

The Week

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS
Vol. 4, No. 21. 2nd December, 1965

6^D

- C.S.E. FORGES AHEAD
- BANK OCTOPUS EXPOSED
- WORKERS' CONTROL DEBATE
- AMERICAN PEACE MOVEMENT
- UNOFFICIAL STRIKE CURB

LABOUR'S COAL SCUTTLE

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. - Robin Blackburn - Ken Coates - Chris Farley - Ralph Schoenman - Eric Varley, M.P. - Earl Russell, O.M. - Malcolm Caldwell - Tony Brewer - Alan Sillotoe

54 Park Road, Lenton, Nottingham

Subscription: £2 per annum and pro rata

THE WEEK

A NEWS ANALYSIS FOR SOCIALISTS
Vol. 4, No. 21, 2nd December, 1965

6p

- CEE FORGET AHEAD
- BANK OCTOBER
EXPLAINED
- WORKERS' CONGRESS
DEBATE
- AMERICAN SPACE
MOVEMENT
- FINANCIAL STABILISATION
CLUB

LABOUR'S

COAL SCUTTLE

Labour's...
Coal...
The...
The...
The...

CONTENTS

PAGE	1	Editorial.
"	2	Unofficial strike penalty for Busmen.
"	3	Steelmen knock Gunter?
"	4	"Reinstate Ken Coates" movement grows.
"	5	Centre for Socialist Education forges ahead.
"	6	The Anglo-Irish Free Trade Area.
"	7	" " " " " " "
"	8	The new American anti-war movement.
"	9	" " " " " " "
"	10	Growing Concentration of Banking.
"	11	" " " " " "
"	12	C.S.E. Directory.

LABOUR'S COAL SCUTTLE

"One hundred and fifty pits are to close, and that is the only way we can get this House to agree to the capital reconstruction of the industry." Mr. Tom Swain's angry speech in Thursday's debate ought to stir the conscience of every Labour Party worker. "When I pulled the string and raised the flag on January 1st 1947," he said, "I was the proudest man alive. I never dreamed I would see a Minister of Power on a socialist front bench introduce a Bill of this character . . . it is the requiem mass of the mining industry." The ferocity of the Government's 'rationalisation' of the mining industry cannot, unfortunately, be seen as an occasional aberration. Rail fares better. Whenever 'modernisation' is needed, it is remorselessly pushed through, at the expense of the very people the Labour Party was formed to protect. Tom Swain left the coal face for the back benches at Westminster. He knows his men. His heart-cry rings true for the whole mining community. But the Government flatly steamrollers its way over all protests, from the NUM, the NUR, or its own supporters. Perhaps we could accept the need for some of these terrible cuts, if we saw similar controls being made into the power of the elite. But if some of our mines are out of date, how much more out of date is the City of London, and Britain's imperial play-acting East of Suez? Yet brave as he is with the unions, Mr. Wilson is timid as a tenderfoot boy scout in the City. It is time for us to listen to Tom Swain, and for all of us, the people who put all their hopes in this Government, to recall it to order.

STOP PRESS

The holocaust in Vietnam is about to flare out into even more unspeakable ferocity. Mass demonstrations in the USA prove that if Britain spoke out, Johnson would be compelled to withdraw from his butchery. It is vital to pull out every stop to lobby the Government, and to make it plain that we will tolerate this carnage no longer.

NEXT WEEK: 'Rhodesia - What Now?'
and more on the Busmen's new agreement.

ANTI-STRIKE PENALTY IN NEW AGREEMENT.

The following disturbing report appeared in Motor Transport on 26.11.65.

"Municipal bus employers who shrink from invoking the penalty clause covering unofficial strikes in the new 40-hour week and bonus agreement reached on Fricay last week for the industry will risk expulsion from the Federation of Municipal Passenger Transport Employers.

The agreement confers a length-of-service bonus of from 10s per week (for employees with 6 months' service) to 30s (for those with 20 years' service).

But it also includes a clause stating that these payments shall be subject to forfeiture for absence other than that justifiable through sickness, or leave of absence. If the absence is individual, service pay will be forfeited for the week during which it occurs. If the absence is "collective" on the part of a number of employees the current six months' service payment will be automatically withheld from them...

The reference to "collective absence" was substituted at the eleventh hour for "unofficial strike" in order to render the draft agreement more palatable to union leaders who had to report back to their delegates.

Inclusion of the word "automatic" is highly significant since it not only relieves a general manager of the unpleasant decision whether or not to stop the bonus payment for six months if there is an unofficial stoppage, but it gives him no choice in the matter. Failure to apply the six-month sanction becomes just as much a violation of the national agreement as unauthorized deviation from national wage rates, which in the past has cost Birmingham, Rochdale, Luton and Heading membership of the federation.

For an employee with 20 years' or more service on buses the consequences of joining an unofficial dispute could be the loss of 30s a week for six months thereafter, or £39 in all before tax. This could well prove a more powerful deterrent to such action than the loss of two or three days' full earnings, and would clearly give employees even more cause to think where they were contemplating the all-too-frequent one-day strike..... There will be a right of appeal by an aggrieved body of workers...." Alderman Harris, chairman of the employers' federation hailed all this as "a new concept of industrial relations in this country." He may be more right than he thinks !

WORKERS' SAFETY COMMITTEES NEEDED

"A real and serious increase in the number of reportable accidents is revealed by the Chief Inspector of Factories in his annual report for 1964," writes the editor of the Transport and General Workers' Record in the December issue. "Accidents reported during the year totalled the highest since the war: 268,648, an increase of 31.5 per cent over the 1963 total of 204,269; the number of fatal accidents increased from 610 to 655. It is true that the long-term trend of fatal accidents is slowly downward... It is also to be remembered that with an increasing labour force and a rising level of production more people are at risk....Nevertheless...the figures indicate a real and serious increase."

These forbidding tendencies underline yet again the importance of the TUC decision to pursue legislation for elected workers' safety committees, with effective powers, in every enterprise. The campaign to implement this decision should be quickly set in motion.

STEELMEN KNOCK GUNTER ?

The Editorial in the current issue of Man and Metal, the notably cautious journal of the Iron and Steel Trades Confederation, sternly criticises the Ministry of Labour's evidence to the Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employers' Associations.

"A great deal of attention is given in the evidence to the subject of unofficial strikes which, says the Ministry, are held by a large body of opinion as being the main defect in industrial relations in this country. Some people think that unofficial strikes should be made illegal and there are, of course, those who would like to see all strikes outlawed.

These views, however, are not supported by the Ministry which points out that apart from the impracticability of pursuing such a course, attempts at putting large numbers of trade unionists in jail would hardly be conducive to good industrial relations.....

The Ministry does, however, lend some support to the modified suggestion that pressure should be brought to bear on trade unions which do less than they could to prevent unofficial disputes arising and that this pressure might be exerted by subjecting the union concerned to a defined penalty relating to the duration of the unofficial strike. By supporting this idea, the Ministry, although emphasising in its evidence that the causes of unofficial strikes do not always lie on the employees' side, is tacitly, if paradoxically, accepting the view - so often encouraged by the manner in which strikes are covered by press and television - that the blame rests always on the unions.

It would, we submit, be manifestly unfair to penalise a union for not speedily bringing to an end a dispute provoked by bad and inefficient management. Yet there is no suggestion that in such circumstances managements should be penalised.

It seems, therefore, that while the Ministry is quite prepared to support the idea that trade unions should be penalised, it regards it as sufficient, so far as management is concerned, merely to draw attention to the desirability of raising the standards of personnel management and more widely disseminating available knowledge about workpeople's attitudes and the most appropriate procedures for handling the labour force, in the hope that this knowledge would be acted upon."

It should not escape any trade unionist's attention that the man responsible for this evidence is the Minister, Mr. Gunter. He has clearly forgotten where his allegiance should lie.

KEEPING OUT CHINA

From the 'New York Daily' of 26.11.65.

"We think that the U.N. decision (to exclude Communist China) merits applause from all lovers of freedom, with U.S. ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg rating a special cheer. And now, how about Washington paying attention to Mrs. Chiang Kai-shek's suggestion that the United States furnish planes and bombs for use by Nationalist Chinese pilots in taking out Red China's nuclear plants?"

THE ANGLO-IRISH FREE TRADE AREA : THE "PROS" AND "CONS" (Excerpts from a Leaflet produced by the Socialist Republican Wolfe Tone Society)

The following points list the main advantages to Ireland and Britain of a Free Trade Agreement :

Advantages for Ireland (1) Possibly better agricultural prices; the "sugar" meant to serve as coating for the bitter pill of free trade in manufactures. Better agricultural prices might mean the extension of British cattle subsidies to Irish cattle. Would this make much difference though? Irish cattle prices are very high now and the high demand for them will probably continue for years. The Irish Government will also try to get a better deal for Irish dairy products, butter and bacon - perhaps the benefit of subsidy from Britain for these, or larger quotas. But the Danes and New Zealanders are bound to object violently, and it is hard to see Ireland getting great improvements here. Further, by giving Irish agricultural products the benefit of a "subsidy", Britain is not being generous. She is giving only a fair price, expressing the real value of the goods in question, which would otherwise have to be sold at less than their value in the "normal" artificially rigged British market, where agricultural goods are normally sold below their cost of production.

(2) It might bring more British capital to Ireland. This would be an advantage on the premises of Mr. Lemass's economic policy, but it is only a possibility. Moreover, it is highly likely that whenever new British capital were attracted here in free trade conditions would be even more "parasitical" than much of it is already, that is, used to buy up Irish firms, shops, the distributive trade, land, etc., when Ireland becomes to all intents and purposes as much a part of Britain's home market as Lancashire. Would British businessmen come to Ireland to take advantage of our cheaper labour? Some of them might for a time; but in the long term it is more likely that many more Irish workers, failing to find industrial employment at home, will go over to Britain to take jobs there - a Britain which under the new Economic Plan will have a labour shortage of 200,000 jobs by 1970, the period when free trade would be really starting to hit employment here. What would be the effect on foreign non-British firms? They might still be possibly attracted by grants and cheap labour - but it would no longer be possible for the Irish Government to stipulate that they produce primarily for export - except for exports outside the Free Trade Area. Foreign products coming in must inevitably have free access not only to the British market but also to the Irish "home" market.

(3) A third advantage might be to expand the market for Northern Ireland goods, by giving them free entry to the south. This is something progressive Irish people should welcome in so far as better terms for Six County businesses help to give employment in Ireland for Irish people. But this could presumably be done without the need for an Anglo-Irish Free Trade Area. A North-South Free Trade Area is quite a feasible proposition, though it would require that southern imports from the North should have certificates of origin to ensure that they were made or had a significant proportion of their value added there. This is something which the Labour and Republican movement in Ireland might well consider advocating, as Irish nationalists have generally been in favour of a unified Irish economy. It would also have the benefit of driving a wedge between the Six Counties and Britain to a certain extent.

The Anglo-Irish Free Trade Area : continued /

So much then for the advantages or possible advantages of the Free Trade Agreement for Ireland. What of the advantages for Britain? These, it is suggested, far outweigh the former. The main ones would be the following :

Advantages to Britain (1) Economically it would expand Britain's industrial markets, and help her exports at the expense of other countries which would have to overcome tariffs in order to sell their goods in Ireland.

(2) It would assure Britain of Ireland's food exports, and particularly meat and livestock exports, at a time when demand for these is growing in other countries of Europe, and Irish exports are expanding there, to Britain's possible loss. The Argentine and New Zealand are no longer as reliable suppliers of Britain's needs as they used to be.

(3) It would make Ireland more dependent on Britain's goodwill politically and economically than at any time since the Union period. Having entered a Free Trade Area, it becomes more difficult to withdraw the longer one is in. No guarantee could be given that Britain, having Ireland at her economic mercy, would not over a period of time use her economic power to turn the country into a glorified cattle ranch and tourist resort. British business has as little interest in seeing industry flourish in Ireland as she has in setting up industry in the Highlands of Scotland. And it is only by increasing industry in Ireland that the Irish population can maintain its present size, not to speak of increasing in numbers. Our entire historical experience should have hammered home the lesson that British business has no interest in a prosperous industrial Ireland. The way in which the last Trade Agreement was broken by Britain last October shows that things have not changed with the years.

(4) A further political advantage to Britain could be that, by making the Twenty Six Counties even more dependent on her than at present, this would fit in quite well with possible changes in British policy in relation to Ireland as a whole. It should always be remembered that, unlike many people in our progressive movement here in the South, Britain always sees Ireland as a whole. Her political and economic policy in relation to Ireland takes the position on both sides of the border simultaneously into account. At the present time, Unionism and the Unionist Party, the main political support for British influence in Ireland, is showing many signs of losing support in the North. The decline in the Unionist vote in the last Imperial election, and the rise of a Labour opposition in the North, are indications of this. A gain of 7/8 seats by anti-Unionists in the North could lay the basis for an anti-Unionist Government there. In the vote for the University-for-Derry issue in Stormont the other month, the Unionist Government had a majority of only 2. The prospect is therefore emerging - long though it may be - of Stormont, which was established as the spearhead of political reaction in Ireland, being used some time in the coming years by an anti-Unionist Government for progressive purposes. It is therefore clearly in the interests of intelligent "imperialists" in Britain to make plans accordingly, and do their best to make of the Southern state as nearly an economic satellite of the United Kingdom as possible. Such "Machiavellianism" may never have entered Harold Wilson's head, but political considerations of this kind may not be totally beyond the ken of Sir Algernon Rumbold and his colleagues on the British negotiating team in our Free Trade talks. They have certainly been

The Anglo-Irish Free Trade Area : continued /

publicly aired by some Conservatives in Britain, for example, the Bow Group. Britain should not be thought to have any compunction in "ditching" the Ulster Unionists if she could thereby secure a closer economic and political hold on the whole of Ireland. This may seem a far fetched picture, but it is something to bear in mind.

It would seem, therefore, that to condone the setting up of a Free Trade Area would be tantamount to accepting a cynical form of neo-colonialism. Does Mr. Wilson know ? Does he care ?

D.R. O'Connor Lysaght.

THE NEW AMERICAN ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT by Fred Halstead.

One of the most important features of the new Anti-War Movement is the practice of non-exclusion - of working with anyone opposed to the war, regardless of his political or philosophical viewpoints on other matters, and of refusing to go along with red baiting. By sticking to this simple principle, the new movement has already made a good start in educating the American people away from the whole atmosphere of hysterical anti-communism which is used to excuse the worst war crimes abroad, and the most flagrant violations of civil liberties at home. It has successfully challenged the whole cold war mystique by which all reasoning, exchange of ideas, and co-operation around common goals is supposed to stop when the epithets "communism" or "subversive" are applied.

In a few months, the application of the principle of non-exclusion has shattered the crust of fear and capitulation to red baiting which had overlaid the "old" peace movement. This is an accomplishment of no small impact, which has already had its effects on wider circles of American society - particularly the academic community - and it is bound to have an ever widening effect as the movement continues to grow.

Non-exclusion, as it has developed within the movement since the April 17 March on Washington, has two aspects. Both were initiated by the Students for a Democratic Society in its preparations for that march. First, anyone who agreed with the call for the march, regardless of political affiliations or views, was invited to join the committees building the march. Second, every interested organisation - including those which were the direct targets of red baiting, was invited to endorse it and to participate in its planning and organisation. Generally, in the Committees to End the War in Vietnam which have been formed since then, everyone has been welcome to join. In the united fronts - where various organisations, including the committees, co-operate in an action they all agree upon - the principle of non-exclusion has been widely adopted.

All this has had a dynamic and energising effect. For the first time in many years a movement involving many thousands of Americans is developing which has not only rejected, but has directly challenged McCarthy-type thought control. This, among other things, has made the movement attractive to many who value their right to weigh different ideas in an objective atmosphere, and who resent being told that there are some political and social concepts which are taboo

The point is often made that merely educating or demonstrating against the war

The new American Anti-War Movement : continued /

is not enough, that people must become involved on levels which touch their own day-to-day lives, that a general radical "base" must be built in this country to effect the social changes necessary to eliminate imperialism, and that a "multi-issue" movement should embrace such activities as anti-poverty, civil rights, political action, university reform, etc. In the first place, a clear distinction should be made between the anti-war movement as a whole and the Committees to End the War in Vietnam which were formed around a specific issue.

In a sense the movement as a whole is already multi-issue. All the radical groups involved in anti-war work - SDS, DuBois Clubs, YSA, May 2nd, etc., have multi-issue programmes. All understand that no basic change can be made in American society - whether it be reform or revolution - by a programme limited to a single issue. But all these groups have differences over what the programme to transform society should be. These are extremely important differences which cannot be resolved by ignoring them, or by glossing over them. They should be discussed, clarified, and tested in action. All of the various political tendencies should be anxious to learn from the experiences, and to discuss their views with one another, and with the many persons just awakening to radical social consciousness.

The great unifying issue at this time is opposition to U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war. The Committees to End the War in Vietnam are the natural vehicles to reach and organise the growing number of Americans who are developing opposition to the administration's war policy. Even the public opinion polls show that millions of U.S. citizens right now are opposed to the war, and that many additional millions are deeply disturbed about it. Yet the new movement has barely begun its work of countering the calculated campaign of distortions, hate propaganda and lies to which the American people are being subjected. It has just begun involving people in mass demonstrations of various kinds. It has so far had demonstrations involving only between 100,000 and 300,000 people. This is significant, but only the beginning.

This movement could not possibly have come about among the youth, the academic community, the intellectuals, or even among all the radicals who have suddenly become active, if it did not reflect a changing mood in much broader sections of the community as a whole. The growth of consciousness by the student youth is a forerunner of a growth of consciousness on a much larger scale, among the working class youth, among young men forced into the army, and in much wider sections of the population.

It is well within possibility that not just a few hundred thousand, but millions of Americans can be actively involved in the struggle against the Vietnam war. A movement of that scope, even though centered around the single issue of the war, would have the most profound effects on every social structure in the country, including the trade unions and the soldiers in the army. But, above all, it could be the key factor in forcing an end to the Pentagon's genocidal war in Vietnam. The lives of untold thousands of Vietnamese men, women and children, and U.S. G.I.'s may depend upon it, and that alone is reason enough to put aside sectarian differences to unite and help build a national organisation which can encompass anyone willing to oppose American involvement in Vietnam, regardless of their commitment, or lack of it, on other questions.

GROWING CONCENTRATION OF BANKING

Three banks together controlling assets of more than £650m. mainly in Scotland and Ireland announced last week that they are having talks "with a view to forming a strong and close association." They are the National Commercial Bank of Scotland, in which Lloyds Bank has a 36.6 per cent. shareholding, the Bank of Ireland, the biggest bank in the Republic, and the National Bank, which owns 254 branches and sub-offices, chiefly in the Republic.

The National, after announcing the talks, said that "shareholders will be advised immediately any firm proposals can be presented to them for their consideration." But a statement by the National Commercial made it plain that there was no question "of a merger as such between the three banks." Officials of all three banks said they could not elaborate on the statements that had been made. A spokesman for the National said that a full statement could be expected within a month.

The National Commercial is easily the biggest of the three banks, with assets of £323m. and 453 branches, all but seven of which are in Scotland. A link with the other two banks would have an obvious advantage of giving the National Commercial its first foothold in Ireland. The National is one of the 11 London clearing banks, but its business is concentrated in the Republic Of Ireland where it has 215 branches and sub-offices. It was established in 1835 and has assets of £153m.

An association with the other two banks would not only spread the National's interests, but it would strengthen the bank's position in Ireland against competition from the "Big Five" which now looks like building up. This would also apply to the Bank of Ireland, which has 160 branches in the Republic and employs assets of around £174m. Established by Royal Charter in 1783, this is the only Irish bank whose shares are quoted on the London Stock Exchange.

This is just one aspect of the growing concentration of British banking. An indication of just how far the process has gone was given in a chart published in a recent issue of The Economist.

WHO OWNS WHOM British Banks have forged so many new links in recent years that nearly everyone has lost track. This table provides an up to date record.

<u>PARENT BANK</u>	<u>CONTROLLING INTEREST</u>	<u>MINORITY INTERESTS</u>
<u>Barclays</u>	Barclays DCO British Linen Barclays Bank (France) Barclays Export Finance Corp.	Banque de Bruxelles Banque de Commerce Banco Del Desarrollo Economica Espanol Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce. Yorkshire Bank*.
Barclays Bank DCO	Barclays Overseas Developm't Corporation. Credit Congolais Barclays (California)	Bank of London & Montreal* (33 $\frac{1}{3}$ %)

WHO OWNS WHOM (continued)

PARENT BANK	CONTROLLING INTEREST	MINORITY INTERESTS
District	County Bank	Yorkshire Bank *
Glyn Mills & Co.	Glyn Mills Finance Co.	
<u>Lloyds</u>	Lloyds Bank Europe Lloyds Bank (Cannes) Lloyds Bank (Belgium)	National Commercial Bank of Scotland (36½%) Bank of London & S.America National & Grindleys (25%) Yorkshire Bank (20%)* Mauritius Commercial Bank (16½%) National Bank of New Zealand National Bank of Australasia
<u>Martins</u>	Lewis's Bank	Yorkshire Bank *
<u>Midland</u>	Belfast Banking Co. Clydeside Bank Northern Bank	Midland & International Bank 45% Standard Bank*
<u>National Provincial</u>	Coutts & Co. District Bank Isle of Man Bank	Standard Bank* Yorkshire Bank* National & Grindlays (10%)
<u>Westminster</u>	Ulster Bank Westminster Foreign Bank	Banco de Financiacion Industrial* Roy West Banking Corp.* (25%) Standard Bank* Yorkshire Bank*
<u>Royal Bank of Scotland</u>	Glyn Mills & Co. Williams Deacons	
<u>Chartered Bank</u>	Eastern Bank Allahabad Bank CBI Developm't Corp. Chartered Bank of London	Irano-British Bank (49%) Commercial Bank SAL (49%)
National and Grindlays	National & Grindlays finance & Developm't Corp. Wm.Brandt's Sons	
Standard Bank	Bank of West Africa Standard Bank of S.Africa Standard Bank Finance & Developm't Corp.	Midland & international Banks
<u>Hambros Bank</u>	Laidlaw & Co.New York	Banca Privata Finanziaria Milan (25%)

Note: Parent Banks not underlined are partly or wholly owned by other listed banks; those marked with an asterisk have shares held by two or more other banks.

C.S.E. DIRECTORY

Branches already established (including allied organisations)*

Birmingham: Barbara Allen, 51, Lomaine Drive, Birmingham, 30.
Bristol: Tom Nicholls, Flat 3, The Rowans, Manor Park, Bristol.
Edinburgh: Gavin Kennedy, Edinburgh Left Club, 32, Morningside Rd.,
Edinburgh, 9.
Glasgow: Pat Southall, Glasgow Left Club, 97, Otago St., Glasgow, W. 2.
Hull; Tony Topham, Hull Labour College, 1, Plantation Drive,
Anlaby Park, Hull.
London: Chris Farley, 15, Ramsden Road, London, N.11.
Sean Gervasi, 71, New End, London, N.W.3.
Councillor C. van Gelderen, 6, Aycliff Rd., London, W.12.
Manchester: Colin Barker, Top Flat, 43, Daisy Bank Rd., Manchester, 14.
Nottingham: Geoff Coggan, 47, Brindley Rd., Bilborough, Nottingham.
Oxford City: Peter Sedgewick, 34, Swinburne Road, Oxford.
Scarborough: Peter Baines, Scarborough New Left Club, 52, Beacon Road,
Seamer, Scarborough, Yorks.
Sunderland: Mr. T. McBride, Sunderland Labour College, 79, Washington Rd.,
Hylton Castle Estate, Sunderland.

Branches pending with convenors to contact

Belfast: Tony McFarlane, 29, Eden Terrace, Strabane, Co. Tyrone.
Brighton: Ian Clegg, 4, Clifton Terrace, Brighton, Sussex.
Cambridge: Robert Q. Gray, Caius College, Cambridge.
Cheshire: A. Hackham, 221a, Finney Lane, Heald Green, Cheadle, Cheshire.
Croydon: Pat Fortune, Flat 5, 24, Bramley Hill, Croydon, Surrey.
Exeter: Paul Golder, Exeter University Labour Club, Devonshire House,
University, Exeter.
Ipswich: Ioan Davies, Dept. of Sociology, The University of Essex.
L.S.E.: Stephen Jeffrey, 34, Hornsey Lane, London, N.6.
Mansfield: J.W. Attenborough, 144, Nuncargate Hill, Kirkby-in-Ashfield,
Notts.
Merseyside: Peter Booth, East Woodfinnlow, Lower Thingwall, Thingwall,
Wirral, Cheshire.
Oxford: Bob Libienthal, Magdalen College, Oxford.
Ruskin College: Peter Wyncoll, Ruskin College, Walton St., Oxford.
Wallsend: Herby Bell, 134, Holly Avenue, Wallsend.
W. Middlesex: Peter Jenner, 13b, Deane Way, Eastcote, Ruislip, Middlesex.
York: Nigel Harris, 5, Holly Terrace, New Walk, York.
R.J. Looker, University of York, Heslington, York.

Regional Convenors

Midlands: Bob Gregory, 54, Park Road, Lenton, Nottingham.
North-East: Dave Peers, 6, Bilborough Gdns., Newcastle, 4.
Wales: Tom Nicholls, as above.
Yorkshire: Tony Topham, as above.

This list will be brought up to date each week. Local organisers would like to receive the names of people who might be interested. These addresses should also be sent to the National Convenor, 19, Greenfield St., Dunkirk, Nott'm. Anyone who would like to form a local branch is invited to contact the National Convenor.

* Allied organisations have not necessarily discussed affiliation.