

The Week

A.E.U.
election
exposé

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS

6^D

Vol 8 No 12 Sept 21st 1967

DOCKS : ?

WHO TAKES CONTROL ?

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

The Week

A.E.U.
election
exposed

60

A NEWS ANALYST FOR SOCIETY

Vol 6 No 15 Oct 1963

DOGS
WHO TAKES CONTROL

VI Onslow Grah., London, 1963. 150 pages. 15s. 6d. (hbk) 10s. 6d. (pbk)

Page 1	Editorial notes.	Page 2	AEU Elections.
" 4	Debray's Trial.	" 5	Letter from Peruvian Guerrilla.
" 6	Dock Decasualisation.	" 7	Vauxhall Shut-Down.
" 8	U Thant and Vietnam.	" 9	Oct. 22 Progress Report.
" 10	Scottish Political Notes.	" 11	Black Power Manifesto.
		" 12	" " "

* * * * *

THE NEED FOR A STRATEGY

Following on from the T.U.C. conference defeat of Wilson's economic and political policies at Brighton a whole series of struggles have developed on the railways, docks, in the motor car industry and even in teaching. These struggles are in different stages of development, but each one of them is very restricted in its aims and appeal. The most significant, that on the docks, seems to be doomed to defeat by a process of attrition (we sincerely hope that our assessment is wrong) and the railway struggle seems scarcely more likely to win its main objectives. It is sad to say that in a period when the trade union movement as a whole has rejected Government policies a fight against those policies seems futile. What is wrong? And how should the left seek to remedy the situation?

First we need to note that most of the struggles taking place today are essentially defensive struggles. And they are defensive struggles in a period most unfavourable to defensive struggles, i.e., one in which unemployment is growing. Secondly, they are struggles which do not link the particular industrial battles with a general overall political perspective. For instance, the National Union of Railwaymen has backed the railway work-to-rule, thus coming slap-bang into conflict with the railway bosses and, behind them, the Labour Government. Yet no one would know from the political stand that this union takes that it is even critical of the Labour Government. Likewise, The National Union of Mineworkers is desperate to stop the closure of pits in a situation of high unemployment in all the main mining areas, yet it has nominated for the treasuryship of the Labour Party, Callaghan, the main architect of unemployment-inducing policies in the Labour Government. Numerous more examples could be given: the lesson is clear, it is no use combating particular aspects of the Government's policies whilst carrying out support for their general line. This approach is one which is least likely to mobilise mass support for opposition to the Government and, therefore, is doomed to failure.

But even assuming that one adopts a fighting stance towards the Labour Government and its vicious anti-working class policies one can be impotent unless a general anti-capitalist strategy is elaborated. The present struggle on the docks is most commendable from the point of view of general militancy. But the lack of response to the anti-Devlin strikes should be analysed by the Left. This journal can add nothing to the analysis contained in the article elsewhere in this issue by Tony Topham. But the points he makes need generalising: it is of highest importance that all struggles today are both generalised and made specifically anti-capitalist. Not anti-capitalist in an abstract sense but in the sense that demands are made which link the understanding and aspirations of the workers with real erosions of capitalist power. The demand for workers control is a case in point, but these also remain at the level of abstract slogans unless they are made the property of large numbers of workers. In a period of struggle - which is what we are entering - slogans particularising the concept of workers control can gain a ready response. More than that: they can mark out the boundaries of an alternative strategy: one which can mobilise workers and yet remain anti-capitalist in

NOTES ON THE A.E.U. ELECTIONS condensed from "Voice of the Unions" articles*

The combined votes for the left and centre candidates is nearly two-thirds of the total cast in opposition to Lord Carron's nominee, the favourite son of the establishment. On Scanlon's side, the election was fought entirely on issues of policy. In his election address he says that members must decide "whether they desire a complete and absolute reversal of what I consider to be a most disastrous record". In supporting the July 20th measures we not only accepted a total "wage freeze" without any effective control over prices and dividends, but we did it in the full knowledge that agreements solemnly entered into would not be honoured and anyone attempting to ensure their operation during the freeze periods would be guilty of a criminal offence. "The country undoubtedly faces serious economic difficulties but the greatest fallacy ever uttered is that these difficulties can be solved by wage freeze and unemployment".

"We must have loyalty at all times to the principles of trade unionism and socialism". Scanlon's opponent in the second ballot hardly bothers to discuss policies in his election address, which is a hotch potch of innuendo and personal abuse: "Desperately anxious to capture our union; it is now an open secret that communists, ex-communists, ex-Trotskyists and those politically spineless characters known as fellow travellers - and not all are AEU members - have temporarily joined forces, held meetings in various towns under the cloak of propagating a newspaper (prize to the first reader to guess its name) decided to drop their support for a well-known communist, and to nominate and support an ex-communist who now holds Labour party membership".

Bro Birch (11438 votes) and Bro Edmondson (7865 votes) will not be entering the second ballot. Len Edmondson says "I have always fought against unemployment by taking part in marches, demonstrations, meetings and deputations to Government representatives etc., in an effort to eliminate the evil of capitalism which imposes so much suffering on the working-class and their families".

Reg Birch sees it the duty of the AEU - To defend the workers; to maintain and improve working conditions; to oppose and put down all injustice from the employer to our class.

FREE GIFTS

During July full time officials of the Union received from Jim Conway, who was seeking re-election as the General Secretary of the A.E.U., an ornate presentation case containing cigars and cigarettes with his compliments. Branch secretaries were not so fortunate. All they received was a dozen ball-point pens each, marked with the words: A.U.E.F.W. - Jim Conway, General Secretary. Some thirty-six thousand pens were distributed in this way. When Branch secretaries looked for the bill to cover these pens they found a note slipped into the parcel worded: "with the compliments of Jim Conway, General Secretary".

WHO PAID?

Who paid for this form of propaganda and are these gifts an infringement of Union rules relating to election procedure? One hopes that the members of the Union are more influenced by policy questions than free gifts, but, nevertheless, if the Union's rules have been infringed the ballot should be set aside, as has been done so readily in the past.

* Available from 73, Ridgeway Place, London, S.W.19; price 9d. post paid.

SCANLON SPONSORS V.S.C. TRADE UNION CONFERENCE

A.E.U. Leader, Hugh Scanlon, in his personal capacity, has agreed to sponsor the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign's Trade Union Conference which will take place in London on December 3rd. Support has already been given to the conference by a promise of delegates from the South Wales Mine Workers Union, and the Derbyshire Mine Workers who visited North Vietnam recently have also endorsed the conference.

The Vietnam Solidarity Campaign is appealing to Union branches to send delegates to the conference. For all enquiries about the conference write to V.S.C., 49, Rivington Street, London, E.C.2.

VIETNAM AND TRADE UNIONISTS

The latest pamphlet produced by the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign which presents to British Trade Unionists the Vietnam war in the context of the Labour Government's abandonment of Socialist principles at home, and its political and economic dependence on the Johnson regime in the United States.

The message of the pamphlet is an appeal for British workers who fight the Wage Freeze and unemployment imposed on them by the Labour Government, to align themselves with the workers and peasants of Vietnam.

Price: 1/3d. post paid, from V.S.C., 49, Rivington Street, E.C.2.

THE BERTRAND RUSSELL PEACE FOUNDATION

The London Bulletin price: two shillings

The September issue will contain articles on the Black struggle in the United States and an interview with DOUGLAS BRAVO, leader of the Venezuelan guerrilla movement (F.A.L.N.).

49, RIVINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.2.

Two features on Bolivia appeared in The Times last week; they pose a grim contrast. A brief news item (September 15) clarified the extent to which M. Georges Debray, the distinguished French lawyer and father of Regis, will be permitted to assist in his son's defence. A week earlier, in a major concession to world public opinion, the Bolivian authorities conceded, in vague terms, M. Debray's right to serve as co-counsel (alongside the placeman of the military). Colonel Reque Teran quickly intervened to prevent M. Debray from conferring with his son more than twice weekly. M. Debray was not only forbidden to visit his son; he was even ordered not to stray near the window of Regis' cell. Stepping a bit too close to that window on September 14, M. Debray provoked a warning shot from a trigger-happy guard. Meanwhile, all the books and papers used by Regis Debray to prepare his defence were confiscated, to prevent their reaching the world press.

A more detached view of Bolivia appeared two days earlier, in the form of undisguised advertising. 'The Times Special Survey' carried a long piece by Professor Raymond Carr (of Oxford). A photo of dictator Barrientos occupied the centre of the article, which was flanked on both sides (unconscious of irony) by advertisements for international banks and assurance companies. Blaming the moderate MNR revolution for bringing violence to Bolivia in the 50s, Professor Carr writes, 'Thus, the military coup of November 1964 which gave power to Air Force General Barrientos and his army colleague General Ovando, was greeted with relief.' One might well ask, 'By whom?' In the next breath, Professor Carr magically transforms Barrientos into the 'constitutional' president. I am no pedant or legalist, but this is an astonishing suggestion to me. Professor Carr goes on to repeat the contention that all the guerrilla leaders in Bolivia are foreigners. He adds confidently, 'Once, with the help of the United States, the army succeeds in training a Ranger Battalion, the guerrillas will be eliminated. If not they will be a growing source of financial and political embarrassment.' Does Professor Carr feel no embarrassment at the elimination of ten thousand jobs in the tin mines, military occupation of the mines, or at military dictatorship in general?

Ending on a note of sober optimism, Professor Carr states, 'Since 1965 things have looked brighter for the Bolivian businessman with a little money to invest in his own country.' The future of the lower classes is, quite naturally, more bleak: 'modest progress is all that is possible in a country with a small internal market and a small income a head.' It is scandalous that such rot passes for the wisdom of a Latin American 'expert' at a leading British university. We should view such articles as the opening stage of a propaganda offensive. Latin America will seize the spotlight increasingly. The ideologues will turn out in force to analyse events and to mystify and obscure the profound contradictions in Latin American society and politics. The British Labour movement should prepare itself for this ideological onslaught. Two pieces of essential background reading for British socialists appear in the current number of the London Bulletin: Ken Coates on OLAS and Perry Anderson & Robin Blackburn on Bolivia. They merit the widest circulation. An active campaign must be waged at once for the liberation of Regis Debray. This must lead on to a wider campaign in solidarity with the Latin American revolution.

A LETTER FROM A PERUVIAN GUERRILLA

RICARDO GADEA, it is claimed was the leader of the M.I.R. in Peru. Below is a translation from Spanish of a letter sent by him from a prison in Lima, where he is being held as a hostage against any revolutionary movement amongst the oppressed peoples of his country.

He led the famous PACHACUTEC guerrillas (named after one of Peru's pre-Colombian Incas) centred around Huancayo, Junin, in central Peru. Originally pacifists, he and his followers advanced in hundreds to reclaim promised lands. Troops and police rushed in to defend the land for the idle rich families, and machine gunned the pacifists, amongst whom were women and children. Gadea's Pachacutec legions held out for months in the jungles of Central Peru. Eventually he was captured and held as a hostage on various trumped-up charges, including one of setting fire to an American jeep. His cousin, Hilda Gadea, was at one time the wife of CHE GUEVARA, this being regarded as a further crime against Gadea himself!

"I write to greet you and thank you for your activity in defending and assisting those who suffer the repression which the Government inflicts on popular movements. It is most heartening for us to know that, in distant England, important people and progressive movements send us a welcome, warm solidarity and constant support. Peru now lives through times of great social tension and sharp political encounters. Political and military repression is constant, and hunger, misery and illiteracy together with great backwardness, heavily burdens our country. This is now well-known. It is necessary to continue to denounce the crimes committed and the crushing of all popular movements. For example, at the end of April the M.I.R. leader, ENRIQUE AMAYA QUINTANA, vanished together with various peasants and students in Cuzco. To date his fate is unknown.

In recent weeks there have been numerous arrests such as that of the writer and journalist HECTOR CORDERO GUEVARA and that of the General Secretary of the COMMITTEE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS in Lima, Architect Gustavo Ruiz de SOMOCURCIO. The latter arrest followed a public meeting which condemned repression in Peru and the NORTH AMERICAN INTERVENTION IN VIETNAM. The foregoing are examples of repressive deeds committed daily. From this Republic Guard Barrack Prison, I denounce the fact that I am held as a hostage on the charge that I am a guerrilla leader. I find myself subjected to a constant threat of brutal reprisals in the event of a revolution occurring in Peru. My very life and that of other imprisoned leaders of the guerrilla movement, is in grave peril. "

(Signed) RICARDO GADEA ACOSTA
LIMA, PERU, 20th July 1967.

The above letter to the London Committee for Solidarity with the Victims of Repression in Peru, emphasises once again the necessity for the continuance and constant vigil of the work of our Committee and of the need for international solidarity. We appeal to comrades to assist us financially so that we can intensify our aid to political victims in Peru. Recently the Committee sent £20 to the families of some of the victims and this small amount has been warmly acknowledged as a concrete gesture of our solidarity. The London Committee is holding another jumble sale in the near future - and details will be given in later issues of THE WEEK. We welcome any assistance you can give us, including jumble of any sort, which please either deliver to Millie van Gelderen, 6 Avonliffe Road, London, W.12, or ring 743-5791

DOCKERS DECASUALISATION: WHO TAKES CONTROL? - Tony Topham

The introduction of the Devlin proposals this week represents one phase of the Wilsonite drive to rationalise the port industry. Its immediate effect is to strengthen the port employers, who assume much more authority over 'their' workers than they have enjoyed hitherto. It also improves the prospect for orthodox, official trade unionism, which by its nature is more adapted to handling normal employer-worker relations than the semi-casual system which has prevailed under the Dock Labour Scheme of 1947-67. The support which the T&GWU has given to the new Devlin scheme therefore reveals, not a conspiracy between union officials, employers, and the State, but the limitations of purely trade union strategy when it is unrelated to an overall political purpose. And if Devlinisation has found the T&GWU lacking in this latter respect, it has also challenged equally the perspectives of the unofficial Portworkers' Committees.

Portworkers' leaders have correctly said that the issue is not really decasualisation - the dockers have been permanently employed, in one sense, by the National Dock Labour Board, since 1947. The permanent allocation of dockers to individual employers which began this week, is not, therefore, a progressive step from a socialist point of view. The real issue behind the new set-up is clearly that of control. Under the 1947 scheme, the unions shared control of port labour with the employers. Any alteration had to mean either a strengthening of employers' control, or of workers' control. In fact Devlin moves in the former direction. On this, the portworkers' leaders are clear. In order to mobilise opposition to Devlin therefore, it is absolutely necessary to prepare for an alternative port labour scheme which points in the opposite direction, towards workers' control. But the main demands expressed in this week's strike actions will be for a higher basic wage, improved pensions, and proper guarantees against redundancy. All these things are of course perfectly reasonable demands and should certainly receive our support. For they do challenge the utterly cynical inequalities built in to the government's incomes policy. Whilst Gunter and Government have resisted the basic pay levels negotiated for London dockers earlier this year, (in the name of incomes policy) they have hastened to give approval to the proposal that the port employers' charges should be increased by over 30 per cent. The employers of course need these price increases to maintain (or increase - nobody knows!) their profit margins which might otherwise be reduced by the increased wage costs they incur under Devlin.

But the wage, pension and 'no redundancy' demands should be re-inforced by a challenge to the fundamental aim of Government and employers, which is to strengthen their controls and to soften up the dockers for the coming battle over redundancies and rationalisation. The gains in productivity to be achieved by new cargo handling methods are astronomical - with roll-on-off and containerisation, output per man hour goes up hundreds of per cent. Therefore, like the productivity bargainers amongst the oil refinery employers, the more intelligent and advanced port employers will be prepared to PAY FOR CONTROL. Of course they will bargain about the price: they will certainly fight against the £5,000 compensation for early retirement which the portworkers' committees are demanding. But they will fight within their own terms of references, about the price.

The end of that process could see the dockers' bargaining power near to exhaustion and the stage set for the mass redundancies which the system demands. This stage may well coincide, in point of time, with the nationalisation of the

industry, in 1969-70. Some commentators confess themselves puzzled by the Government's apparently careless time-table, which will involve the industry in two major upheavals within two or three years. But in fact, from the point of view of the rationalisers, it makes sense. First, destroy the dual control exercised under the old Dock Labour Scheme. Undermine the leadership of the portworkers' committees, by strengthening orthodox industrial relations, hoping that that leadership will limit itself to purely trade-union-type demands which can be obtained, even at the price of considerable strikes. Then, having achieved this degree of control, cancel the one remaining barrier to ruthless rationalisation by the act of nationalisation. For it may well be in the government's mind to claim that after nationalisation the guarantee of 'no redundancy' - which was the price the T&GWU required in order to accept Devlin - does not bind the new Nationalised Authority. The dockers and their leaders should remember coal, railways, and now steel. The steel workers face a rationalisation which will reduce their numbers by a third in the next few years. It was necessary to nationalise the industry, and to attempt to get union and worker loyalty towards the nationalised authority, in order to carry out this operation.

The only effective challenge to this strategy is to change the priorities, and to challenge it in terms of control. This does not conflict with demands for higher wages, security, pensions, etc. If the above argument is correct, there is no hope of ensuring satisfaction on these economic questions, unless control is swung back again towards the workers' side. If the present drift continues, redundancy payments will be made, pre-mature retirement will be paid for, and in Britain's ports, as in Britain's steel towns, colliery areas, textile centres, and so on, Wilson's PERMANENT POOL of unemployed will increase, to the detriment of workers' bargaining power, and to add to the subservience of Britain's working people.

The contradictions of the Government's strategy must be challenged directly. It has endorsed a Labour Party plan to nationalise the industry, with port-level operations to be conducted by elected workers' committees. The dockers should demand and prepare for the implementation of this programme NOW.

Author's Note: This article was written at the weekend, before the impact or nature of the planned strike actions at the ports could be known and incorporated in the discussion.

* * * * *

SHUT-DOWN AT VAUXHALL from David Robinson.

Following the decision of Vauxhall's 25,000 manual workers to work to rule and ban overtime the management shut down the Ellesmere Port and Luton factories. Talks between management and the unions last Monday broke up after the management demanded an unconditional return to normal working. A meeting of the joint shop stewards committee on Tuesday decided that the work to rule and overtime ban should continue. Jim Watts, shop stewards convenor for the National Union of Vehicle Builders, said, "We are continuing the work to rule and other measures because the company is demanding complete capitulation. We want this trouble to end and we have offered further talks; but the company wants them only on its own terms." The shop stewards have set up a "fighting fund" to allay hardship among the men laid off and has called on the company to pay them for their lost time under the terms of the guaranteed week agreement. The Vauxhall workers have refused to be intimidated in their fight for conditions and wages equal to those in other sections of the motor industry. Threats of a complete lock-out are still being made by the management. A company spokesman said on Tuesday; "The longer the work to rule goes on the more difficult things will become and more production areas may have to be shut down."

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Re Vietnam Solidarity. Slogans of support for the Vietnamese people in their struggle for national independence are perfectly compatible with slogans telling the US to get out of Vietnam now, and both will be highly effective when carried on our Oct 21-22 international demonstrations. So what is Alan Rooney grousing about? U Thant has now called once more for the bombing of N.Vietnam to be stopped and I dare say A.R. will grouse about that too. Like others with a tendency to extremism and a sectarian turn of mind (his appeal, not to the left, but to "our part of the left" is significant) he seems to feel that obstinacy in adhering to a point of view compensates in some mysterious way for its lack of relevance and common sense, preferring to confront a kind of dummy figure bearing the label "U Thant" instead of concentrating his attack on our real enemy - the American Government.

I hope he will come to see the point in this criticism of mine and in Alan Kinchin's statement of Sept.6, and not go on wasting valuable time and energy in beating the air.

Katy Y. Rintoul (Bristol)

Editorial Note: This correspondence is now closed.

VIETNAM - THE REALITY OF U.S. ESCALATION by Alan Rooney

The Western press and TV gave much prominence to U Thant's diplomatic kite-flying last Saturday. He said that if the U.S. Government would only stop bombing North Vietnam for three or four weeks, Hanoi would be ready to begin immediate peace talks. He added "I do not even think it would be necessary for Washington to announce publicly that it will stop the bombing unconditionally."

The U.S. Government must be quite pleased with U Thant's remarks and with the publicity they have received. Such an inference can be drawn from the report by Dennis Bloodworth, the Observer's correspondent in the Far East (Sept 17):- "Mr. Dean Rusk, American Secretary of State, has confirmed that he is 'examining the possibility' of a new approach to the problem by the United Nations, but has 'little hope' that it will succeed. There is strong reason to believe, in fact, that this initiative is solely designed to deflate the doves, just as escalation of bombing is designed to placate the hawks."(emphasis added).

The reality of the U.S. Government's Vietnam policy is that they are escalating their war crimes. For instance, on September 12th the U.S. bombers made their heaviest raid of the war on the main North Vietnam port of Haiphong. The Americans admit to bombing Haiphong four times in the one day. The raids were made by U.S. Navy pilots from two aircraft carriers in the Gulf of Tonkin. The American bombing targets were right in the middle of the port, or as the U.S. spokesman put it:- "within one mile of the city centre." The gravity of this barbaric escalation is underlined by a Times report (Sept 16) from Washington which indicates that Haiphong is about to face an even heavier blitz: "More was learnt today of the standing orders for the bombing of targets in Haiphong. It is understood that targets in the city are not to be attacked while Russian ships are in port." Apart from this, the people of Haiphong are likely to face unrestrained aerial bombing.

/Cont'd.....

These are the realities of U.S. policy in Vietnam. Three weeks ago McNamara said that the complete destruction of North Vietnam's ports would not make much difference to that country's resistance: "It seems obvious that cutting off seaborne imports would not prevent North Vietnam from continuing its present level of military operations in the South". In view of this statement why is the U.S Government escalating its attacks on Haiphong and other North Vietnamese ports? Either this statement of McNamara is simply another vicious Pentagon lie, or the even more extreme military maniacs in the U.S. Government are winning their way. For instance, a former U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff, Mr. Curtis Lemay recently said that the U.S. should "eliminate" Haiphong. It should be noted that Mr. Lemay, a retired general, has some support as a Republican Presidential candidate in next year's U.S. elections. There are other 'hawks' like him.

Dennis Bloodworth's Observer report summarises the situation thus: "Reports that the American Administration might make a new bid for a settlement in Vietnam have coincided with the news that American bombers had been given the green light for operation 'Rolling Thunder' in order to block the major ports of North Vietnam."

* * * * *

OCTOBER 22 VIETNAM PROTEST from David Robinson.

Arrangements for bringing coaches from regional centres to London for the demonstration in Trafalgar Square have been made in a number of areas. In Bristol an Ad Hoc Committee has been set up which will be organising a meeting on October 21 as well as bringing people to London on the Sunday. The following is a list of the coach organisers who have confirmed that they will be bringing supporters to London.

Nottingham John Daniels,
69, Colwick Rd.,
Nottingham.

Leeds. Jim Scott,
25, Midland Rd.,
Leeds,6.

Bristol. Don Bateman,
26 Burghley Rd.,
Bristol,6.

Sheffield. Peter Smith,
14, St. Andrew Rd.,
Deepcar,
Nr. Sheffield.

We will bring this list up to date each week as we receive confirmation from other areas. A promise of full support has been received from the Hull-Haiphong Committee. Their banner will be at both the C.N.D. march in Scarborough on October 1 and in London on October 22.

In London the October 22 Vietnam Ad Hoc Committee meets every Tuesday at 7.30pm for a progress report and discussion meeting, followed by a work-party at 8.30pm. Over 25 active workers attended the last meeting on September 19. Posters and stickers advertising the demonstration are now appearing all over London. If anyone has a prominent front window or has access to a Public Library notice board or similar then we can supply posters. These are also available in bulk at £2 per hundred for posters and £1 per thousand for stickers and leaflets. Also, a reminder about tickets for the Vietnam Concert on October 21, these are 7/6 each and we only have a limited number. All orders to: Ad Hoc Committee, 49 Rivington St. E.C.2. Tel 739 6951

May Day Speaker Controversy

An interesting situation has arisen over the choice of a speaker for the May Day demonstration in Glasgow next year. By custom this has rotated amongst the three organisations sponsoring the demonstration - the Co-op, Labour Party and Trades Council. Last year however there was some conflict. The Executive of the City Labour Party tried vainly to get the Trades Council nominee - Alex Kitson, General Secretary of the Scottish Commercial Motormen's Union - rejected. At the time we were informed this was because 'Kitson was not a national figure'. The real reasons became apparent after May Day when it was recorded in the E.C.'s minute that Kitson's speech was 'shocking to members of the Labour Party'. (He had of course strongly attacked government policy over the development areas, incomes policy, Vietnam etc....and consequently was the first speaker to receive an ovation at a Glasgow May Day for many a year). This minute of the E.C. has twice now been brought forward to the Management Committee of the City Labour Party - and twice rejected. It is clear that the rank and file of the Labour Party do not agree with the Executive's assessment of Kitson's politics.

A new development occurred at the beginning of September. The City Labour Party Executive (whose privilege it is to nominate this coming year's speaker) decided to invite Denis Healey, Minister of Defence. At the last meeting of the Trades Council Harry McShane successfully moved opposition to this choice. Healey, the man who has presided over the British Polaris programme (in spite of pre-1964 pledges to do away with the British 'deterrent') was clearly unacceptable to the Labour Movement of a city which still remembers Gaitskell's 1961 visit. Latest news is that Woodside Labour Party is forwarding a resolution to the City Labour Party supporting the Trades Council's stand. It is to be hoped that that vote for Kitson will be transformed into one against Healey and that a speaker more in keeping with the opinions of the rank and file of the movement in Glasgow will be found.

Government Censured in C.L.P. Resolutions

The following resolutions were passed at the last G.M.C. meeting of the Woodside C.L.P.:

1. This C.L.P. considers that the root of recent differences between the People's Republic of China and Britain lies in the maintenance of Britain's imperialist role in Hong Kong and other areas of South East Asia. It notes with dismay that the latest defence plans contain no pledge to leave this colony and calls on the Labour government to immediately withdraw from Hong Kong and the South East Asian Treaty Organisation, removing all British forces from this area.
2. This C.L.P. deplores the Home Secretary's action in banning Stokely Carmichael from further visits to Britain and considers this to be yet another example of the Labour government's subservience to the government of the U.S.A. as well as an unwarranted attack on freedom of speech in this country.

In present circumstances it is not surprising that policies like those advocated by the Universal Coloured Peoples Association should be exercising a fair amount of attraction. It is nevertheless thoroughly reprehensible, and doubly so when socialists accept them uncritically. Certain valid points made by the U.C.P.A. manifesto only serve to show up its essential weakness. It points out for instance that certain types of "advancement" mean nothing but "...a replacement of exploitation of Black by White by exploitation of Black by Black of colour discrimination by class discrimination". Very true, --- but then the manifesto makes "Black Power" the key point in its programme, though it never analyses the implications of this ambiguous slogan. What does "Black Power" mean? The replacement of white by black domination? Surely not. The "annihilation of oppression" in a state where the black population is a small minority can only mean the reconstitution of society on an entirely non-racial basis, a socialist community where colour is irrelevant, i.e. that despised word "integration", though in an entirely different sense from that given to it by the liberals.

The U.C.P.A. calls for the destruction of the system of exploitation of black people. Does it imagine that this can be smashed without reference to the exploitation of the entire working class? Is the black militant to isolate himself from his fellow-workers in industrial struggle, to refuse to collaborate with white tenants in rent strikes and other mass actions? "For too many years he has let the white man do his thinking for him..... and lost his own personality". Which white man? What is this but communal chauvinism, or rather, to call things by their true names, racialism? The U.C.P.A. has an immediate programme for establishing various community services for the benefit of coloured people, staffed exclusively by coloured people. Have we not heard this somewhere before? Is this not what in other contexts and other places we call apartheid?

This is not to say that Socialists should not give critical and conditional support to organisations like the U.C.P.A., to individuals like Stokely Carmichael and Michael X, and even to slogans like "Black Power" insofar as it is a demand for majority rule, but they must expose and refute, patiently and tactfully, but no less determinedly, the reactionary and misleading aspects of such ideas and organisations. If the policies peddled by the U.C.P.A. take hold they could do more damage to the British working class than the Orange and Green has done to the Irish.

* * * * *

BLACK POWER IN BRITAIN - A MORE CRITICAL WELCOME by Geoff Crossick

Marx argued in "On the Jewish Question" that the emancipation of the Jew could only be achieved as a part of the emancipation of man. The context and the specific criticisms were different; nevertheless I believe that these ideas of Marx can form the basis of a relevant criticism of the ideological basis of the Black Power movement. Bernard Reaney was right to welcome the publication of the manifesto of the Universal Coloured People's Association (THE WEEK Sept.14) -- all involved in the struggle against imperialism must welcome the development of a revolutionary militancy among the section of society most oppressed and ill-used by Western capitalism. And their alignment with coloured peoples (widely defined) throughout the world is an important attempt to break through the complex structure which inhibits the unity of those who, objectively, should combine to fight imperialism. But one of my major criticisms of the analysis in the Manifesto is that it shows no awareness of just that Marxist concept of the objective situation. This appears most clearly in the rejection by the Manifesto

/Cont'd.....

of the white worker, who, it argues, correctly "would rather form a racial pact with his kith and kin exploiter". This is true; but it ignores an analysis of the objective situation where the white worker is not, in Marxist terms, less exploited than the black man, but is merely, because of the benefits and relative comforts that he enjoys, less conscious of that exploitation. It would be absurd for me to argue, as this position can be misread as meaning, that because, objectively, the interests of the different sections of the struggle are the same, they should be shackled together and inhibited by the speed of the slowest. That the black man must sacrifice his own surging militancy in an effort to carry the white working class with him; this is absurd and it is impossible.

What I am complaining of is the long term strategy in the analytical basis of the Black Power movement - a strategy which, if it exists, argues no role for the other objective sections of the anti-imperialist fight. The working class in western bourgeois society, the black people in those societies, and the black exploited countries, must all be seen as objective components of this struggle. And, to adapt Marx's words, it is only by the emancipation of man that the black man can be emancipated. In this context I would challenge the statement in the Manifesto that "what we are facing today is International White Power. And the only force that can quell it is International Black Power". The fact must be faced that victory against imperialism cannot, ultimately, be achieved by one section of the struggle alone; and that to argue that the black American car worker on strike at Ford's to improve his 190 dollar a week pay, yet still working there on essential war work for the destruction of Vietnamese peasants, has more in common with Africans and S.E. Asians than he does with his fellow U.A.W. white workers, is fanciful delusion.

As I tried to make clear at the beginning, this in no way constitutes a rejection of the U.C.P.A. manifesto. I welcome both it and, more important, the militant development that it represents. What I am here questioning -- not in a dogmatic fashion, but in search of answers -- is the coherence of its position; fundamentally, the Black Power movement lacks a strategy. The consciousness of the black western worker is at a far more developed stage, on the whole, than that of the white worker; as such the militancy of the Black Power movement is a crucial part of the fight against imperialism. And the Manifesto itself says that the demand for Black Power "simply reflects a new stage in the revolutionary consciousness of the black man". But then it goes on to argue that this is "a change of strategy". It is here that the essence of my criticism of the black power analysis must be located; black power is not a strategy, it is merely a tactic. A tactic of shattering importance, but still only a tactic. My fear is the danger to the long term strategy of the anti-imperialist struggle which can be posed by the use of a major tactic in an ideologically and strategically incoherent framework. My fear is less that the black power movement can damage the future of the anti-imperialist struggle, than that the analysis offered by its leadership may do that damage.

The most obvious omission in the manifesto is any discussion of long term strategy. There is no discussion of the real content of black power, of how it is to be achieved or of what relation it will bear to other sections of the struggle against imperialism. Indeed, if we turn to the listed aims of the U.C.P.A., on pages 13/14 of the manifesto, we find them to be fundamentally corporatist (nursery schools, advice centres, cooperatives etc.) if isolated from a broader strategy. And that essentially is what has happened; they have been isolated from a broader strategy. All we find is this cloudy reference to a non-corporatist approach: "(j) To propagate solutions of our problems on international levels". The whole of this document seems to me to support my view of it as part of a radical tactic, not a radical strategy. As a tactic, the demand for black power is of crucial importance and relevance in stirring the consciousness of one of the most militant exploited groups. But in terms of strategy, it offers no coherent guides.

Scarborough '67

Will Scarborough follow Brighton in rejecting Mr. Wilson? Will there be a victory for democracy? What can the left do?

forum

Stan Newens M.P.
C. van Gelderen
councillor

Thurs. Sept. 28th
Caxton Hall, 7.30

Scarborough '67

Will Scarborough follow Brighton in rejecting Mr. Wilson? Will there be a victory for democracy? What can the left do?

forum

Stan Newens M.P.
C. van Gelderen
councillor

Thurs. Sept. 28th
Caxton Hall, 7.30

sponsored by 'The Week' (71 Onslow gardens N.10.)

MEMORIAL MEETING IN TRIBUTE TO ISAAC DEUTSCHER

Speakers

Perry Anderson

Lawrence Daly

David Horowitz

Marcel Liebman

Daniel Singer

Chairman: Ralph Miliband

7.30 pm, Friday, September 22

Mahatma Gandhi Hall

41 Fitzroy Square, London, W.1