

The Week

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS
Vol. 6, Nos. 6/7, 24th August, 1966

6^D

Vietnam
War Crimes
Tribunal
Shapes up

THE BATTLE AGAINST THE WAGE FREEZE

74 Mansfield Road, Nottingham

Subscription : £2 per annum and pro rata

Vietnam
War Crimes
Tribunal
Shapes up

THE WEEK

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS
Vol. 6, No. 67, 1981, August 1981

WAGE FREEZE AGAINST THE BATTLE

CONTENTS

Page 1	Editorial	Page 7	DATA on the Wage Freeze
2	Road to Brighton Pier	8	A Socialist Alternative
3	The Froth on Neo-capitalism	9	Industrial Notes
4	AN URGENT ANNOUNCEMENT	10	Vietnam War Crimes Tribunal
5	Line Up against the Wage Freeze	11	Vietnam Air Losses
6	continued	12	Vietnam Pledge

MILITANCY, YES! SOCIALISM, MORE SO!

The fight against the Government's wage-freeze is beginning to gather serious momentum. According to a rough count in the Times, 3,436,000 votes are already stacked against this measure at next month's TUC, and only 2,619,000 for. But, as George Woodcock has rightly pointed out, this decision, whichever way it goes, is not the vital matter.

The plain fact is that, vicious though the Government's measures are, and they are vicious, they are also, to coin a phrase, a paper tiger. Some of us may be locked up for inciting or supporting strikes, and all of us will suffer setbacks in our standards of living. But neither of these brave acts of the Wilson regime will produce the economic or political effect intended by their architect. Every failure of the freeze, and there will be many, will bring the Government's strategy into greater contempt. Every success will arouse against it greater hostility. Each move the Government makes, from now on, will arouse a greater hostility.

Nor can the orthodox union leaders act as an effective barrier to this resistance. An example will show why. On the fish-docks in Hull, the unions concluded an agreement for a wage increase just before the freeze. Upon the announcement of the freeze, the employers asked the unions concerned to sign a joint letter explaining why the agreed amount was no longer payable. "Of course", said the doughty spokesman of the NUGMW. "Not on your life", said the T&GWU representative. So the Hull dockers received a leaflet in which one union backed the freeze while the other refused. Is it unreasonable to assume that T&GWU cards will soon be at a premium, while NUGMW cards will be ten a penny? This elementary fact of life will impinge on Lord Cooper, as he begins to find difficulty in meeting the bills of his large administration.

Even such intemperate reactionaries as the present leaders of the ETU understand this matter. They have told the premier that they are in no position to offer prolonged support to the policy. This fact should by no means inhibit such excellent initiatives as those of the workers at Shardlow's, but on the contrary, encourage them. We can rout this intolerable Act. But, in the process, we must face the fact that Wilson will hit another bankers' crisis. He will then return even stronger to the attack. We must have political answers to offer, if we are not to win a battle, and lose the war. Only a socialist strategy, a whole alternative programme of anti-capitalist reforms, based on the whole great extension of workers' powers in the factories, can meet the disaster impending for the Labour Movement. Militancy alone is not enough.

SEE PAGE FOUR FOR AN URGENT ANNOUNCEMENT.

Shortly after the last general election, Michael Stewart entertained some of the new M.P.s to tea. In the course of the discussion, he expressed the opinion that the Constituencies were not interested in Vietnam. With his head in the clouds of the upper regions of diplomacy, he probably had little time to notice what was happening at the grass roots. He can hardly maintain that position today - unless he has not bothered to study the resolutions for Labour's 65th Annual Conference at Brighton in October.

There are more resolutions on Vietnam than on any other issue - 43 in all, more than one tenth of all the resolutions sent in. And rightly so, for Vietnam is today the supreme test for all socialists. Most of the resolutions are confused and wishy-washy, but the underlying principle which inspired them is the clear message to the Labour Government - disentangle yourselves from the spiders' web of American imperialism. Subservience to American policy can only mean no socialism at home, and abroad a betrayal of everything the Labour Movement stood for.

It is significant also that the Transport and General Workers' Union, committed as it is to an all-out fight against the Government's Prices and Incomes policy and the Wage Freeze, nevertheless sent in a resolution strongly attacking the Government's foreign policy. It rightly recognises that only a sharp change in foreign policy, and a substantial reduction in military expenditure can enable the Labour Government "to achieve the national economic recovery, social progress and prosperity to which it is pledged...."

At Brighton, by platform manipulations, with Ministers dominating the discussion time which rightly should belong to the delegates, by unscrupulous use of the block vote, the Government may win the day, though this time the fight will be harder because the massive ranks of the Transport and General Workers and some of the other unions are lined up in defence of the basic principles of the Labour Movement. A majority of votes at Brighton for Harold Wilson and his cohorts may well turn out to be a Pyrrhic victory. The resolutions from the constituencies show what the active rank and file of the Labour Party is thinking. For the Government to persist on its path of folly and betrayal in spite of this can only take the heart out of the movement, leaving it spiritless and apathetic.

At Brighton, the Parliament of Labour will have a great opportunity to save the party from treading once more the road which leads to 1931. The Government must be challenged to abandon its pro-capitalist, pro-imperialist policies, and to strike out boldly on the road to socialism. There is no other way!

THE FROTH ON NEO-CAPITALISM

by Ken Tarbuck

(The Monopolies Commission Report on the Detergent Industry)

Against the background panic cuts in public expenditure, 7% Bank Rate, and the wage freeze, the Monopolies Commission report on the detergents industry reads almost like a theoretical case study of modern capitalism. The report makes five basic points:

1. Substantial percentage reductions should be made in Unilever's and Proctor and Gamble's wholesale selling prices for household detergents. (Between them they control 90% of the market.)

Continued.....

2. Reductions in these prices should be decided by the Board of Trade in consultation with the two enterprises.
3. The Board of Trade should encourage the companies to agree that at least a 40% cut in selling expenses could accompany the price reduction.
4. In such event, consultation with the companies might well begin on the basis of an average cut in prices.
5. In the long term, the Board of Trade should consider the possibility of introducing some form of automatic sanction that would discourage excessive selling expenditure in the field of household detergents and should continue to keep a watch on prices.

Unilever had in 1964, 45% of the market, and Proctor and Gamble 43%, their combined sales being £62.4m. The report says, "During the period 1954-56, both of the major suppliers adopted price cutting as a main means of competition, bringing about substantial changes in the market situation. However, by June 1956, both companies are stated to have brought their prices into line for comparable products and since that time the emphasis in competition had again been placed on advertising and sales promotion." Here we have a "classical" example of modern oligopoly pricing in practice; having carved out their respective share of the market, the two giants opted out of the price war, which was becoming too costly for them in terms of profit margins.

The report discloses that in 1964 both of these firms spent something over £8m. each on selling expenses etc., i.e. two firms spent over £16m. on what can only be described as socially wasteful expenditure. If one compares this with the £212m. spent in the same year on National Assistance, one begins to see the crazy type of society we live in. A spokesman for Lever Bros., commenting on selling costs said, "In fact we believe that we compare well with other industries in total distribution costs." If this is so, then the report has only lifted one small corner of the curtain that covers the tremendous misuse of resources within the British economy, for the report gives as its opinion that selling costs play a more significant part in determining price patterns than do manufacturing costs. In sum, the selling costs are estimated to be 25% of the price of detergents.

Each company in its evidence said that its profits on these products were earned by efficient production and distribution. They argued that these products had to be improved year by year, not only because of competition from the other, but also to prevent an opening for new companies to come into the field. However, the Commission estimated that Unilever's profit in 1965, on detergents, was 23.4% on a historic cost basis, and 16.4% on replacement basis on capital employed. For Proctor and Gamble the figures were 53.2% and 37% respectively. These figures show that both companies obtained profits substantially above average for manufacturing industry.

The reasons given by the report for other firms not entering this field were that for those who could do so, e.g. I.C.I., the terms of entry would be too costly, not so much from the amount of capital investment required, but because their entry would intensify the competition in promotion expenditure. This would obviously lead to a decline in existing profit margins, both to the detriment of existing producers and to the new entrants. Therefore there has been the tendency to let sleeping dogs lie for the mutual benefit of all concerned; all, that is, except the consumer!

THE FROTH ON NEO-CAPITALISM (Continued)

Having in fact provided a striking condemnation of this industry, the Commission's conclusions & recommendations turn out to be as limp as a wet lettuce leaf. It thinks that price regulation would not be desirable, but that selling expenses in excess of an approved percentage of net wholesale turnover should be disallowed for tax purposes, and that the Board of Trade should continue to keep a watch on prices.

Such weak recommendations, following the indictment are only to be expected from a body which works within the framework of monopoly capitalism. Such a body is faced with an insoluble problem, for it cannot step outside the bounds of capitalist society. Moreover, since it looks at these industries separately, it cannot provide an overall solution to the problems that are essentially ones not of individual industries, but of a whole system.

For socialists the problem is not how to curb monopolies, nor try to return to a more competitive society, since monopolies are the logical outcome of competition. What such reports should do is to provide us with the ammunition to fight and supplant such a wasteful, crazy system. Consumer control and choice need not be mediated by plastic tulips, and T.V. bilge, there is another way. The social ownership and control of industry via workers' control and socialist planning would soon relieve the scum that floats beneath the neo-capitalist society.

* * * * *

AN URGENT ANNOUNCEMENT

AN URGENT ANNOUNCEMENT

With this issue of The Week, we end our summer schedule. We resume weekly appearances. But we are sorry to say, that in doing so, we are straining every financial nerve. It is only because just prior to the Labour Party Conference in the context of rising fury at the Government's reactionary policies, we feel that we are needed, that we do not extend our fortnightly schedule for another month.

We need money, and we need it badly. WE NEED DONATIONS AND WE NEED RENEWALS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS. Although we greatly regret this, our financial position is such that we shall have to cut short every edge of our mailing list: we simply cannot afford to send out 3 or 4 hundred unpaid subscriptions.

AS FROM NEXT WEEK, IF YOU OWE US ANY MONEY, WE ARE VERY SORRY BUT YOU WON'T GET THE PAPER. 250 OF OUR WORST OFFENDERS HAVE ALREADY BEEN CUT OUT THIS WEEK. WE HATE DOING IT, BUT HAVE NO ALTERNATIVE.

PLEASE, PLEASE PAY UP, AND PERMIT US TO BE HUMANE AGAIN !

PLEASE, PLEASE PAY UP, AND PERMIT US TO BE HUMANE AGAIN !

PLEASE, PLEASE PAY UP, AND PERMIT US TO BE HUMANE AGAIN !

PLEASE, PLEASE PAY UP AND PERMIT US TO BE HUMANE AGAIN !

* * * * *

LINE UP AGAINST THE WAGE FREEZE

Opposition to the Government's Wage Freeze is now mounting so fast that any list of committed Unions runs the risk of being overtaken by events. At the time of going to press the list of the larger unions committed to oppose the policy is as follows: T&GWU (1,426,424 votes); NUM (419,107); USDAW (351,934); NALGO (338,322); NUPE (240,000); SOGAT (218,516); A&B (119,513); C&AWU (79,177); DATA (65,893); NUS (62,500); Plumbing Trade Union (54,865). On the same basis of listing only those unions whose commitment is reasonably firmly known the tally of supporting unions now totals 2,600,000 votes - a shortfall of nearly a million votes compared with the growing opposition.

THE WAGE FREEZE - A BANKER'S VIEW from an industrial correspondent

On Monday the 'National Provincial Bank Review' carried an article by Mr. Cyriax, who is described as an "industrial economist", and who is a member of the Economic Development Committee for the Newspaper, Printing and Publishing Industry ("Little Neddy"). Mr. Cyriax says that "pressure from the United States Treasury was the main factor behind the original legislation." He goes on to say that the inadequacy of the initial early warning legislation had to be replaced by "decisive action, particularly designed to meet American fears."

Elsewhere in the article Mr. Cyriax pursues the theme of rationalising the trade unions. He writes of the need "to rebuild the structure of the TUC in such a way that the leaders can control the member unions and the member unions can control the men." "The task of the Labour Government ... in deliberately using higher unemployment as an economic regulator, must be to dissociate itself from excessive trade union expectations."

ANTI-FREEZE RALLY PLANNED FOR BLACKPOOL AND MANCHESTER

by a Manchester correspondent.
A number of left wing trade unions associated with the Manchester Socialist Conference have collaborated in booking the Manchester Free Trade Hall on Friday, September 2nd for an Anti-Freeze Rally. The T&GWU are understood to have promised assistance. It is hoped that Frank Cousins will be able to address the Rally. If not, then one of their other national officers will attend, as well as officers from other unions.

Publicity will be given at the Rally to the proposed lobbying of AEU delegates at Blackpool. A coachload of unionists from Manchester will join lobbyists from other parts of the country. Further details from John Forrester, DATA Cinephone House, Market Street, Manchester, 2.

AEU STRIKE AGAINST THE PAY FREEZE AT SHEFFIELD from a Sheffield reader

The decision to stage a one day token strike against the freezing of long standing productivity agreements was taken at a mass meeting of AEU members at the Shardlow factory in Sheffield. The management, say the workers, is interpreting the pay freeze as applying to increases on piecework pay related to increased production. Coaches have been booked by the Shardlow workers to take demonstrators to Blackpool, where they will lobby the AEU delegates to the TUC.

Amongst the first sackings to be announced as a direct result of the Government's measures was the dismissal of several hundred railway workshop staff, to take effect mostly in October. Resistance from the N.U.R. is expected, and it makes it more likely than ever that the union's block vote will go against the Government at the T.U.C. and Labour Party Conferences. In addition it has been announced this week that more than 1,000 men at 3 factories of I.C.I. Fibres, which employs 9,300, are to lose their jobs within the next 2 weeks - 600 in Doncaster, 250 in Pontypool and 200 in Gloucester. Announcements of staff cuts in such consumer durable industries as cars, domestic appliances and the like are expected in the next few weeks, according to the financial page of the Guardian. This has occurred already in the building industry. The first and the hardest to be hit will by and large be unskilled workers. The Financial Editor of the Guardian on August 23rd estimated that the traditionally high unemployment areas - Scotland, Northern Ireland, Wales and the Northern Region will bear the brunt of Wilson's measures, just as they bore the brunt of Selwyn Lloyds freeze in 1961. In Scotland, one of the Week's correspondents, Willie Thompson, has informed us of the determination of the Scottish N.U.M. to fight the entire content of the Government's policy.

On the pay front, a strike by 34 D.A.T.A. members at Bristol Siddeley Engines, Ltd., Bristol was the first militant action against the measures. This strike is now over but a work to rule and overtime ban, involving over 1,000 D.A.T.A. members has followed. Early this week, a strike began at Shardlow's engineering factory in Sheffield over the pay freeze, involving well over 1,000 workers in several unions. Such resistance will be joined by many similar moves in the next few weeks.

WOCISIDE C.L.P. AGAINST THE FREEZE

By Tony Southall

The following resolution was passed unanimously at the August C.L.P. meeting:-

This C.L.P. rejects the basis of the Government's incomes policy and particularly the recently introduced wage freeze. The latter is unjust because: A) it freezes existing inequalities between workers; B) it has stopped legitimate increases being paid e.g. to railwaymen and municipal busmen; c) while wages are frozen corporate wealth will increase and its benefits can be realised at a later date in increased dividends, share prices etc; D) the provisions for preventing rises in the cost of living are totally inadequate.

We reject the penal provisions of the Prices and Incomes Bill against the Trades Unions, which constitute an unprecedented attack by the Labour Government against its supporters and we pledge solidarity with any workers prosecuted under these provisions. We commend those M.P.'s who have demonstrated their opposition to this measure and we ask our members to do likewise.

We call on the Government to replace its present economic policies by measures based on: alleviation of balance of payments difficulties by withdrawal of troops from overseas; extension of control over the economy by implementation of Clause IV and redistribution of the national income in favour of the wage earner.

Arising from the Government's major reappraisal of its economic policies and its intention to implement a six months freeze on wages followed by a further six months of severe restraint, the Executive Committee issued the following press statement:-

D.A.T.A. does not accept the Government's decision to have a salaries standstill for six months followed by a further six months when there is to be severe restraint on salaries. D.A.T.A. does not believe that such a policy is necessary because it does not accept the reasons given by the Government for the economic difficulties. The Grounds for D.A.T.A.'s opposition to the Prices and Incomes Policy are now well known and do not need re-stating. The threat to enact the provisions of the Prices and Incomes Bill to enforce a wage freeze will create new problems and undermine the relationships in industry which are necessary to advance our future economic strength. This strength must be based upon expanding production for constructive purposes. D.A.T.A. strongly criticises the failure of the Government effectively to reduce Britain's massive military expenditure and the continued intention of the Government to purchase American military aircraft. D.A.T.A. intends to press as vigourously as possible to obtain for all its members proper salary levels and working conditions.

A special meeting of the Executive Committee has now given further consideration to the Association's position and to the action to be taken to safeguard the wages and working conditions of members. In accordance with the policy decisions taken by the Representative Council Conference of opposition in the present inequitable conditions to the Government's Prices and Incomes Policy and to any form of wage freeze, and the decision to pursue national claims with both the Engineering and Shipbuilding Employers for substantial increases in salaries, the Executive Committee has decided to advise members that it reaffirms its belief that a solution to Britain's economic problems will be achieved only through planning for general benefit in a society in which the people have adequate control over the means of production, distribution and exchange. Under such conditions D.A.T.A. participation in an incomes policy would be a logical requirement. In present circumstances however, a wage freeze is no answer to Britain's economic problems.

The distribution of wealth is grossly maladjusted and has not significantly altered since 1938. Now, as then, the top 10% of the population own around 80% of the wealth in Great Britain. Workers and their families - all 45m of them - compete between themselves for only 20% of the national wealth while no serious challenge is posed to the 80% still in the hands of a small minority. Nowhere in the Government's pay freeze or future policies for wage restraint is there any challenge to correct the maldistribution of wealth.

The inequalities of wealth should be reduced and not made worse by measures to stop increases in pay and improvements in living standards.

Attempts are being made to make the Government's proposals acceptable to the trade unions by including a restriction on increases in dividends but dividends can be frozen now only to be paid out in full once the six months are over, whereas wages once lost are gone for ever.

Humberside Voice Editorial Board, which drafted the following statement, comprises trade union lay members, trade union officials, shop stewards, Labour Party activists, teachers and journalists of the labour movement. The statement reflects a positive, healthy reaction to the present crisis; we urgently need this mood repeated across the length and breadth of our movement if we are not to witness the collapse of hope, the return of apathy, and acquiescence in a tacit Labour-Tory consensus with frighteningly authoritarian consequences.

Editorial Statement from Humberside Voice : 'Readers, Members of the Humberside Labour Movement- So, Wilson is now the prisoner of bankers and international financial wizards. We have a major economic crisis on our hands, and Wilson, our Labour Prime Minister, has accepted that unemployment is the solution. This is therefore a great crisis in our movement. Suddenly a Labour Government, with an unprecedented large majority, has accepted the bankers' answer to our economic ills- the severest 'stop-go' policy we have ever known. The measures Wilson has taken will cut our living standards and make inroads into the trade unions' rights and position. WHERE DOES THIS LEAVE US AS SOCIALISTS ? - We are not fooled by a price freeze. Prices will rise because of purchase tax increases, etc., and Wilson intends this to happen; this is what deflation is all about. We are not hoodwinked by the freeze on dividends. The bosses and owners of industry will just build up their reserve fund of capital and distribute it later on. THEREFORE, to our READERS we must say: If you urge us still to be loyal to Wilson, we ask you - which Wilson ? The Wilson of 1966, the prisoner of the bankers ? Or the Wilson of 1964 ? In 1964 he was saying: "You can't... add to insecurity, create hardship for millions of families, and then come along and ask for wage restraint. You can't ask for an incomes policy if you first cut production down and then say that having reduced production we will now hold wages down in line with productivity." (From a speech at Usher Hall, Edinburgh, 21/3/64) and again:- " ...we come to the two sides of industry with clean hands with no responsibility for the faith-breaking interference with collective bargaining and industrial conciliation and arbitration that were involved in Mr. Selwyn Lloyd's pay-pause. And we can make the national appeal that is needed because, for us, an incomes policy is the condition of sustained growth and because a pledge of sustained growth is a condition of that policy." (From a speech at Swansea, 25/1/64)

BUT WE HAVE GOT STAGNATION, EVEN A RECESSION ! THEREFORE, TO WILSON we must say:-

Brave words in 1964 ! BUT where are your alternatives to Toryism now ? We would like to remind Wilson, our readers and ourselves of the Socialist alternatives to 'stop-go':- 1.) We want the Government to control our money affairs, and not be at the mercy of financiers and bankers just to preserve a free market in money and restrict our own standard of living to do it. - Therefore the Labour Government must as a matter of urgency look at the burden on this country of maintaining the £ sterling, and at the reforms needed in the world's currency and monetary system. - Nationalise the banks so that they operate in the public interest. At present the very people who are in charge of our capital are speculating with it against our country's interests. - Nationalise the insurance companies who control more of our capital than the banks. - Control the outflow of private capital overseas. 2.) Overseas defence costs and the balance of payments: the gap between what this country earns and spends is an artificial crisis; the gap is ONLY made by our vast military spending overseas. Therefore: - We should cut the defence burden drastically, and rethink our foreign policy to go with the cuts, especially our commitment to NATO, and our support of American policy in the Far East. - Cut out the £1000 million we are spending on American planes.

3.) Wage Freeze and Higher Productivity: these cannot go together. We wholeheartedly endorse the stand of unions like the T&GW, D.I.L., ASSET against the wage freeze. We want higher productivity, BUT - the workers must share in the benefits of any productivity agreements. The only way to get technical modernisation is to push up wages, not hold them down. To achieve higher productivity the workers must themselves know what is going on in industry. OPEN THE BOOKS, so the workers can negotiate on the facts to stimulate production. - We want to strengthen the workers' position, not weaken it, therefore reject the Prices and Incomes Bill and its penal clauses against industrial action.

4.) We want more PUBLIC OWNERSHIP of essential industries: Why stop at steel? What about machine tools, natural gas, chemicals etc.? BUT, again it must be nationalisation with workers' control. We are expansionists for the workers under workers' control. Let us start a great debate in the Labour movement on alternative socialist policies to Tory 'stop-go'.

THE SHORTER WORKING WEEK AND OVERTIME from the NUFTO Journal

"Did you know that on average workers in British industry are at their benches, vats, machines or whatever marvel of the industrial revolution demands their attention for (a) longer than the Italians, Germans, Jugoslavia, Austrians, Japanese, Belgians, Americans - in fact, you name the country, it requires shorter hours from its workers (unless you nominate France, where the system is apparently even crazier than ours); (b) just about as many hours as did their fathers - in some cases grandfathers - almost 50 years ago? You don't believe it? Then your naivety is such that your career as a safety officer is likely to be a frustrating one. Study the Ministry of Labour Gazette, the Annual Report of the Ministry of Labour and the Statistical Supplement of the International Labour Review, and you will find that the average British worker puts in 7 hours of overtime each week, which brings his average week almost to the 48 hours and hardly any overtime put in by his forebears of 1919. Only one country is working as many - or more hours.from a Safety Officer's Notebook."

EXECUTIVES' SALARIES RISE FASTER THAN WORKERS' PAY from a
Special Correspondent

An analysis by HAY-MSL, the consultants to management, records that salaries of executives went up by an average of 7.5% in the 12 months to July 1st. This is close on double the rate of increase regarded as the norm during the period in question. At the upper end of the executive scale, a July 1965 salary of £5,738 has become £6,207, a rise of 8.2%. Salaries of £8,000 and upwards are estimated to have risen by a percentage of 8.3. A trend is noted among middle management of a move towards a 4 week annual holiday period, as the shop floor holiday entitlement moves slowly from 2 to 3 weeks.

HAY-MSL also notes an upwards movement in fringe benefits which now account for from 11.22% of a basic salary of £1,000 to 31.1% of salaries exceeding £7,000.

AMERICAN REACTION TO THE VIETNAM WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL by Geoff Coggan

American reaction to the announcement of the setting up of an International War Crimes Tribunal to investigate U.S. war crimes in Vietnam is indicative, not only of the U.S. administration's guilty conscience but also of the seriousness with which it views the outcome of such impartial proceedings.

Sponsored by the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, the Tribunal has recently come into the news with the announcement of its provisional list of participants. As the 'New York Herald Tribune' comments, "Lord Russell has rounded up a set of judges with considerable standing among many throughout the world. Among them are former Mexican President Lazaro Cardenas; French writer Jean-Paul Sartre; novelist Simone de Beauvoir; Italian lawyer Lelio Basso; Brazilian economist Josue de Castro; a winner of a Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Foundation award, who has been mentioned as a Nobel Peace Prize candidate; Italian social reformer Danile Delci, sometimes called the 'apostle of the poor'; Peter Weiss, German-Swedish author of the highly successful play 'Marat Sade'; and historian Isaac Deutscher, who was an anti-administration participant in the 1965 Vietnam all-day Teach-in."

"While the administration has considered what it might do, no decisions have yet been reached, officials say. Probably all the government could do directly would be to deny passports to potential American participants, but even this would doubtless be challenged in court. Hence the question next arises: will French President Charles de Gualle permit such a trial in Paris? Thus far there has been no overture to the French on this issue, officials say."

The New York Herald Tribune admits that such tactics might involve the U.S. in further controversy which could scarcely be favourable to their cause. "The trial involves both freedom of speech and of the press. In France, the press is largely but not totally unsympathetic toward the American role in Vietnam and could be counted upon to raise a howl if Genral de Gualle blocked the gathering. Furthermore, the United States has said that it is prepared to defend its case."

Morally, U.S. policy in Vietnam is indefensible. Legally, too, the administration is embarrassed by past utterances. Without repudiating the legality of the Nuremberg trials of Nazi military and political leaders after World War II, any defence of the appalling brutalities being inflicted on Vietnam would seem to be impossible. Article VI of the Nuremberg Charter quotes as crimes coming within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal such violations as "murder, ill treatment or deportation of civilian population of or in occupied territories, wanton destruction of cities, towns or villages, persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds." The relevance of these clauses to the indiscriminate bombing, the enforced migration of whole areas of villages into concentration camps labelled 'strategic hamlets', and the violent measures taken to curb Buddhist demonstrations in Vietnam are obvious.

And it was an American participant at Nuremberg who exclaimed that if the American Government itself was ever guilty of such crimes, he would expect that it, too, should be brought before the bar of world opinion.

VERIFICATION OF U.S. AIRCRAFT LOSSES IN VIETNAM by Geoff Coggan

Hanoi has been claiming U.S. aircraft losses of over 1,000, against American admitted figures of somewhat less than half that number. Even allowing for the impossibility of complete accuracy under war conditions, the discrepancy is a large one. Now, verification is seeping through of the reality of the Vietnamese claims, and also of their frequent references to the effectiveness of small arms fire against modern aircraft.

The U.S. now admits that their figures do not include aircraft destroyed on the ground, nor planes that are damaged beyond repair. Even more significant is a recent 'Sunday Telegraph' article which says that "the American Air Force is making a serious effort to recall old Skyraider piston-engined planes, first used in 1945, for use over North Vietnam. By using them they hope to reduce the severe loss rate of war planes owing to the vulnerability of modern jets. ... One hit has been sufficient to knock out the whole sensitive sophisticated system, but the Skyraider, which was used in Korea, has shown itself much less vulnerable to ground fire. The Pentagon is now even considering re-opening production of the Skyraider in the U.S."

FURTHER EVIDENCE OF VIETNAM DRAIN ON U.S. RESOURCES

The American journal 'Aviation Week' (April 1966) reports that "an official Defense Dept. spokesman admitted for the first time Mar. 29 that the 4 Army divisions were understrength because of the strain of Vietnam. ... The admission was forced by wide publication of the Stennis subcommittee's latest report on the low state of readiness of the 4 Army divisions. But there is much more embarrassing information in that confidential report that has not yet been made public - including findings that more than half the tanks and other combat vehicles in the 1st and 2nd Armoured Divs. at Fort Hood, Texas, had to be put in storage because there were no troops with enough training to use them."

T.U.C. CONFERENCE : PHOTOGRAPHIC EXHIBITION ON THE VIETNAM WAR

Over 20 Trade Unions have joined in sponsoring the Photographic Exhibition organised by the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, which is to be held in Blackpool at the time of the T.U.C. Conference. The exhibition, which includes a great deal of material hitherto unpublished in this country, will be at the CENTRAL PUBLIC LIBRARY (Lecture Hall), QUEEN STREET, NEAR BLACKPOOL NORTH RAILWAY STATION.

The Exhibition will be open from 10.00 am. to 9.30 pm. each day on Tuesday 6th, Wednesday 7th and Thursday 8th September.

There will also be a meeting in Blackpool on Tuesday 6th September, at the Albert Hall, Albert Road, at 7.30 pm., when the Speakers will be BERTRAND RUSSELL, TERRY PARRY (FBU), BOB EDWARDS (CWU), and Dr. MALCOLM CALDWELL. GEORGE ELVIN, of the Association of Cinematographic, Television and Allied Technicians, will be in the Chair.

PLEDGE YOURSELF TO DEMONSTRATE AGAINST BRITISH COMPLICITY IN THE VIETNAM WAR

The National Council of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign has decided to call a Demonstration on the eve of the Labour Party Conference:

- (1) to publicly demonstrate against the British Government's complicity in the Vietnam War, and
- (2) to show our solidarity with those members of the Labour Party who are struggling against that policy.

The servile role of the British Government in supporting the Americans in their war of aggression against Vietnam is in complete contradiction to the declared aims of the Labour Party. This question will be hotly contested at the Annual Conference of the Labour Party in Brighton in the first week of October.

Accordingly, we have called this demonstration on

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28th, ASSEMBLING AT 7.00 P.M. IN TRAFALGAR SQUARE,

moving off at 7.30. The March will go to the Labour Party H.Q. in Smith Square, off Millbank, arriving at 8.00. A letter will be delivered to the secretary of the Labour Party, expressing our disgust with the policy of the Government and our support for all those who are trying to reverse this policy.

For this Demonstration we need an absolute minimum of 500 participants - in fact we will not hold it unless we get that number of people to pledge themselves to attend. In practice we expect many, many more than 500 to take part.

You can help to make this very necessary Demonstration a success by:

- (1) filling in the appended form;
- (2) getting other people to pledge themselves;
- (3) sending us the names of people to whom to send forms;
- (4) making a donation towards the cost of the demonstration.

I PLEDGE MYSELF TO ATTEND THE SEPTEMBER 28th DEMONSTRATION AGAINST THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT'S COMPLICITY IN THE VIETNAM WAR.

Name Address

Telephone

I pledge myself to get other people to fill the forms.

I donate towards the cost of the demonstration.

PLEASE SEND FORMS TO THE FOLLOWING :

.....

.....

.....

.....

Issued by the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, 8, Roland Gardens, London, SW.7
Tel. FRO 3138, to whom this Form should be returned.