

THE WEEK

6^D

- DEVLIN REPORT
- YOUNG SOCIALISTS
- LONDON LABOUR
- AUSTRALIAN REPORT
- LABOUR'S IMMIGRATION
CRISIS

THE LEFT MUST FIGHT

THE WEEK — A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS

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

Students 25% discount

Business Address: 54 Park Road
Lenton
Nottingham

Vol. 4, No. 6. August 19th, 1965

6p

- DEVLIN REPORT
- YOUNG SOCIALISTS
- LONDON REPORT
- AUSTRALIAN REPORT
- LABOUR'S IMPROVEMENT CRISIS

THE WEEK

THE LEFT

MUST FIGHT

Business Address: 14 Park Road
 London
 (North of London)

THE WEEK - A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS
 Subscription rates: 12 weeks 10/-
 26 weeks 21/-
 Single copies 3/-

CONTENTS

Page 1 Editorial.

Page 2 Young Socialists' campaign.

Page 3 Immigration turmoil.

Page 4 Declaration of Dissent.

Page 5 London Labour Party.

Page 6 Devlin report.

Page 7 Workers control on the docks.

Page 8 Why Councillor O.G. Powe is opposing Mr. Bowden.

Page 9 Jamaica and the Immigration Bill.

Page 10 Australia - domestic opposition to Vietnam war grows.

SPONSORS

- Frank Allaun, M.P.
- Perry Anderson.
- Chris Arthur.
- Julian Atkinson.
- Michael Barratt Brown.
- Norman Buchan, M.P.
- Neil Carmichael, M.P.
- Raymond Challinor.
- Henry Collins.
- Lawrence Daly.
- John Daniels.
- Peggy Duff.
- Ray Gosling.
- Richard Fletcher.
- Trevor Griffiths.
- Eric Heffer, M.P.
- Ellis Hillman.
- Dave Lambert.
- Ralph Miliband.
- Stan Mills.
- Jim Mortimer.
- Tom Nairn.
- Dick Nettleton.
- Stan Newens, M.P.
- John Rex.
- Ernie Roberts.
- Alan Rooney.
- David Steele.
- Professor E.A. Thompson.
- E.P. Thompson.
- Tony Topham.
- William Warbey, M.P.
- Raymond Williams.
- Bert Wynn.
- Konni Zilliacus, M.P.

THE LEFT MUST FIGHT!

This issue of our journal is largely taken up with criticising various aspects of the Government's policies and Transport House action. This does not please us one little bit - ^{were} our hearts would be much lighter if we turning our attention to the fight against the Tories and British big business. But we have no choice, the issues are too grave, too far-reaching, too pregnant with disaster to keep quiet. One cannot rock a boat which is rapidly going down; all one can do is to bale like hell and call upon the captain to order the crew to plug the leaks. There are signs all over the country that active members of the Labour Party, just now in ones and twos, are taking action - sometimes desperate - to show their dismay with Government policy. This process threatens to get out of hand unless the rightward drift is halted. If the left makes a poor showing at Blackpool, the ones and twos may become tens and twenties and the left suffer an irreversible decline.

On another front, unions are coming into conflict with the Government. When, this winter, the full consequences of the Callaghan cuts are felt, big sections of the working class will find it hard to regard the Labour Party as their party. The action of the P.I.B. in casting doubt on cost of living provisions in wage agreements could open the way to a de facto wage cut for more than 10% of Britain's work force. The left at all levels must speak out now, otherwise we have the Tories back in power for a long time and an even more right wing Labour Party.

THE YOUNG SOCIALISTS: SUPPORT FROM GLASGOW C.L.P. Glasgow Correspondent.

The following resolution was passed at the August meeting of Woodside, Glasgow, Constituency Labour Party:-

'That Woodside C.L.P. protests at the undemocratic manner of calling the 5th National Conference of the Labour Party Young Socialists, considering that it is wrong that the Young Socialists are not allowed to discuss resolutions of a general nature, and that revisions have been made in the accepted procedure for the nomination of delegates and submission of resolutions. We further ask that previous forms of organisation be immediately resorted to, until the Young Socialists themselves agree upon a new constitution.'

On the recommendation of the Executive Committee of the C.L.P. it was agreed that the nomination of delegate and selection of resolutions by the Young Socialists would not be subject to vetting by the C.L.P.

SUPPORT FOR YOUNG SOCIALISTS FROM HORNCHURCH C.L.P. London Correspondent.

At its last G.M.C. meeting, Hornchurch C.L.P. moved the following resolution for submission to the Annual Conference of the Labour Party, by an overwhelming majority:-

"This Hornchurch Constituency Labour Party strongly condemns the action of the National Executive Committee- or the Officers responsible- in disallowing resolutions on subjects of general interest at the 1965 Labour Party Young Socialists Conference, in spite of the right of Y.S. Branches to do so under Rule 4 (e) (iii) of the Rules for the Y.S. Conference.

"As amendments to Constitution and Standing Orders may only be made at Labour Party Conference, this C.L.P. declares its intention of raising this matter at Annual Conference, and hereby gives notice of its intention to do so.

"This C.L.P. further declares its intention of not withholding endorsement of any Hornchurch Y.S. resolution merely on the grounds that this has been placed 'out of order' by the Notice of Y.S. Conference."

The point about the last paragraph of the resolution is that unless Y.S. Branches are allowed by their Local Parties to send in resolutions as in past years, it will be too late to do so by the time the Labour Party Conference gives its decision on the action of Transport House. Of course, if Conference endorses the action, those Y.S. Branches who are 'out of order' in their resolutions could possibly find themselves without a resolution at their Conference

But then, being an optimist, I very much hope that Conference will agree to refer back that part of the Report, which deals with this decision- so making sure that 'resolutions of general interest' already submitted do appear as part of the Y.S. Conference Agenda.

Can I end by hoping that other C.L.P.'s will not only follow this line of action, but also strongly support Hornchurch when Reference Back is moved at Conference.

INDIAN WORKERS ASSOCIATION CRITICISES IMMIGRATION POLICY

A resolution was passed at the Indian Independence Day celebration of the Nottingham branch of the Indian Workers Association which described the Labour Government's White Paper on immigration as a move to divert attention from the real cause of social evils. It went on to say that the White Paper was harmful because racialsists would regard it as a victory, and step-up their campaign to blame immigrants for housing shortages, lack of health services, unemployment and other evils. The resolution continued "It is deplorable that the Labour Government instead of repealing the Commonwealth Immigration Act - which was branded as barefaced and open racialism by the Labour Party - have further tightened it."

The resolution will be sent to the Government, Labour Party branches, the trade unions and Commonwealth Governments. The Labour Party will be asked at their annual conference to reconsider the White Paper. Moving the resolution, Mr. A.S. Johal, general secretary of the Birmingham branch of the Indian Workers Association, declared "Racialism has now become a more serious menace than it has ever been in Britain. The immigrants do not cause housing shortage, bad health services and other difficulties - they existed long before the immigrant came." Mr. Johal pointed out that the restrictions would not apply to people coming from Spain, Italy, Germany and Southern Ireland. Another resolution expressed the branch's concern at the "growing menace of racialism." It went on to call for colour bar and racial discrimination to be made criminal offences.

Mr. Michael English, Labour M.P. for Nottingham West, said that now was the time for the association to object to the provisions in the White Paper. "It is at the moment a proposal and it may be that wiser counsel may prevail," he added.

MR. FREESON HITS OUT AGAINST "PREJUDICE" from a Parliamentary correspondent

Mr. Reginald Freeson, M.P. for Willesden East and Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Minister of Transport, has written to the Labour Chief Whip, Mr. Edward Short, saying that he is "seriously considering" his position on immigration. Mr. Freeson entered Parliament at the General Election and he has been prominent in anti-Fascist activities - he has helped to establish the anti-racialist, anti-Fascist paper Searchlight.

His letter to the Chief Whip challenges the basis of the Government's figure of 8,500 a year for Commonwealth immigration. He deplores the "Muddled thinking and prejudice" that these restrictions and other aspects of the White Paper imply. "I fear that we have shown a lack of political courage," he concludes.

Mr. Freeson's letter sets out 13 questions he intends to put to Ministers when Parliament reassembles. One will enquire as to how the figure of 8,500 was arrived at; he will ask how this figure compares with that arrived at by the Mountbatten Mission; ^{and} why does the report of the Mountbatten Mission have to remain confidential? he will further enquire.

Meanwhile the Kidderminster Labour Party is in a turmoil over immigration: its president, Mr. R.A. Ricketts, has resigned from the panel of Parliamentary candidates, and its press officer, Mr. W. Bufton, has resigned his post. In both cases the Government's immigration policy was the cause.

Mr. Jack Brooks, who contested the Wycliffe Ward in Leicester last May, has resigned from the panel of Labour candidates as protest against "the attitude of mind of some of my socialist colleagues." Mr. Brooks told the local papers on August 8th "As you may be aware I was a Labour candidate at the last municipal elections and as such have remained on the municipal panel. I have today, after considerable thought on the matter, decided to resign from the panel as a protest against the attitude of mind of some of my socialist colleagues. The statement made by one prominent councillor regarding the itinerants is, in my opinion, in direct conflict with socialist principles. The question of the children of these itinerants is dismissed as a social responsibility with the stock phrase 'We are not our brothers' keepers to that extent...' The problem that must be faced is, are they irresponsible or are we?" On the question of the diabolical 30% rent increase for council houses, all efforts to obtain adequate discussion on the anomalies which will exist if this increase is implemented have been fruitless.

"Old people and people on low fixed incomes will suffer as a result of a policy that has been bulldozed through. There is no guarantee that the Ministry of Pensions will meet the increase in full unless they receive Governmental instruction. I have written to Mr. George Brown and asked him to intervene and refer this increase to the Prices and Incomes Commission as a test case. On the one hand we are asked to keep prices stable and yet, on the other, a Socialist-controlled council chose to ignore national policy and impose this increase, which is out of all proportion. I intend to remain a member of the Labour Party and support the policies of the party, but I cannot stand by and give my support to hypocrisy. My conscience would not allow this."

TECHNICIANS' UNION DECLARE THEIR DISSENT by Dave Windsor

Five unions catering for technicians - D.A.T.A., A.S.S.E.T., A. Sc. W, the cine-technicians and the technical civil servants - have countered Mr. Brown's declaration of intent with their own declaration of dissent. At a press conference on August 17th, Mr. George Doughty, D.A.T.A.'s general secretary, said industry should be controlled by people who plan expansion not restriction. He went on to describe 1965 as "the year of the technician's revolt."

A.S.S.E.T.'s general secretary, Mr. Clive Jenkins, complained that for too long British big business has had skilled labour on the cheap. The unions demanded a high wages, high salaries economy. An incomes policy based upon a low norm would keep Britain old-fashioned. The present policy was wrong and would not last. Mr. Tony Carter, the technical civil servants' assistant secretary, said that the Government should give a lead. Before the election the Labour Party had had a lot to say about the social status of technicians, it was essential that this be expressed in terms of money.

The declaration says that the problems of an incomes policy cannot be separated from the wider problems of the British economy; that more effective planning, redistribution of wealth and income and a reduction in military expenditure are all needed. Skill and qualifications are under-rewarded and the problem is how to persuade Britain's backward employers of this fact.

Negotiations have taken place over the last two years between the E.C. of the London Labour Party and N.E.C. over the future of the L.L.P. The present structure, created by Herbert Morrison, gives direct (equal) representation to constituencies and trade unions, with some co-operative and other seats, on an executive which is responsible to a democratic annual conference nominated and elected by the affiliated organisations.

The L.L.P. was built as the policy-making body for the L.C.C. - and on these policies Labour fought and won successive elections in the inter-war period until it has won control of the L.C.C. This success was partly due to the existence of an efficient, but democratic central policy-making body directly in touch with working people in London through the constituencies, unions and co-ops. The achievements of the L.C.C. undoubtedly helped in the return of an increasing number of Labour M.P.s from the London area.

Under Morrison the very success of the L.L.P. led to friction with the national party and the N.E.C. which feared a rival centre of power. This resentment has continued and with the setting up of the G.L.C. the national party stalled on the L.L.P.'s proposals that it should become a Greater London Labour Party, and instead set up a temporary co-ordinating committee, to run the G.L.C. elections. The co-ordinating committee structure was criticised by most constituencies as being undemocratic, top-heavy and too far removed from the ordinary rank and file member and Labour voter.

A new temporary co-ordinating committee has now been set up, representing the 32 borough co-ordinating committees, and with much smaller representation for the T.U.s and co-ops. This is to last until after the next General and G.L.C. elections when the whole question will again be reviewed by the N.E.C. The committee will be staffed and controlled by the N.E.C. Meanwhile the London Labour Party remains in existence and continues to press for a new Greater London Labour Party with a democratic annual conference directly electing a working executive, whose main function would be to formulate the policies on which the G.L.C. fights its elections. Most Londoners from Bob Mellish, the chairman, to the rank and file, feel that unless strong policies are developed specifically for the needs of the London area - housing, transport, health centres, comprehensive education, the police, the City of London, etc., Labour could well lose the next G.L.C. elections.

A committee to co-ordinate the work of individual boroughs has its uses - these should not be confused with the functions of democratic, long-term policy making. Representatives elected from Borough Committees, preoccupied with the day-to-day problems of local government, are no substitute for a directly elected annual conference made up of delegates from constituencies, trade unions and other organisations. It is said that the N.E.C. fears the setting up of a Greater London Labour Party will diminish its own authority, as it would cover 106 constituencies. The present organisation already covers 71 constituencies without causing undue difficulties - increasing its coverage from $\frac{1}{8}$ to $\frac{1}{6}$ of the parliamentary seats in the country is unlikely to create new problems.

Further, the London organisation has always been restricted to matters related directly to the London area, and would continue to be so. The N.E.C. must accept that the responsibility ultimately for winning the G.L.C. and London seats for Labour rests with members in that area and they should set up the organisation that they consider necessary for the job.

The attempt of the London Dock Labour Board to suspend for one day 1,618 dockers and the men's retaliatory threat to ban overtime, nightwork and piecework, has rudely shattered the illusions engendered by the Devlin report that peaceful co-operation was on the agenda in dockland. The suspensions were imposed because the men had attended an unofficial meeting during working hours on July 2. At a stormy meeting outside the Royal Docks, last Thursday, the men voted to ban overtime, nightwork and piecework. The last measure is particularly serious in a port where 85% of the work is done on a piecework basis. Rejecting the advice of the Liaison Committee's chief spokesman, Jack Dash, who argued that each suspension should be fought individually through the union officials, the men insisted on the ban. This meeting and the one next day where attempts by TGWU officials to get the ban squashed were contemptuously dismissed, echoed a salutary warning to those who believe that rationalisation and re-organisation of the port industry can be carried out at the dockworkers' expense.

Dockers' determination to resist the Dock Labour Board's arbitrary disciplinary measures, has obviously provoked some consternation in official circles. Minister of Labour, R. Gunter, a firm advocate of the Devlin recommendations, is anxious to move ahead towards their speedy implementation. A conflict in the ports over the burning issue of discipline and control would hardly assist his plans. Those employers who are dependent on the docks for export, view with alarm any possibility of a dock strike. Most employers are prepared to subordinate their present difficulties to the perspectives offered by the Devlin report. A spokesman for the Confederation of British Industries, commenting on the ban said: "There is no single problem that more urgently requires Government action than that of the docks." Their money appears to be on Mr. Gunter.

Ever since its publication, the Devlin report has evoked a chorus of acclamation from apparently diverse sources. The employers' chief representative, Sir Andrew Crichton assures that the employers will "back it to the hilt." He will be "delighted if the Government does step in and force something through." Jack Jones of the TGWU considers it a "great opportunity" and like Gunter and Crichton welcomes the "idea of quick movement to get the Devlin findings implemented." The most important factor in this situation, the dockers themselves, have shown less enthusiasm. Their past experience of the port employers and their deep-rooted suspicions of their own full-time union officials, whom even the report chided for being "too pro-employer" cautions them about welcoming a report which aims to strengthen employer-trade union relations.

Members of the National Amalgamated Stevedores and Dockers Union - the "Blue union" - are unmoved by the Committee's lament that their general secretary, Dick Barret has too little power and is only a "voice" of the union. Their union's constitution compels its leaders to report back to mass meetings all important decisions for ratification or rejection. The Devlin report wants to end this and involve the "Blue union" leaders in agreements, irrespective of rank and file opinion. The bait of "limited recognition" dangled at the Ministry of Labour meeting on August 10, is clearly conditional upon the union removing this right from its membership.

The report envisages a streamlined industry, based upon 50 "groups" or "consortiums" of employers in the five main ports, as opposed to the present total of 713. It seeks a modernised industry, with fewer but bigger employers, increased mechanisation, a reduced labour force, reduced working gangs and the introduction of decasualisation. It was horrified to learn that the docker had "no sense that his working hours belonged to any particular employer."

continued over/

Devlin report continued/

No one would deny that the docks suffer from an excess of private firms, that its equipment is outdated and its organisation inefficient. The labour movement must seek to remedy this, not by strengthening its natural enemies, the big employers, but by demanding nationalisation. To organise an industry the co-operation of the workers is an essential pre-requisite, that can only be fully realised by workers' control. Siding with a report that denounces the advocates of nationalisation as "disruptive elements" and "wreckers" weakens Labour's case and undermines the dockers' confidence in socialist measures.

The labour movement should renounce this report and use the present situation in the docks to win support for socialist planning.

N.B. This article was written before news came through that the suspensions had been lifted. This development does, however, confirm the main thesis of the article and its corollary: namely, that only by militant struggle and a determination not to give up any rights can the dockers hope to maintain and improve their position.

A N N O U N C E M E N T

The special issue of The Week devoted to a full report of the Manchester conference on Workers' Control contains three major articles on the docks. These are:

Report on the Docks - by Ken Britton.

A Solution to the Docks Problem - a paper presented by Dockworkers Voice; and

Workers Control on the Docks - the conclusion of the dockworkers group at the conference.

Other articles in the pamphlet include items on incomes policy, steel, workers control and labour, etc.

This pamphlet is available from 54, Park Rd., Lenton, Nottingham, price 9d post paid.

(Editorial note: This article is based upon a press statement issued by Councillor George Powe on his decision to oppose Mr. Bowden. The fact that a firm supporter of the Labour Party of many years standing felt obliged to take this action is further proof of the urgent necessity to oppose by all means the Government's immigration policies. Let every reader of the Week get all the organisations he or she is a member of to go on record against the Government's disgraceful proposals.)

I am a West Indian who has lived in this country for 21 years. As an active socialist I have been a member and a supporter of the Labour Party for over 15 years. For the past two years I have sat on the Long Eaton U.D.C. in Labour's interest. It is with deep regret, and after a severe crisis of conscience involving nearly a week of sleepless nights, that I have come to the conclusion that I must make the following announcement.

For 13 years I looked forward with the hope for the advent of a Labour Government. I had hoped that such a Government would represent the interests of the English working people and in so doing protect the immigrant community, of which I am a member. I watched with dismay the successive measures of the Conservatives to discriminate against my countrymen. I pointed out to my friends who were cynical about Labour's promises that the Labour Party had opposed the British Immigration Act in Parliament, with very strong language indeed.

Now Mr. Bowden, the Lord President of the Council, has placed a White Paper before Parliament, limiting the entry of immigrants from the Commonwealth to 8,500 a year, including 1,000 from Malta, imposing a double health check, and setting out a whole series of insulting and humiliating conditions. This is a direct betrayal of all Labour's previous pledges. It is a racist measure which is anti-colour, anti-socialist anti-Christian and anti-human. Mr. Bowden had the effrontery to introduce it to a wider public on television by making a whole series of stock racist innuendoes about the alleged "problem" which I and my countrymen represent.

I am deeply convinced that the Labour Party and the trade unions do not support Mr. Bowden's attacks on the immigrants. They know full well that more people have left England than have come into it over the whole of last period during which immigration has taken place. They also know that there is a labour shortage in England. They are aware that the Government has abandoned most of its promises on housing, education and social reforms, and they will resent this attempt to curry favour with the most bigoted and backward section of the electorate, in which lurks a fearful tradition of racial prejudice. For this reason I am not going to resign from the Labour Party, among whose active workers I include many of my personal friends, and some of whom I have been deeply pleased to represent in public life in recent years.

But I cannot possibly connive at the immoral policy which Mr. Bowden has outlined. I should lose all my self-respect if I did. My fellow immigrants and millions of other socialists, Christians and liberal-minded people must feel exactly the same shame for Mr. Bowden as I do. For this reason I have decided to fight against Mr. Bowden in Leicester in the next General Election. I am appealing to my friends in the immigrant community and the Labour movement for funds and help, and I shall ask the Leicester Labour and the Labour N.E.C. to support me.....

Signed Councillor O.G. Powe, c/o 10, Bute Avenue, Lenton, Nottingham.

On the occasion of the visit to Britain of the Jamaican Government mission which is to discuss the implications of Labour's immigration policy, the Financial Times published a special study of the effect of immigration on Jamaica. I have culled the main facts and figures from this article.

First, the clearest indication of the importance of immigration to the U.K. from Jamaica's point of view is shown by examining the figures:

Year	Natural population	Net emigration		U.K. emigration as %
	increase	to U.K.	elsewhere	of natural increase
1960	54,100	30,269	31	55.9
1961	51,900	37,645	855	72.5
1962	52,100	19,911	8,789	38.2
1963	51,300	3,248	4,050	6.3
1964	55,800	6,257	7,243	11.2
<u>TOTALS</u>	<u>265,200</u>	<u>97,330</u>	<u>20,970</u>	<u>36.7</u>

From the table it can be seen how severely the amendments to the Commonwealth Immigration Act in 1962, restricting free immigration, affected Jamaica. Emigration in 1963 decreased to 6% of the natural population increase, compared with 38.2% in 1962 and 72.4% in 1961. There is a lack of reliable figures as to levels of unemployment, etc., in Jamaica, but the article gave some guesses which cannot be too far from the truth: in 1960 with a total population of 1,639,000, the labour force was estimated at 648,000 with some 92,000 to 94,000 unemployed (about 14% - the equivalent of $3\frac{1}{2}$ million in this country). There are no official estimates of the labour force or unemployment in 1964, but with a population of 1,762,000, some estimate the latter at about 120,000 (that is, a population increase of 7% and an unemployment increase of nearly 30%). Put another way, it is estimated that a little over 20,000 persons ^{new} join the labour force each year, but the economy only generates some 10,000 jobs a year.

The agricultural sector employs about 37% of the labour force, but because of the tightening of international markets the prospects of increased cultivation is poor. In the manufacturing sector, although the problems are different, there is little hope of rapidly absorbing large numbers of unemployed. A factor here is the high degree of mechanisation which has actually led, in some sectors, to an easing of demand for labour in spite of increasing production.

It is widely felt that restricted emigration will mean that more skilled labour will remain in the island (in some fields skilled wages are higher in Jamaica than in the U.K.), but that a higher proportion of unskilled will seek to emigrate to other countries. The U.K. restrictions will harm the Jamaican economy and force it to try to absorb the full force of the population explosion. Thus the difficulties of the Jamaican Government will become almost unbearable - that is why such a high-powered mission has been sent. In the past Bustamente and Manley have been able to avoid some of the worst consequences of their collaboration with neo-colonialism through encouraging massive emigration. Perhaps one of the by-products of Mr. Wilson's capitulation to racialist pressures will be to make life impossible for his Jamaican equivalents.

AUSTRALIA - DOMESTIC OPPOSITION INCREASES TO THE VIETNAM WAR

At the end of last year, Melbourne waterside workers again refused to load barbed wire for Saigon, refusing to accept official explanations that it was for use in "strategic hamlets." According to the waterside workers, these hamlets can only be likened to concentration camps.

The intellectuals responded more slowly, but with increasing tempo. In Conservative, isolationist Australia, few can remember an issue which has caused the sustained publication of a huge press correspondence over twelve months and longer. In May this opposition was given a fillip by the unanimous decision of the Federal Labour members of Parliament to oppose the sending of Australian troops to Vietnam. The unions have not responded further, and there has been considerable behind-the-scenes pressure on them not to hinder the transport of war materials to Vietnam. The reason? Under amendments to the Crimes Act passed by the Menzies Government in 1960, it is an act of treachery (penalty life imprisonment) to "assist by any means whatever any opponents or possible opponents of an Australian defence force anywhere" or to commit any act of hostility to a "proclaimed" friendly country. Unions were not anxious to risk implementation of these acts. However the Trades and Labour Councils of every State of Australia and the Australian Council of Trade Unions have all carried resolutions opposing Australian participation in what is increasingly recognised as a civil war.

Few now believe the simplistic line that Menzies has pursued recently (and he quotes Britain's Michael Stewart!) that this is an exact replica of Korea - an invasion of the South by the North. Even powerful sections of the press no longer accept this unreal view of the war. In May 2,000 Sydney students demonstrated, with 30 arrests. More than 3,000 Canberra citizens demonstrated outside Federal Parliament House. 1,000 clergymen and religious persons held a 12-hour peace "vigil" outside Federal Parliament. Fourteen leading Anglican bishops wrote two powerful letters of protest over the war and the atrocities. Menzies rejected them contemptuously, but their contents received maximum publicity. At its May Congress, 20 of the 60 delegates to the Australian Student Labour Federation were arrested for a sit-down protest in the streets of Canberra. (Earlier this Congress, representing 20 Student Labour Clubs all over Australia had carried a policy motion giving "critical support" to the Vietnam National Liberation Front as the effective government in South Vietnam).

On 24th July the Australian National University heard sixteen speakers in an eight-hour "teach-in" which created consternation and a press attack on the Government for refusing to defend itself by declining to take part.

Finally there is a bout of organised resistance to conscription of 20-year-old youths for service in Vietnam. The number of "conscientious objectors" has run into hundreds; while some labour youth groups are holding classes on "how to fail the Army medical."

It is a long time since open discussion and real criticism of Australian foreign policy on this scale has been seen. As the war intensifies it might grow - but so also will restrictions on domestic opponents. All the Government has to do is proclaim South Vietnam a friendly country under the 1960 amendments to the Crimes Act (as noted above) and they have a formula for taking action against the critical discussion now developing. If the war continues, in 12 months or five years, it is extremely unlikely that even the "teach-in" would be permitted.

Bruce McFarlane (Canberra)