

The Week

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS
Vol. 5, No. 6. 3rd February, 1966

6^D

- SOUTH AFRICA AND RHODESIA—I. B. TABATA
- DAVE LAMBERT SLAMS T.V. LEGISLATION
- WHY WE SHOULD SUPPORT THE N.U.R.
- UNITY AND THE LEFT
- VIETNAM CAMPAIGN

COAL : SOME QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

54 Park Road, Lenton, Nottingham

Subscription : £2 per annum and pro rata

CONTENTS

Page	1	Editorial.
"	2	Coal questionnaire.
"	3	Why Fred Lee must resign.
"	4	Dave Lambert attacks anti-union laws.
"	5	Why we should support the N.U.R.
"	6	A comment on Arnold Kettle's appeal for unity.
"	8	The New York transit strike - a victory for U.S. labour.
"	10	Rhodesia and South Africa - the role of U.S. & British imperialism.
"	12	Vietnam campaign.

COAL: SOME QUESTIONS WHICH MUST BE ANSWERED

The coal crisis is reaching staggering proportions. Readers of The Week will have followed the reports of the acceleration of pit closures with concern. About forty thousand men left the mining industry last year. Five more years of such human wastage will mean that the industry will probably not be capable of maintaining an output of even half the recent annual target of 200 million tons, the scrapping of which has been a drastic blow against the mining community. The National Plan of the D.E.A. budgets for a decline in manpower of 29,000 per annum, from 1964-1970. It is also predicted on the assumption that output per manshift will rise by an average of 6.0% per annum in the same period. But the demoralisation which the uncertain future of the industry has rightly induced in the coalfields has meant that output per man shift rose by a figure nearer two per cent than the required six, last year.

Mayhem among the collieries spells good business for the oil men. But whether such good business is good housekeeping for Britain, even in the stolidly neo-capitalist framework set out by George Brown, is very much open to doubt. Coal does not produce a balance of payments problem. But as coal is phased out of use and more key sectors of the fuel economy, its replacements will. All of these facts speak with one voice: the Government must sheath the knife it is holding over our miners. But there is another fact which speaks the same message: this is a Government which was elected to serve the interests of Britain's workers, including its mineworkers. Over 40 of its MPs directly represent the NUM. It is flagrantly immoral to break trust with the mining community, and at the same time it will prove politically catastrophic if Labour alienates its staunchest adherents. Dennis Healey spoke this week of how necessary it was to keep faith with the oil Sheiks of the Gulf, in order that people might "trust Britain's word." How much more necessary is it to keep faith with the miners, if "Labour" is not to become a swearword in the pits?

HOW "ACCOMODATING" CAN MR. STEWART GET?

Resumption of bombing raids on North Vietnam makes the U.S. commitment to expanding war irreversible. The remaining steps in the North are the destruction of light industry, the levelling of Haiphon and other centres and breaching of the dykes. This means famine and genocide.

"There is little doubt," The Observer reported from Washington last Sunday, "that the Administration's will has been strengthened by the accomodating line taken by Britain's Foreign Secretary, Mr. Michael Stewart." The action of a large number of Labour MPs in publicly supporting the pause in bombing suggests a constructive policy the Government should have adopted. Their stand deserves the firm support of everyone sickened - and threatened - by the war.

COAL: SOME QUESTIONS WHICH MUST BE ANSWERED

The Week is addressing this questionnaire to a number of leading miners and spokesmen of the mining industry. It is also asking the views of its readers in the mining industry on the points it raises. Answers will be published in subsequent issues.

Question one

- (a) Your name.....
(b) Your position in the union or political life.....
.....

Question two

Are you satisfied with the present fuel policy which is being carried out by the Government?.....

Please add your comments explaining why you answer as you do

Question three

Do you think that Labour's pledge to carry out an integrated fuel policy is being adequately honoured?.....

Question four

If not, how do you think it should be honoured?

Question five

Would you favour Governmental intervention in the oil industry, including the nationalisation of its commanding heights?.....

Question six

Do you think it is possible to integrate fuel policy without control of the key oil industries?.....

If so, how?

Question seven

Are you satisfied with the provisions which are being made to assist mining communities which are affected by the closure programme?.....

If not, what provisions would you recommend?

Question eight

Under the present policies being carried out, what in your opinion is the future in mining?

Question nine

Would you advise your son to be a miner?.....

FRED LEE MUST RESIGN!

We regret that our editorial last week got mixed between the stages of writing and duplicating. Since its message was important, we are reprinting what it should have said.

"... and arising from our determination to maintain our members' standard of living, we feel we are left with no alternative but to instruct our members to withdraw their labour as from 00.01 hours on Monday, February 14th, 1966." With these words the National Union of Railwaymen began a new phase in the history of the Labour movement : a phase in which the trades unions, which founded the Labour Party, are finding themselves compelled to move inexorably towards a showdown with the Labour Government.

On the same day, news reaches us, another sorely mistreated group of workers will be in action against totally unjust governmental policies. The Scottish Miners have called for a lobby of Parliament, and invited other areas of the N.U.M. to join in. It is much to be hoped that many will do so. The Scots are overcoming the transport problem by chartering aeroplanes : perhaps other, nearer, areas might be able to travel by agreement with the N.U.R., so that the only trains on the lines will be full of protesting coal-miners. This would be a powerful reminder to the Government of what is possible once its often neglected, and now shamefully misused, supporters are aroused.

Certainly the miners and the railwaymen must link together in the fight against the attempt to control wages to stabilise capitalism. This is the fight of all workers. All workers, too, must take heed of the Callaghan-Jay axis and its apparent determination to induce enough unemployment to impose wage restraint by simple market pressures. For the miners, these two general dangers are augmented by a third especial one : that of the complete subordination of coal to oil, and the dismemberment of the mining industry which is being remorselessly pushed through by Fred Lee.

All Labour's major pledges to the miners, about introducing an integrated fuel policy, have been brazenly shelved. Until, belatedly, Mr. Fraser was sacked, the same thing was happening to the railwaymen. Since Barbara Castle was given the chance, it now becomes possible that some of the worst damage to the prospect of an integrated transport system could be undone, were she backed up by a fierce campaign to give her the powers to attack the vested interests which stand in the way. But the matter has been left dangerously late, and could well prove beyond rescue.

Urgently, then, the miners must secure the same reversal of policy which is implied in transport. Fred Lee, who, we understand, is profoundly miserable at the role he has been manoeuvred into playing, is obviously incapable of withstanding Treasury and departmental pressures. He must join Mr. Fraser, and a new man must be found to represent the promises which Labour made to Britain's mineworkers. Let every miners' branch and lodge join the lobby on the 14th February, and let all voices be raised with the slogan "Fred Lee must Go !" This is no longer a personal issue : we are sorry for Mr. Lee, who has been a pawn in an evil game. But no change will be made until new, strong hands seize the tiller at the Ministry of Power.

The course of abject subordination to private industry must be sternly stopped. Everyone must help the miners to reverse it, and to assert the socialist priorities without which this Government will founder and irretrievably lose.

DAVE LAMBERT ATTACKS ANTI-UNION LAWS

Writing in "The Foundryworker", "Week" sponsor Dave Lambert has stern words about the threatening anti-union laws: "On 23rd December, 1965, the T.U.C. General Council discussed (legislation to enforce an Incomes Policy). They decided by 23 votes to 12 just to 'note' the Government's decision to go ahead with legislation. They did so despite the advice of their General Secretary, George Woodcock, who urged them to oppose legislation and tell the Government: 'A voluntary incomes policy is much more likely to prove effective and to achieve greater justice and equality than is a system based on the use of legislation.'

"George Woodcock is dead right. A rational and acceptable Incomes Policy has to be achieved by consent, not by force. The sooner we get back to that principle the better. Meanwhile we have to pull the hotheads away from the morass of legislation we are rushing into. This is a very dangerous way to go.

"We must appreciate that our Government is not a free agent in this matter. The international bankers are clearly demanding, as a condition of their continuing support, that their ideas on a policy for prices and incomes are operated. This is what all the mad rush is about. When our Chancellor Jim Callaghan, meets them again they want to see their pound of flesh dripping on the scales. And pressure to enforce the legislation now in preparation will steadily increase. This we all know. Our first need is to get ourselves out of the moneylenders' clutches. We have to pay our national way. In this, our job as the main foundry union is to prod and expose backward foundry employers who are content to muddle on with poor production methods and low wages so long as they can show a profit. 'Let's Go With Labour' was our election slogan. So let us go now on production. This is the way out of our present danger.

"We have to insist here on a lot more advance information about company plans and how they relate to the general needs of the National Plan. The sooner we start to develop effective forms of joint consultation and of workers' control the sooner we are likely to find out how we can best contribute to running British industries. In this the Government must give us a clear lead. Foundries are clearly run for private profit. We accept that fact. Employers must equally accept our right to believe in and work for public ownership and control. Extending the operation of existing public industries to new work is one way we can do this. The Fairfield Shipyard Experiment may lead to another. So long as our ultimate aim is clear: to make industry serve us. To make life better and our families secure.

"National wage claims, vetted now by the T.U.C., can be kept broadly in line with national production increases. This will only work if we achieve what is intended in the National Plan. If prices are effectively controlled, by legislation if need be- and this is a very different thing from legislation on earnings- employers will have to face one simple fact. Higher wages will have to come out of their profits or from better working methods. Our shop stewards must be free to provide this spur to action where they can. Legislation to stop them will only shield diehard employers, inflate profits, and frustrate the positive contribution unions can make to industrial efficiency and the National Plan."

NORTH HULL: A VICTORY AGAINST A TORY REVIVAL

The Week is extremely pleased to see that the Tory party has suffered such a crushing defeat in the North Hull by-election. We have commissioned articles to discuss the significance of the result for the left wing.

"The workers of the railway companies are entitled to the same treatment from their employers as workmen employed by other employers of labour." This is a quotation from a letter to the Prime Minister from the Railway Unions in 1911. It could well be repeated verbatim in 1966. Except for a very brief period in the early sixties railwaymen have always been on the bottom rung of the workers wages ladder. They have been permanently underpaid in spite of the 1955 Cameron Court of Inquiry which established the principle that workers in nationalised industries were entitled to a rate of pay equal to that paid in comparable industries and services, and the Guillebaud Report which worked out the practical details of this principle.

Sir Brian Robertson, who was B.T.C. chairman, helped to initiate the report and welcomed the findings as a basis for future wages negotiations. But he was quickly disposed of and subsequently management have repeatedly rejected N.U.R. claims based on Guillebaud. Latest 'Labour Research' figures, compiled from and compared with the same industries as Guillebaud used, show railway workers' wages to be almost 9% below the average. The Prices and Incomes Board have now sided with the British Rails Board and rejected the comparability principle in defiance of the N.U.R. and previous railway management decisions. The strike decision by the N.U.R. is a natural and justified reaction. The Union also reject the outrageous contention that pay should be based on earnings and not on basic rates.

This proposal means that railwaymen should work round-the-clock duties and week-ends and that any extra cash gained for these socially inconvenient periods should be counted against any claim for a decent basic rate of pay. The railway unions have co-operated in improving efficiency and increasing productivity and the facts and figures were submitted to the Prices and Incomes Board. During the last four years manpower has been reduced by 103,000 while passenger and ton-mile figures have remained constant - a productivity increase of more than 26%. Is it then fair that no wage claim can be considered unless a further productivity increase, which means a sacrifice one way or the other by rail workers

I challenge the PIB chairman, Tory Aubrey Jones, to ride with a locomotive driver, one who has just lost his mate through an extension of the single manning agreement, through the "deep night" hours and explain to him that no basic pay rise is justified because of extra cash earned by overtime and at the same time justify his own salary of nearly £300 a week.

Acceptance of the conditions of the Prices and Incomes Board report put the clock back ten years in the railwaymen's struggle for justice. The N.U.R. has the right to expect the support of all trade unionists if the Government does not reject this report, causing the railwaymen to strike on February 14th.

SHEFFIELD C.S.E. FEBRUARY MEETING

from Chris Otley

The first major meeting of the Sheffield C.S.E. is to be a forum on "Incomes Policy and Trade Union Rights" and will be held at 11.00 a.m. on Sunday, February 6th in the King's Hotel, Commercial St., Sheffield 1. The speakers will be Fred Gambles - a Rotherham steelworker; Royden Harrison - Senior Lecturer in Politics at Sheffield University; and Vernon Thornes - Secretary of Sheffield Trades and Labour Council. Readers of The Week in the area are asked to publicise this meeting as widely as possible.

In the January issue of Marxism Today Arnold Kettle has written "An Open Letter to a non-Communist left-winger", this needs some commenting on in view of the current discussion aroused by the Hull North by-election. Some of the points raised by Arnold Kettle are very pertinent to the present state of the left, and for its future. However, there are so many points raised that it will be difficult to deal with them all. Instead I shall try to deal with the most important ones.

The first point is on the question of the third Labour Government (1945-51).

"Each of the Labour Governments has had its excuse. The first two were minority governments. The third with its huge majority, was faced with the difficult post-war situation. And it is clear that every Labour Government will in fact be faced with some sort of inherent difficulty. Does this mean that the more radical solutions are to be ruled out for ever?"

Now this raises a very important point, but not the one that Arnold Kettle thinks it does. The implication here is that the third Labour Government was a failure. Is this so? From the point of view that there was no transition to socialism, yes! But, and here is the crux of the matter, was it failure when measured against its own declared policy? The answer must be a decisive no! This is not a mere question of historical analysis, this question is very important for the left today. Let me emphasise, the third Labour Government, apart from steel, was very successful in carrying out its own programme. Britain was put on the road of capitalist recovery. I don't want to analyse this apparent paradox here, but the point I want to make is that the very success provoked a serious crisis within the non-Labour left, even within the Labour left. The reason for this was that many previous assumptions had been knocked on the head. There emerged two distinct, yet tending to merge, strands. Firstly, those who argued the Crosland thesis, and secondly, those ex-marxists who now accepted the parliamentary reformist road to socialism. Along with this, and as part of it, there emerged the new programme of the British Communist Party, The British Road to Socialism, which I suggest was also a product of this crisis of the left. The left was faced with a social democratic government that did carry out its programme. The way the programme was carried out was, and still can be, disputed, but there on the Statute books were the Acts of Parliament. There before our eyes was the British Railways Board, the National Coal Board, The Coal Board taking over without any fuss, apart from some stirring scenes of flag-raising at the pitheads. This has to be viewed against the pre-war background of bitter struggles and near civil war in the twenties in the coal fields. If all this seems rather exaggerated, it is because I want to stress the point. I would suggest that in some ways the left (or part of it) has still not recovered completely from this crisis.

I make the above point to bring the discussion down to realities. And the reality in this: the third Labour Government failed not because the right wing betrayed, but because it was successful within its own terms of reference. Unless the left understands this, and along with them Arnold Kettle, they will never understand the nature of the struggle.

The next questions worth discussing are:

continued over

An Appeal for Unity from Arnold Kettle, cont'd

"Two Basic Points...(1) that it is not irrelevant in the mid-twentieth century, in the conditions obtaining in Western Europe, to talk seriously about fundamental social change; and (2) that one of the most important problems holding back the advance of the left in Western Europe and America is anti-communism."

With the first point there can be little disagreement, but what of the second? Before going on to discuss this, let's look at another point which has a bearing on it. Writing about the communists, Arnold Kettle says: "We may (and most of us do) regret this or that aspect of, say, the Chinese or Soviet policy, or deplore this or that by-product of the socialist revolution in this or that part of the world." Let us now examine point two and the previous quotation. First let us make it quite clear that the anti-communism of the C.I.A. and the alleged anti-communism of some of the left are two very distinct things. Those of us who oppose the C.P.G.B. have nothing in common with Mr. Heath or President Johnson. Both Heath and Johnson proceed from a fundamental class position irreconcilable with socialism and national liberation, because they defend bourgeois interests. Those of us on the left who oppose the C.P.G.B. do so from a different class position from Heath or Johnson. This is why our opposition is not the same. Despite all its faults, which we should discuss, we see the C.P.G.B. as being a part of the working-class movement, and as such should be defended against attack by our mutual enemy. Therefore when Arnold Kettle writes about anti-communism he should tell us very clearly whose anti-communism he means. For many of the Left do not oppose the C.P.G.B. because it is communism, but because they feel it is not. We don't think it helpful to use such euphemisms as "deplore this or that by-product of the socialist revolution". If this is to be a genuine dialogue then let us speak plainly: let us call Stalinism and its accompanying terror by its real name. Until the members of the C.P.G.B. face up squarely to this question of Stalinism there cannot be any genuine discussion as to the state of the left, for their party today is a "by-product" of that phenomena. Ever since the XX Congress of the C.P.S.U. nearly a decade ago, the C.P.G.B. has failed to face up to this question of Stalinism, and this is why for many of us on the Left there is still a big question mark over the role of the party.

Arnold Kettle tells us that we cannot effectively oppose the Right on a whole number of issues-overseas military commitments, Vietnam, Rhodesia, etc.- unless we also explain what communist policy is. But we do not need to explain communist party policy, since many of us oppose it. If on the other hand this means that one should equate all socialist and national liberation struggle with communist policy I would say it was rather presumptuous of Arnold Kettle. First of all it suggests that these struggles only take place under communist party leadership, which is certainly not the case. Secondly it suggests that the non-communist left in this country is without policies of its own and is incapable of formulating any. Arnold Kettle puts forward a programme for united left action, and with many of the points most left-wingers would agree, but there are a number which raise doubts. For instance: "End Britain's support for U.S. policy in Vietnam". Unless this is firmly linked with not merely being against the Wilson policy but also for a victory of the N.L.F. and the withdrawal of U.S. troops, this could lead to support for 'negotiations'.

to be continued next week/

New York, January 18th - The 13-day transit strike was of great significance for organised labour even though the Transport Workers Union's new two year contract falls far short of rank and file demands. It was the most effective demonstration of the latent power of American workers in many years, and its lessons will surely be absorbed by union militants across the country. The unity and fighting spirit of the 36,000 transit workers in the face of injunction, jailing and press attack was like a fresh breeze in the union movement. Full terms of the agreement with the city Transit Authority are not yet public and it will be at least two weeks before the results of a mail ballot on the contract by TWU members will be known. The overall increase is estimated between \$50 and \$70 million, more than double the Transit Authority's final offer before the strike. According to the January 15 AFL-CIO News; however, transit workers "will receive an immediate 4% raise, an additional 4% January 1, 1967, and a 7% raise on July 1, 1967. For \$3.22 an hour bus driver, it will mean raises to \$3.35, \$3.48, and finally to \$3.73 an hour."

Wages of another category of workers, subway motormen, will go from \$3.46 an hour to \$4.00 over the same period of time. The average pay of transit is only \$3.13 an hour, however, and their pay, even after the above increases, will still be less than other city employees for comparable work. In addition to this city-wide wage differential, it is not yet clear what if anything was done to eliminate wage inequities among transit workers themselves. The most serious is the lower wages paid Negro and Puerto Rican transit workers who make up some 40 to 45 percent of the membership of the TWU. Other reported contract gains include allowances for work uniforms, an improved health and welfare plan and better life insurance. Another condition for settlement was the release from jail of TWU President Mike Quill and eight other strike leaders charged with violating an anti-strike injunction. Also dropped was a suit for \$332,200 a day damages against the TWU which was filed by the Transit Authority.

To achieve these modest gains, union negotiators headed by TWU International Vice President Douglas MacMahon withdrew some major union demands. First and foremost was the 32-hour-week with a 30% pay increase. So popular was this demand that it appeared scrawled in yellow chalk on the side of subway cars after the strike was over. An example of the importance of this demand is provided by the January 12 Michigan AFL-CIO News. In a report on the transit strike it said "8,000 to 10,000 jobs have been lost over the last several years but attrition has taken care of the crisis. As men retire or die they are simply not replaced. One report on the settlement indicates union negotiators agreed to a continuing policy of job reduction through attrition and that workers will be given an extra bonus of \$500 if they retire while the contract is in effect. Finally, union negotiators apparently were unable to force the Transit Authority to stop using company spies or "beakies" to pry into personal lives and working conditions of TWU members.

One of the main reasons the full power of the transit strike could not be used to wring more concessions for the Transit Authority, was the lack of all-out support from top leaders of the AFL-CIO. Although more than 50 union leaders sent messages of support to the strike they were mainly directed to demand that the jailed leaders be released, and none of the top leaders supported the overall demands of the rank and file workers. AFL-CIO President George Meany played the role of strike breaker by publically criticising the strike and praising Mayor Lindsay, who denounced

New York Transport strike continued/

the striking union as "lawless". Meany's partner kept his mouth shut during the strike but after it was over he denounced the New York transit workers before a meeting of the Economics Club in Detroit. He called strikes by public employees "obsolete" and suggested the formation of a labour, industry and Government board to handle the needs of public workers in the future. "Society," he intoned, "can't tolerate stoppages which endanger the very existence of society." Again not a word in defence of the strikers' demands. President Lyndon Johnson gave still another reason for opposing the strike and subsequent wage settlement. He complained that it violated his wage guideline of 3.2% increases for workers which is allegedly designed to prevent inflation and rising living costs. Johnson is not nearly as concerned about rising prices and profits for the corporations.

While the strike was on, for example, U.S. Steel announced plans to increase its profits by raising steel prices and the President had his press secretary announce that the price hike was justified. The same U.S. Steel is one of five steel companies charged with conspiring to fix the price on subway wheels. Johnson went a step further than mere criticism in his State of the Union speech by proposing new anti-strike legislation which would be directed against the whole labour movement. But he was not the only capitalist politician who opposed the transit strike. New York Governor Rockefeller, whose family helped finance and subsequently made a fortune from the New York transit system, has also proposed new, more effective anti-labour legislation to curb strikes. New York City's Republican Mayor Lindsay used existing strike-breaking laws by enforcing the anti-strike injunction that resulted in the arrest of strike leaders. Finally, Democratic Mayor Wagner, who could have granted the transit workers just demands as late as December 31, ducked out to Mexico before his term ran out.

Despite these tremendous obstacles the rank and file power of the transit workers strike was of great educational value to all workers. First of all it brushed aside President Johnson's phony 3.2% wage guide and demonstrated that this policy was an obstacle to workers fighting for better conditions. Secondly the opposition to the strike by both Democrats and Republicans ran counter to the illusion still held by many workers that they had any friends in either capitalist party. Third, the strike-breaking role of Meany and other top union leaders branded them as saboteurs of the legitimate demands of rank and file workers everywhere. Fourth, the tremendous rank and file solidarity and power of the transit strikers was a tonic to union militants and helped point out the need to build a left wing in the unions that would kick Meany, Reuther, and other high paid fat cats out of office. First and foremost among the demands of these opponents to labour misleaders is the need to break with the strike-breaking boss parties and organise a genuine independent labour party.

MEETING TO ESTABLISH C.S.E. BRANCH IN SOUTH WEST from Tom Nicholls

A meeting to launch a Bristol and South West branch of the Centre for Socialist Education will be held at 3.00 p.m., on Sunday 13th February, at 4, Portland Street, Clifton, Bristol 8 (near the suspension bridge). It is hoped that a member of the national steering committee will be present. All readers of The Week in the South West will be welcome.

Editorial note: this is the second part of an article reprinted from Militant, an American socialist paper, which we are publishing on the occasion of the visit of I.B. Tabata to this country. There are copies of last week's issue left should anyone wish to make up the pair.

"Then despite the great threats by Sir Roy Welensky of what would happen if Northern Rhodesia was granted independence, Britain just went ahead and granted it - and you must understand that in that whole area the most important part was and remains Northern Rhodesia because it has the copper mines. That's where there are heavy investments. Southern Rhodesia has nothing. It is veldt (grasslands), underdeveloped. But Britain thought it wise to give Northern Rhodesia independence despite Welensky's fire-and-brimstone threats of all sorts of things that would happen. And in fact afterwards some of the great investors shifted their headquarters from Southern Rhodesia to Northern Rhodesia, what is today known as Zambia, under a black government, and nothing is going wrong. So there is no problem about Southern Rhodesia.

"What is 220,000 whites? Britain put into concentration camps more than that number of freedom fighters in Kenya, when the people were struggling for their liberation. Of course nothing like that would be necessary in Southern Rhodesia.It is Britain's competence to declare their constitution invalid, or to create a new constitution and to give Southern Rhodesia independence within its own rights. If Britain didn't do that for other reasons...it is because Britain gave (Smith) an understanding that no harm would be done. The present situation is due entirely to the fact that it is not Rhodesia which is at issue. What is at issue is the whole part of Southern Africa, beginning from West Africa and Central Africa, right down to South Africa. You have only to follow the investments of Britain, America, France and West Germany to see the ramifications of these investments, and to realise that in their eyes Southern Rhodesia cannot be dealt with by itself, as a separate entity. Southern Rhodesia is important only insofar as it is linked up with the rest. To put it another way, Southern Rhodesia is both a buffer state between South Africa and the independent African states in the north, and at the same time a front line of defence for South Africa, which means that it is a front line for all those vested interests of American, British, German and French finance. When you talk about Southern Rhodesia, you can't talk about it in isolation. You have to remember that it is part and parcel of a whole plan which embraces the Congo, Angola, Mozambique and South Africa.

"Take, for instance, the struggle of the freedom fighters in the Portuguese territories of Angola and Mozambique. You know, Portugal is one of the poorest countries in Europe. So poor is it, as a matter of fact, that a few African states, backward as they are, could invade Portugal. Portugal is not capable of maintaining the present civil war that has been going on by itself. But it is maintaining it. Now why? First because America pumps money into Portugal to make it possible for the Portuguese to maintain the civil war. Secondly because NATO powers themselves provide arms and ammunition to the Portuguese to enable them to fight against the freedom fighters. And thirdly, South Africa itself supplies soldiery to make up the Portuguese forces. The interesting thing is what ties all these groups together. It's nothing but finance. It's finance interests alone that have brought them together. It is the American and British investments in South Africa that demand that the Portuguese territories must not be free. This is a question of labour supply. South Africa has not got the required labour for both the mines and agriculture, the two most important South African industries. They are the primary South African industries, although not the largest in terms of the amount of national income they provide, because they do not supply the necessary foreign exchange. Sales of mining

continued over/

Today, Verwoerd is being trained by Hitler's officers, and the French terrorists of the Secret Army Organisation which tried to prevent the Algerian revolution. It is they who are training Verwoerd's police in the methods of guerilla warfare. You have the best trainers from Europe, and Europe knows it, aiding and abetting the Verwoerd regime. Why? Because of the investments. These investments are responsible for our position in Angola, Mozambique, the Congo and South Africa."

TABATA TO SPEAK AT "WEEK" MEETING

This coming Sunday, the 6th of February, I.B. Tabata will speak on

"Rhodesia - a New Stage in the Southern African Freedom Struggle"

at: Africa Unity House, 3, Collingham Gardens, London S.W. 5
(near Earl's Court tube station or a 30 or 74 bus stop.
Ask for Bolton Gardens.)

Commencing at 3.00

Chairman: Sam King.

Please give this meeting maximum publicity.

On Sunday,
Johnson out
letter hande
Vietnam with napalm and other
organised by the Harrogate committee against the war in Vietnam.

VIETNAM CAMPAIGN: COMPREHENSIVE TEACHERS CONGRATULATE VIETNAMESE

A message to the Vietnamese people congratulating them on the way they are facing the continuous American bombing raids has been sent from 18 members of the staff at Shoreditch Comprehensive School. "A considerable body of opinion in this country is disgusted by the atrocities which are committed in the name of freedom. We feel sure, in this case that the 'Big Bully' will not win, says the letter. The signatories included a variety of political opinions (and some non-political). The letter added: "...we feel, as schoolteachers, that we must express our solidarity with you and your fight."

VIETNAM CAMPAIGN: SUPPORTERS MEETINGS IN HAMPSTEAD AND S.W. LONDON

Meetings of supporters of the Campaign for Solidarity with the People of Vietnam have been organised in Hampstead and S.W. London. The meeting in Hampstead was fixed for Wednesday, 2nd of February and will discuss the holding of a meeting in Hampstead on the campaign. The S.W. London meeting will be on Thursday, 10th February at Africa Unity House, starting at 8.00. Ring FRO 3138 or WHI 4209 for further details.