particularly in antibiotics. Now this monopoly has been further strengthened by a Labour Government!

The union went on to pass, unanimously, an executive-sponsored resolution urging an enquiry into the drug and pharmaceutical section of the chemical industry. It is to be hoped that a campaign will be mounted for the nationalisation of this industry and its integration into an overall health and welfare scheme, with effective democratic control by the workers and technicians concerned.

U.S. WHITES LESS RACIST

by Jean Holman

A recent Gallup poll in the U.S. reports that there has been a definite shift in white attitudes towards Negroes in the past two years. Two years ago Southern white parents, by a ratio of about 3:2, said they would object to sending their children to a school with several Negro children. Now this ratio has been reversed so that only 2 out of 5 parents would object to their children attending an integrated school. The results of the latest poll are contrasted below with a similar sampling taken in May 1963:

Question: "If coloured people came to live next door, would you move?"

	<u>1963</u>	<u>1965</u>
Yes, definitely	20%	13%
Yes, might	25%	22%
No	55%	65%

Question: "Would you move if coloured people came to live in great numbers in your neighbourhood?"

	<u>1963</u>	<u>1965</u>
Yes, definitely	49%	40%
Yes, might	29%	29%
No	22%	31%

These figures confirm the important findings made public by the Scientific American in July 1964 showing a very deep, long-range trend among the whites in the U.S. away from racism. The study showed that the trend held not only in the North, but in the South, including areas that had been scenes of violence, and was so pronounced that an absolute majority of whites in the U.S. are now in favour of integration.

Negro militants have often been warned to go slow in their drive for freedom because their vigorous activities would alienate the white population, increase prejudice and erase gains already made. The classic argument has been: you can't legislate hate, fear and ignorance out of the hearts of men; only a long, slow process of education can wipe out prejudice and discriminatory practices. The militants' answers have been: If we can't legislate what goes on in the human heart, we can legislate to protect our lives, our jobs and our civil rights; and we can educate the white population by our daily battles to defend and extend our rights and our human dignity.

Scientific tests of shifts in sentiments among whites show the correctness of these arguments. The drive for racial equality has reached new heights during the last two years. The struggle has continued to press on and on, and the participants refuse to be content with a few token crumbs. This unyielding, uncompromising perseverance has left a deep impression on the minds - and the hearts - of all U.S. citizens, educated for hundreds of years by the slavemasters and the wage-slave bosses. The Negro community is now providing some new textbooks, some new lessons, tens of thousands of new teachers, and racial tolerance has taken a few steps forward.

The hypocrites in Congress and the White House are quick to take credit for any gains in the field of civil rights. It should be emphatically clear who deserves credit in this instance: the freedom fighters in the streets of the South and the ghettos of the North.

Editorial note: This item was sent before the announcement that Dr. Beeching had been made a life peer. That appointment makes the article all the more relevant. Moreover, one is struck by the fact that the Government seems to be going out of their way to antagonise the railmen. It is very difficult to work out what its motive can be. Putting Dr. Beeching in the House of Lords as a reward for his 'services', following on the liner train decision and other moves, seems to show an astonishing lack of tact. It would appear that not only did many people overrate Mr. Wilson as a socialist, even more ^{people} overrated him as an astute politician.

The June 4th Railway Review carried as a lead article the following comment on the departure of Dr. Beeching:

"Indignant letters, exasperated expressions from men at the end of their patience, and angry disgust; these are the reactions of many railwaymen to the incredible spate of whitewashing nonsense that certain newspapers have splashed about on the departure of Dr. Beeching. One of the worst pieces ever written in that very bad newspaper, the Daily Express, appeared the other day. It was a leader headed "What one man can do." The unknown know-all who disgraced the name of journalism by writing this leader began by alleging that Beeching's "Departure is bitterly regretted. In little more than four years he has transformed the service."

"Regretted by whom? How does he know his departure is regretted. If this Express leader writer regrets his departure who the hell is he to regret anything? What we do know is that railwaymen and the railway unions will not regret his departure. They are sorry he ever came. In little over four years British Railways has been reduced, thousands of jobs have been lost, thousands more have been so depressed that they have left the industry in disgust - 70,000 left last year, hundreds of thousands of passengers have been deprived of services, hundreds of firms have been denied freight facilities, depression has settled on the men at all levels, management at large has become jumpy, suspicious, defeatist, the staff atmosphere in the B.R.B. headquarters is astonishing in its instability and tension, the unproductive element in the railways has been grossly inflated, and so on. Ask any active trade unionist what the morale of the staff is; what the state of the railway service is.

"The Express leader writer - and he is not the only guilty one - has decided that the Beeching regime was right and nothing will ^{convince} them, not even the truth. The only official strike in the last forty odd years called by the N.U.R. was in this golden period...."

THE FINANCIAL TIMES WANTS "LEGAL SANCTIONS" AGAINST STRIKES

In an editorial on June 9th, the Financial Times drew what it called "The Lessons of London Airport". After outlining its version of the recent strike, it went on: "As with most industrial events, this one has a...concrete cause. The first is the degeneracy of the command system in the trade unions, which means they no longer effectively perform their main job of managing discontent... The second cause is the system of labour relations so..that men can break their contract of employment with impunity.." The editorial then went on to call for a tough "Companies Act" for the trade unions which would provide for legal sanctions to see that collective bargaining is kept. It combined this proposal with one of the compulsory collection of union dues by employers where there has been a majority vote by the workers concerned. It seems that some sinister plots are being hatched!

SHOULD THE BEATLES SEND BACK THEIR MEDALS?

One or two "distinguished" people have sent back their medals to the Queen because they object to being in the same order as 'nincompoops' and do not wish to encourage hysteria. I would argue that there is much better argument for the Beatles to send back their medals in view of some of the types who have been decorated by the Queen recently. The Beatles have, after all, refused to play in South Africa, and two of them sent a message of support to the Easter March. How then do they feel about being in with such people as those the Queen decorated on her recent visit to West Germany? The latest issue of German Democratic Report gives some details of some of the recipients of strangely feudal-sounding titles Lizzie dished out:

Heinrich Lubke, President of the German Federal Republic. Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath. A Gestapo report of September 24th, 1940, referred to Lubke as a "reliable informant". At that time he was working as building engineer at the nazi secret weapons site at Peenemunde. On September 4th, 1944, he helped make arrangements for slave labourers from Buchenwald Concentration Camp to be transferred to underground arms factories, where they died like flies.

Hermann Hocherl, West German Minister of the Interior. Knight Cross of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire. Hocherl was a state prosecutor in the nazi courts.

Ludger Westrick, West German Minister for Special Tasks. Knight Grand Cross of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire. During the war Westrick was one of Hitler's "War Economy Leaders." He played a leading part in looting the industries of nazi-occupied South Eastern Europe and integrating them in the nazi war machine.

Gerhard Schroder, West German Foreign Minister. Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George. Member of the Nazi Party, candidate member of the Storm Troops.

Herbert Blankenhorn, West German Ambassador to Britain. Knight Grand Cross of the Royal Victorian Order. Blankenhorn served Hitler as a diplomat throughout the entire nazi period, joining the Nazi Party in 1938. In 1941 he paid an official visit of inspection to the Warsaw Ghetto.

Hasso von Etdorf, former West German Ambassador to Britain. Knight Grand Cross of the Royal Victorian Order. Etdorf served Hitler as a diplomat throughout the nazi era, joining the Nazi Party in 1938. He held the rank of Lieutenant Colonel in the Storm Troops.

General Heinrich Trettner, Inspector General of the West German Army. Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order. Trettner, a professional soldier, made a lightning career in the Nazi Wehrmacht. Hitler promoted him to the rank of Lieutenant General in April, 1945, one month before the end of the war, when he was only 37. Trettner fought for Franco in the Spanish Civil War; received the "Knight's Cross of the Iron Cross" for his outstanding services" in the destruction of Rotterdam, May, 1940; helped plan the invasion of Britain in 1940; and commanded the 4th Parachute Division in 'police actions' against Italian partisans in 1944.

However, as is well known, all this mumbo-jumbo of decorations, etc., is part of the political set up, and Lizzie is no more really than an instrument of foreign policy of the Government. So perhaps instead of asking the Beatles whether they are going to send their medals back we should ask Mr. Wilson why the above awards were made.

The annual meeting of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions opens at Hastings on June 22nd. Demands for nationalisation dominate the resolutions to be discussed. One from the E.T.U., in line with the T.U.C. representations to the Plowden Committee, demands the nationalisation of the airframe industry. The A.E.U. goes further than this in calling for the complete nationalisation of the aircraft industry. The Boilermakers' Society urges the nationalisation of the shipbuilding industry in order to "preserve economic stability, improve its technical development and guarantee the future security of the the industry's workers." The A.E.U. considers the implementation of a scrap-and-build programme to be an urgent necessity, and considers that the long-term needs of the shipping industry can be best served by the nationalisation of shipbuilding and ship-owning companies.

D.A.T.A. has a resolution recognising and supporting the need for a reduction of the Government's military spending. It urges the Government not to take up its option on further supplies of American military aircraft to replace the cancelled TSR-2 and says it believes that ^{the} purchase of American aircraft not only imposes a heavy burden on the balance of payments but also encourages other countries to purchase American rather than British aircraft which will hinder Britain's technological development. A.S.S.E.T. asks the conference to accept the view that where Government aid of any kind is provided to private industry there should be "a return to the community in the form of ownership of part of the equity of the companies concerned."

The question of equal pay looms large on the agenda, three resolutions appearing on this subject. Both the National Union of General and Municipal Workers and the E.T.U. ask that the Government be urged to implement or ratify the I.L.O. convention on this subject. The N.U.G.M.W. also wants the Government to be urged to introduce equal pay for its own industrial employees. It also calls for an investigation of the implications of equal pay in the engineering industry. A T.G.W.U. resolution calls for complete closure of the gap between women's rates and the male labourer's rate in engineering at the earliest possible opportunity.

CO-OP CONGRESS OPPOSE EXECUTIVE ON EQUAL PAY ISSUE

The 96th annual congress of the Co-operative Union at Edinburgh, held over Whitsun, was addressed by Mr. Ray (more discipline) Gunter. This didn't stop them from voting for an equal-pay resolution, despite Mr. Gunter's well known opposition to this principle being introduced at present. The resolution urged that the Government should take the necessary steps to introduce legislation to implement the principle of equal pay for equal work. It was moved by Mr. E. Stafford of Watford and Harrow Society. The motion expressed the view that the movement should give a firm lead to the distributive trades on this question. Mr. Stafford pointed out that one-third of the national labour force were women but only 10% of women received equal pay. The majority were employed as second rate workers. Miss Jessie Stephen of Bristol declared that for far too long they had heard lip service paid to this matter and that for far too long politicians and many others had deliberately drawn red herrings across the track in the hope that people would be distracted from the real issue. Mr. L. Oakes, for the Central Executive, claimed that there was no need to pass another resolution on this matter. He also said that it was not true that wage rates were as bad as speakers had quoted. He asked Congress to reject the proposal. The resolution was carried by a handsome majority: 6,797 votes to 3,989.

The Government of the United Republic of Tanzania commissioned the Economist Intelligence Unit to prepare a publication for the purpose of attracting investment from abroad. The result: "Investment Opportunities in Tanganyika" offers as one of the inducements to potential investors the following section on "Employment":

"....Paid employment is heavily concentrated in the agricultural sector, but has declined in most sectors since 1961. During these three years, however, average earnings have been rising, and part of the decline is attributable to the introduction of minimum wages legislation in 1962. The basic monthly minimum wage for employees aged over 18 years was laid down in the Wages Regulation Order as 150/- in Dar es Salaam and Tanga, 125/- per month in the 18 other main townships, and 100/- in other areas. In practice in 1963 average cash earnings by all African male employees amounted to 144/- per month in the private sector and 216/- per month in the public sector. Average earnings by African male employees in agriculture rose from 84/- in 1962 to 117/- in 1963, and in manufacturing industry from 146/- to 177/-"

The British businessman, smacking his lips at the thought of such low wages, might wonder whether there is a catch or not. Perhaps such a situation would give rise to militancy, he might wonder. But he need have no fear: further on we read:

"The Tanganyikan labour force is normally a stable one. The number of strikes rose sharply in the year after independence, due largely to disturbances in the sisal industry, and the government introduced the Trades Disputes (Settlement) Act in the same year to amend the situation. The Act makes strikes and lockouts illegal unless the statutory conciliation procedure has first been followed."

The survey gives the following table as evidence of the success of this move to "amend" the situation:

Year	Number of man/days lost through trades disputes		
	Manufacturing	Sisal	Total all sectors
1961	4,446	45,646	119,254
1962	35,316	186,975	417,474
1963	6	76,057	77,195
1st quarter 1964	-	2,774	3,092

The "success" is not so surprising because:

"Further legislation was introduced in 1964 to dissolve the existing 13 trade unions and to substitute one National Union of Tanganyikan Workers (NUTA). The general and deputy secretary of the new union are presidential appointments; the first general secretary is the Minister of Labour (an ex-trade union leader)."

TRADE UNIONS IN MALAYSIA PROTEST AGAINST STRIKE BAN

Hsinhua of June 11th reported that 47 trade unions in Malaya, Sarawak and Sabah have strongly protested against the action of the Malaysian Government in banning strikes in Government departments, all large foreign enterprises and foreign bases. Among those protesting were 30 Singapore unions, the biggest trade union in Sarawak (the C.T.U.), the Sarawak Dockers' Union and the Malayan Trade Union Council. These organisations have asked the Malaysian Government to immediately rescind the ban.

The latest issue of Ministry of Labour Gazette contains an extensive analysis of facts and figures about strikes in 1964. If one wades through the mass of figures it is possible to glean some important facts. Facts which are useful for socialists and which in some cases expose some of the propaganda put around about "irresponsible strikers".

There were more strikes in 1964 than 1963, they involved more workers and more working days were lost. A comparison with recent years, however, shows that it was by no means a boom year for strikes, for the number of days lost was lower than in any year, except 1963, since 1956.

Year	No. of strikes	No. of workers involved	No. of working days lost
1957	2,859	1,359,000	8,412,000
1958	2,629	524,000	3,462,000
1959	2,093	646,000	5,270,000
1960	2,832	819,000	3,024,000
1961	2,686	779,000	3,046,000
1962	2,449	4,423,000	5,798,000
1963	2,068	593,000	1,755,000
1964	2,524	883,000	2,277,000

The wide variation in these figures is, in most cases, accounted for by particular big strikes: for instance in 1957 the engineering stoppage caused a loss of 4 million working days and a national shipbuilding strike a further 2,150,000. In 1959 some $3\frac{1}{2}$ million days were lost in the printing strike, while in 1962 about 3,785,000 days were lost through two national stoppages in engineering and shipbuilding and a stoppage on the railways. If we subtract the days lost in the big disputes we get a remarkably stable average of about 2-2 $\frac{1}{2}$ m. working days lost; 1964 was just a little below that average.

An industrial breakdown reveals a very uneven strike level: Coal mining, Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding, Motor Vehicles and Ports all having 500-1,000 working days lost per 1,000 workers. At the other end of the scale several industries, Bread and Flour, Tobacco, Pharmaceutical products and Sea Transport, had no strikes of any significance, whilst important industries such as Agriculture, Pottery, Printing, Distributive, etc., had less than 10 days lost per 1,000 workers. In terms of the number of disputes the variation is even more pronounced: Mining accounted for 2 out of every 5 strikes, Iron and Steel, Engineering, Motor Vehicles, Construction and Ports accounted for another third of the strikes. Thus we see that strikes are more likely in industries where there has been the greatest rationalisation (Mining, Motors, Iron and Steel), where there are the most changes in day-to-day working conditions (Mining, Ports and Construction), and where local agreements play an important role (Mining, Motors and Ports).

Most strikes were short, 63% of them lasting two days or less. These short strikes involved over 53% of the workers who took part in strikes. At the other end of the scale 1.4% of the strikes, involving 0.7% of the workers accounted for 10% of all days lost in industrial disputes. This picture is repeated when the strikes are analysed according to the number of days lost in each strike. 61.7% of the strikes involved a loss of less than 250 working days, but those involving a loss of more than 50,000 days (3 in number) accounted for 11.3% of all working days lost.

When the strikes are analysed according to cause we find the following position:

Continued/

Some features of Strikes in 1964 (continued)

Principal Cause	No. of strikes	No. of men involved	No. of days lost
Claims for increase	540	293,400	786,000
Other wage disputes	668	111,300	267,000
Hours of work	23	12,500	37,000
Demarcation disputes	61	17,400	56,000
Disputes concerning employment or sacking	263	61,900	285,000
Other personnel questions	80	19,900	77,000
Other working arrangements	765	145,000	321,000
Trade Union status	98	18,500	174,000
Sympathetic action	26	21,300	27,000

What these figures reveal about demarcation disputes is especially interesting. Despite all the stories in the press, all the sneering remarks from Tory M.P.s, demarcation disputes account for 2.4% of all strikes, just over 2% of the workers involved and about $2\frac{1}{2}$ % of all working days lost. These figures are far less than those for strikes to enforce trade union status, the number being 50% more, and they accounted for nearly five times as many working days lost. The inference from this is obvious: if the papers and the Tories (and, for that matter, Mr. Gunter) are so concerned to stop "unnecessary" strikes, they should turn their fire upon those employers who have to be forced to recognise unions.

The above table shows something else very clearly too: over half of the strikes were of a semi-workers' control category. Perhaps the most significant total in the table is that for working days lost through disputes over working arrangements, this being the highest total apart from that of claims for increases. The number of disputes in this category is the highest of all, and if we add this figure to that concerning employment and sacking we find that over 1,000 strikes took place in a struggle to limit the power of the management.

Socialists can draw the following conclusions from a study of these figures:

(1) any move to limit or restrict the right to take lightning strike action would be a severe attack on very important sections of the working class who, because of the nature of their industry, need this weapon both to defend and improve their living standards;

(2) in the present situation the importance of the long-drawn-out strike is likely to increase. The Government will be sorely tempted to have a show-down with some section of the working class in order to impose its incomes policy. Also employers will seek to take advantage of the general political and industrial situation (and the pronouncements of Mr. Gunter) to "make a stand". This will be all the more likely when the effects of the credit squeeze ease the labour shortage.

The left must resist by all means any move to restrict the right to strike. It must also build up a network capable of organising rapid solidarity with strikers engaging a stubborn employer. Not only trade union branches, but Labour Parties and Young Socialist branches must be brought into this. The workers' control movement must find the way of transforming the present largely empirical struggle in the work-places to limit the power of management into a conscious movement to impose workers' self-management.

While the press monopolies in Britain devote great resources to extending their power and control over newspapers, magazines and the rest of the publishing at home, so they also expend money and energy in order to secure influence in the remaining British colonies and the newly-independent countries of the Commonwealth. With loud protestations they use all means open to them to see that their voices are heard in countries which have broken away from the more formal shackles of colonialism or who are about to do so.

"If the Thompson Organisation goes into the newly emergent countries of Africa, Asia and the Carribean in order to operate newspapers, magazines and television stations", Lord (formerly Sir Roy) Thompson told a New York audience in October, 1962, "this is because we feel that we have a technical job to do. We do not regard it as our function to use these media of communication in order to interfere in their social and political affairs." But, according to the Reuter dispatch reporting his speech, he also told his audience that what the millions of people in these countries "come to believe during the next few years would be decisive in the cold war".

The Thompson Organisation, whose publications in Britain and abroad run into the hundreds, employs over £50 million in capital, and during 1963 made £6 million in profit. Apart from its many newspapers in Canada, New Zealand and the United States, its ownership extends to the following countries: Nigeria (2 papers); Trinidad (3); Southern Rhodesia (1); Nyasaland (1) and Thailand (1). Recent reports speak of a decision to produce a daily paper in Liberia.

Even larger than the Thompson Organisation is the International Publishing Corporation - the vast concern run by Mr. Cecil King. Also with a list of publications in the 200 range, it is valued at some £100 million, and was the concern which bought the Daily Herald a few years ago. The I.P.C. group outdoes the Thompson Organisation in the extent of its publications in the emergent countries. It has daily, and sometimes weekly newspapers in addition, in the following countries: Nigeria (4); Trinidad (2); Sierra Leone (1); British Guiana (3); Barbados (3); Antigua (1); St. Lucia (1). It also publishes West Africa, the weekly review which circulates in the West African countries, and a series of publications (many printed in Britain) which are sold on the continent of Africa.

Control has also been long established by imperialist countries over news and comment which is fed into the former colonial countries by way of relayed radio broadcasting and by the use of news agencies with the sole rights of entry. More recently private and powerful television companies and financial concerns in Western countries have been seeking to exert pressure in particular on African and Middle Eastern countries to allow them to set up and have a measure of control over the television networks. The London Times, speaking of television in Aden, said that "A consortium which is mainly British is in the field there, as has been the case in parts of Africa.....The motive seems to be more ideological and educational than financial."

Recently a newer venture was launched by the foundation whose aim is to train journalists and radio television personnel in order to help what the promoters call "the general advancement of knowledge and material and spiritual enlightenment of all people". Its first course - reported in the Thompson Sunday Times under the headline "Emergent Journalists learn about press freedom" - included journalists from Jamaica, Egypt, Nigeria, the West Indies, India, Uganda, Bermuda, Kenya and Jordan.