

# Socialist Worker

FOR WORKERS CONTROL AND INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

**MARCH 16**  
Vietnam  
mobilisation

IS members and supporters report to main IS banner in Hyde Park to the left of Speakers' Corner at 1 pm sharp. Bring your branch banners and posters. Keep together. March through Grosvenor Square with arms linked. NO ARRESTS!



Dagenham workers collecting their strike pay. The success of the dispute depends on the rank and file's ability to control the negotiations

## NO RETREAT ON PENALTIES:

## SPREAD THE STRIKE

**LSE students expose 'get tough' plans**

From MARTIN SHAW  
STUDENTS at the London School of Economics, who occupied the main building from Monday to Wednesday in opposition to new legal victimisation, have come across an important secret document.

It is a set of minutes of the meetings of the Standing Committee of the court of Governors held throughout February. It seems that:

1. The Governors wanted LSE to try on February 19 to have students under injunctions committed for contempt of court—that is sent to jail for speaking at the Students Union on the same day.

2. They discussed the possibility that students should be admitted on an annual contract renewed from year to year, presumably so they could refuse to renew a student's contract, rather than bother to expel him.

3. They considered replacing normal disciplinary procedures by arbitrary suspension and 'emergency regulations'.

4. Lord Robbins, chairman of the Standing Committee, suggested the possibility of 'introducing legislation in parliament at an early date to amend the law relating to trespass on premises such as those of the School'.

### Make illegal

The last proposal is clearly aimed at re-defining trespass to make illegal all student sit-ins, occupations and direct action.

It would be an attempt to place legal shackles on students just as the government is now trying to take away workers' rights. The difference could be that students would lose all real rights to defend their interests.

Such a law could be more restrictive than even in Place of Strife. This proposed legal repression threatens all students.

LSE students may not now be in a position to win the battle against such measures in their college. The occupation vote by the union against the legal charges of malicious damage, brought last Friday against two lecturers, and 10 students for their part in removing LSE's 'prison gates', was largely unsuccessful.

It was called in support of

### EDITORIAL

**THE FORD STRIKE is at the crossroads. The outcome of the dispute is of vital significance for all sections of the labour movement. At stake is the whole question of power and control in the factories and the unions.**

The management tried to bring in penalty clauses in an effort to prevent unofficial strikes. The Engineers and Transport Workers unions, tailing behind the rank and file who came out on strike, declared the strike official.

Ford attempted to use the courts against the unions, but the law as it stands just couldn't be bent that far to help them. This legal set-back, together with the government's White Paper on trade unions, is certainly going to herald a vicious attack on militant workers. The aim of the operation will be to soften up public opinion before passing new legislation to shackle the unions.

### Government cooperation

For example, agreements may be made legally binding. This would have meant that the workers at Ford could have been faced with a binding agreement which they had never even seen!

Already there has been much co-operation between the Ford management and the Department of Employment and Productivity. Indeed the 'secret memorandum' of the management (extracts of which were published in Socialist Worker last week) was drawn up in consultation with Barbara Castle's Department.

The Ford fight is political, a fight against the type of proposals the Castle White Paper foresees. The aim of the proposals is to shackle the unions, and to transfer all power away from the shop floor to the hands of full-time union officials, who will not be subjected to day-to-day pressures from the men they are actually supposed to represent.

Ford shows that if the rank and file move, the union bureaucracies will split in opposite directions. There are men like Mark Young and Les Cannon of the Electricians Union, or Les Kealey who are violently opposed to militant shop floor action. There are others like Hugh Scanlon and Jack Jones whose strength derives from the rank and file itself.

Within the TGWU, the strike action of the rank and file led to a shake-up and the dismissal of Les Kealey, one of the union bosses who rose to power in the late 1950s. The union has a peculiar structure, with 12 separate divisions, all almost self-governing. These groups (in chemicals, rubber, docks etc) are generally run by survivors of the right-wing Deakin period. Getting rid of Kealey can and must herald a shake-up of the entire union structure of the TGWU.

Scanlon and Jones have supported the Ford workers, but their position often leads them to act in a vacillating or confused fashion. For example, the AEF and TGWU are already involved in four agreements which have provision for penalties in the event of unofficial strikes.

The agreements are at Henry Wiggin's rolling mill at Hereford, with Swan Hunter, at the Continental Oil refinery at

Immingham, and with the Upper Clyde Shipbuilders (see story on back page).

The AEF has also accepted many productivity deals which involve the selling of workers' conditions—for instance the introduction of Measured Day Work, one of the more barbarous forms of productivity dealing, at Rootes, Linwood.

The unions have rejected the attempt to cripple the right to strike at Ford. They must fight now to reverse the deals negotiated elsewhere.

The rank and file cannot rely on anyone to do the job for them. The only guarantee they have is their own strength and organisation.

One of the main features of the Ford strike so far is how localised it has been. If a settlement can't be reached the strike must be spread.

The AEF and the TGWU must act as the massive bastions of working class strength they are and bring out other workers—like dockers and delivery drivers—if necessary. The Ford workers are fighting a battle which affects the whole of the organised working class. It is only right to expect other sections of the class to support them, especially those in their own unions.

One thing is clear. There can be no sell out. Penalty clauses are either included in any settlement or they are excluded.

There is no possible compromise here. The officials negotiating can under no circumstances accept any penalty arrangements without completely betraying the workers they represent.

It is essential that there should be no secret deals and no top-level settlements without shop stewards being involved. In particular, the National Joint Negotiating Committee, consisting of union officials from the 15 unions who have members at Ford, has shown the danger of officials taking decisions on behalf of the shop floor. The NJNC must be smashed.

There can be no return to work without mass meetings of the Ford workers to ratify any agreements which are reached. One of the failings of the strike organisation to date has been the lack of involvement of the mass of the workers who are out. Halewood has been the only truly solid factory.

### Mass meetings vital

Leaflets and propaganda on a massive scale are required in order to consolidate support and to spread feeling for the workers who are on strike. Mass meetings are a vital way of keeping in touch with everyone who is involved.

A further point of great importance is the need for link-ups between shop steward committees, not only regionally and nationally but also internationally. The Ford Motor Co is a giant international capitalist firm. It has factories throughout Western Europe and it has stated that its future developments will be made with an eye on the 'labour situation'.

In other words the company will try to divert production to areas where workers are unorganised or unwilling to fight back.

Only by fighting together can the rank and file safeguard their conditions and win the struggle at Ford. In the long run it will be the workers relying on nobody but themselves who will be able to assert working class interests against those of the capitalist system.

### SEND YOUR SUPPORT

Messages of solidarity with Ford stewards to: 28B New Road, Dagenham, Essex, or Transport House, Islington, Liverpool 3.

**£4000**  
fund —will  
you help?

THE FIGHT is really on. The battles at Ford, Injection Moulders, Vauxhall and Ivy Bridge show that more and more sections of rank and file workers are taking action against the bosses and their Labour government.

Socialist Worker has an important role to play in these struggles. Already the paper has won a growing circulation and reputation for its uncompromising opposition to productivity deals and such swindles as measured day work and time and motion study.

But we're not satisfied. We want a bigger and better paper. We want all militant workers to feel that Socialist Worker is their paper, fighting with them for workers' power.

We hope to produce a six-page paper later this year. That needs money. We want a more streamlined organisation for the paper, its print shop and the headquarters of the International Socialists. That needs money, too.

### ONE ROOF

In the next few weeks we hope to house our print shop, editorial offices and IS HQ under one roof. We want to be completely free from commercial printers, but that means buying our own folding and cutting equipment.

And to produce a six-page paper we will need another small printing press and a second typesetting machine.

The initial outlay in rent, rates and the cost of lighting and heating the new premises will put a tremendous strain on our tiny resources. To meet all our commitments and produce a bigger paper, we need to raise £4000 in the next six months.

Last year, our readers and supporters raised nearly £10,000. We know times are tough, but the only way to defeat the government and the employers is to build a paper and an organisation that will lead the struggle for workers' power and socialism.

This is urgent. Raise the matter in your IS branches, trade unions, youth groups, factory committees and tenants' organisations. If you want a speaker, let us know.

Rush your money to me at Paxton Works, Paxton Road, London N17. All donations will be acknowledged in the paper.

JIM NICHOL

A novelist explodes the myth that writers are well paid and suggests a controversial way for them to get more money

# A penny at the library -is this the only way to help struggling authors?

IT IS POPULARLY assumed that any author known at all is making thousands a year. As the late Dorothy Parker used to say, 'Wouldn't it be nice?'

There are best-selling authors, to be sure, who do make thousands a year. Ian Fleming in one field was pretty rich, so was Somerset Maugham in another.

Romance fiction and crime fiction are the chief money-spinners, and, of course, sensational sex—in so far as it's possible to be 'sensational' nowadays, when Lady Chatterley reads almost like a Sunday-school prize, relatively speaking...

But that a handful of best-selling authors are doing nicely (and good luck to them in our competitive, capitalist society!) doesn't alter the fact that professional authors, i.e. those who live entirely by writing, are a dying breed.

An anonymous survey conducted recently by the Society of Authors (anonymous in that we didn't have to give our names) showed that something like only one in ten authors made a thousand a year.

## NO CRITERION

The fact that they were well-known, old-established, and had a good following, was no criterion of large sales—for the simple reason that though they were widely read they were not widely bought, and libraries buy the minimum of copies they can get by without the long waiting lists all in demand.

And, of course, this library readership profits the author nothing. Not even the royalty on the sale of books by the publisher to the libraries, in many cases, because librarians very often buy review copies from agents who have in turn bought them cheap from reviewers—who had them for nothing.

Private libraries, such as Harrods, sell books at half price ex-libris, and this again brings the author nothing, because they are library copies, so the author is doubly cheated.

A.P. Herbert has been battling for years to get a Public Lending Right bill through parliament, to give the author



by ETHEL MANNIN

a small royalty on the number of his titles stocked by public libraries.

Before A.P. Herbert there was John Brophy, who proposed a penny charge on every book borrowed—this penny, which came to be known as 'Brophy's Penny', to go to the author.

The objection of many people to the PLR proposal is that it requires the already over-taxed public to 'subsidise' the author. The objection to 'Brophy's Penny' is that it cuts across the whole idea of free public libraries... though no one objects to paying for radio and TV licences (or do they?) or for seats at cinemas, theatres, concerts.

In our crazy capitalist society it seems that people are prepared to pay for any and everything—even to be buried—but not for their reading matter.

My own view is that everything should be free—cinemas, theatres, public transport, housing, the lot, because money is nonsense, and production should be for use, not profit. But so long as we live within a money system, to each according to his need has to apply in terms of money—it is part of the general barbarism of the system.

And so long as authors are not deriving any material gain from the library use of their work they are, quite simply, being defrauded.

The cost of books is high because the cost of production is, and keeping authors' royalties and advances down is part of the business of keeping down the cost of production.

Everything goes up in the

book trade except payment to those without whom there would be no books, that is, the authors.

Because books cost more, fewer people buy them so the authors, whose royalties are on a percentage basis, don't benefit by the higher prices, but, on the contrary lose, because their readers resort to borrowing from the libraries instead of buying.

Until something is done to secure authors some sort of royalties on library borrowings, the biannual royalty statements sent them by their publishers can only be accompanied by cheques which steadily diminish as the cost of books steadily rises.

At present nothing is more depressing to an author than to have someone say, cheerfully, 'I see you've got a new book out. I've got my name down for it at the library...'

And it is something people are always saying to authors. Not that people are to be blamed for borrowing books rather than buying them, the price of books being what they are. It's all a vicious circle.

## ATTACK

In the controversy which followed Michael Holroyd's massive attack on our beloved Minister for Culture and the Arts, Miss Jennie Lee in The Times Saturday Review recently, a librarian wrote in to say that if authors couldn't make a living at writing books let them earn their living in some other way—no one asked them to write books... overlooking the fact that but for authors he wouldn't be there as a librarian.

Overlooking, too, the simple basic fact that we all have to do what we're most fitted for.

No one tells the teachers or the car workers, when they are dissatisfied with the returns for their labours, that no one asks them to teach or work in car factories, and if they're not satisfied let them go and earn their livings in some other way.

But authors, we know, make thousands a year. Well, wouldn't it be nice if it were true? Wouldn't it be nice?

As things are we'd do a whole lot better being cabinet ministers or even members of parliament. Only until the next General Election they're full up at the Westminster Gas Works, unfortunately.

# Vietnam: the war and

The solidarity movement in Britain has mobilised large numbers of people. IAN BIRCHALL says we must not restrict them to a single-issue campaign...

'Tan Hiep ... had a school and a church, neat houses and gardens, pigs and water buffalo, a useful irrigation system, and a population of more than 2,000 people.'

'Last night Tan Hiep was utterly destroyed ... by United States F-100 bombers and Vietnamese Skyraiders. Just before dark the jets dropped napalm into the hamlet followed by high explosive. Everything was either burned or blasted.' (Guardian, February 28, 1969).



NIXON Sympathy in the Kremlin

IN SPITE OF the bombing halt, in spite of the talks in Paris, the real war in Vietnam, the war on the ordinary people, goes on.

Since the beginning of last year it has been clear that the US in Vietnam are beaten, militarily and politically.

Morale among American troops gets lower and lower. Pot smoking and alcoholism are rife. There is a whole colony of deserters in Cholon, and recently an American negro was killed fighting for the National Liberation Front. Corruption and inefficiency are so widespread in the South Vietnamese administration and armed forces that talk of 'handing over' to them is no more than a piece of tired rhetoric.

## Nixon's new line

The new Nixon government is anxious to come to terms with Russia and China. Nixon himself, once a hard-line anti-communist, wrote in Foreign Affairs (October 1967), 'We cannot afford to leave China forever outside the family of nations.'

The question is not really whether the US gets out of Vietnam, but when and how.

Here economic factors become important. 'Defence' in the United States employs, directly or indirectly, over seven and a half million people. Annual military expenditure amounts to nearly \$2000 for every American family.

US capitalism would benefit from a withdrawal from Vietnam—providing it is not too quick and not too complete.

Business Week of July 27, 1968, calculates that if 50 to 100,000 troops remain in South

East Asia, then the military budget would be reduced by \$15 to \$20,000 million (about a fifth of the total).

Here Nixon can expect sympathy and understanding from his comrades in the Kremlin. The New York Times of January 27 reported on a meeting of top Russian and American diplomats:

'Perhaps most surprising were the hints given at the Westchester Country Club that the Soviet Union would welcome some continued American military presence in South Vietnam after conclusion of a political settlement in Paris.'

So Nixon will play a waiting game, continuing the peace talks, while trying to gain concessions through Moscow (and possibly Peking).

A sign of his double-faced strategy is the appointment as negotiators to the Paris talks of Henry Cabot Lodge, personal friend of Air Marshal Ky, and Marshall Green, former ambassador to Indonesia, and man behind the scenes in the murder of half a million Indonesian communists in 1965.

## Continue the struggle

In this situation, the National Liberation Front have no choice but to continue the military struggle. The Americans complain that new attacks by the NLF are a breach of the 'understanding' reached when the bombing was stopped last autumn.

But for the last 25 years, from Korea to Guatemala, from the Dominican Republic to Chicago, the US has shown

that it 'understands' nothing but brute force.

Our solidarity with the Vietnamese people must continue to be wholehearted and unconditional. Big demonstrations, like the one planned for this Sunday in London must go on.

At the same time, however, it is important to go beyond the slogans and try to see the Vietnamese revolution in a world political context.

We support the Vietnamese revolution because it has the support of the mass of the people in South Vietnam. No guerrilla movement can survive without this popular support—as Che Guevara discovered in Bolivia.

It is, moreover, a revolution independent of the power blocs of East and West. Russia has tanks to spare for Czechoslovakia, but little more than words and outdated equipment for Vietnam.

China's 'Cultural Revolution' has led to trainloads of arms for Vietnam being captured for use in internal fighting (see the Financial Times, November 13, 1968).

But the Vietnamese revolution is not a socialist revolution. The programme of the NLF appeals to 'Rich people, soldiers, workers, peasants, intellectuals, employees, trades, youth, women.' When, in 1945 and 1946, after the defeat of the Japanese, propertyless peasants seized the land, it was Ho Chi Minh's leadership that punished them.

## Revolution goes on

The Vietnamese people are fighting for the right to control their own country. But the withdrawal of US troops will be the beginning, not the end of the Vietnamese revolution.

A victory for the Vietnamese, however, will be concrete proof that popular forces can defeat any military machine. The French defeat in Vietnam was a major factor in sparking off the Algerian revolution.

A US withdrawal from Vietnam will inspire popular movements from Bolivia to the Philippines, from Mozambique to Thailand.

This does not mean that the US will necessarily make the same mistakes again that they made in Vietnam.

# Prod deals: attack on sh

CHRIS DAVISON's article (February 22) clears up many misconceptions about the fight against productivity deals. But because of the variations in work from one industry to another, it is not possible to lay down a formula that can simply be applied in any circumstances.

What has to be recognised is that productivity deals, however formulated, directly attack the shop or factory organisation. They are the employers' attempt to regain control in order to impose the conditions that their profit margins demand.

The demands that answer the employers' offers must be posed so that the worker defends or strengthens his control over his shop and his own conditions of work. Demands like no redundancy, shop stewards to be at the centre of negotiations, rank and file ballots etc. expose the management's intentions more clearly than a demand for extra money.

Control over conditions is not just something exercised by the shop steward on behalf of the workers, but is demonstrated every day by all the workers collectively. The main expression of this workshop control is the operation of certain practices controlling conditions.

Tea breaks, for example,

as a constant demonstration to the bosses that the workers cannot be completely dominated by the production line and the bosses' god of productivity. If you can stop the production line for a cup of tea you can equally well stop it to support your steward.

Demarcation can be seen to protect your job while at the same time respecting someone else's. At the same time it limits the bosses' control over what you will or will not do and puts effective control of employment into the hands of the workers.

To control overtime, to share it equally and use it as a weapon against the boss is again to use for our own purposes something that he created to serve his.

Because these conditions are experienced every day and by everyone in a shop, factory or indeed any place of work, they serve as the basis, the very foundation of activity and consciousness that supports the rank and file shop stewards' movement.

You can't have effective shop stewards if the workers are unable to escape the complete domination of the production line and to realise that they are a collective even if it is only round a tea trolley for 10 minutes.

What may seem to outsiders to be trivial disputes about

# LETTERS

says 'It's your dirt, guv'nor, we wash it off in your time'—are in reality conflicts over controlling the workshop or factory.

The boss tries to buy conditions for money and so regain or gain control of the production line, thus instituting a 'counter revolution'.

His ideal would be to reduce the workers completely to the same status as mechanical components of the line and the economists, time-and-motion men and business-study experts already regard workers in exactly the same way.

Workers, even stewards, are not always sufficiently aware of the dangers of selling their conditions. Often they are able to con the boss and sell outdated practices or imaginary conditions.

This is easy enough in the first round of productivity negotiations since the bosses may not have been in effective control for years. But even these deals have their dangers.

Workers can become over-confident and treat productivity deals with contempt. At the same time they may be lulled into a general acceptance of deals, while the employer

# Socialist Worker

EDITORIAL 657a High Road Tottenham London N17 telephone 01-808 2879  
BUSINESS Paxton Works Paxton Road London N17 telephone 01-808 4847

Editor Roger Protz  
Editorial Committee Paul Foot Richard Kuper Constance Lever Laurie Flynn  
Business Manager Jim Nichol

SOCIALIST WORKER is the paper of International Socialism, a movement of revolutionary socialists who believe that the present form of society, with its blatant inequalities, its periodic crises, wars and racialist hysteria must be replaced by one based on a planned economy under full workers' control; those who produce the wealth should own and control the means of production. International Socialism is opposed to any incomes policy that seeks to restrict the wages of the workers in order to boost the profits of the employers. We unconditionally support all shop stewards and rank and file trade union members in their struggles for better wages and conditions and oppose all reactionary laws that threaten the labour movement.



mand of no victimisation of trade unionists. Redundancy should be opposed with the demand: five days work or five days pay. Shop

fluence by linking up on an industrial and ultimately a national basis.

We are opposed to racial discrimination, a weapon used by the ruling class to divide the labour movement. Immigration control must be ended, ensuring the free movement of peoples regardless of race and colour. Black and white workers must unite and form their own defence organisations to fight fascism and racialism. The labour movement must demand the immediate recall of British troops from abroad as the first step towards ending colonial exploitation.

The task of revolutionary socialists is to join workers in their struggles with socialist ideas that will link up the various sections of the labour movement and help create

# The British workers



October 27: majority were against capitalism

last summer's general strike. In Britain, Vietnam has been a major issue for educating and mobilising the student movement.

And the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign has succeeded where Herbert Morrison failed. It has killed the British Communist Party.

Anyone who doubts this should read the article 'Unity and the Ultra-left' by Ken Geering in the February 1st issue of Comment, a CP discussion journal.

## Hysterical attack

Less than a year ago Comment published Betty Reid's hysterical attack on Trotskyism in the VSC. Now Geering writes 'The ultra-left... can rally 20,000 to 100,000 at the drop of a hat. We can't.'

From now on the CP is merely a faction, tagging along behind.

There is now only one way forward for the Vietnam movement in Britain. It must turn increasingly to the working class.

Placards and banners calling for 'workers' control' are excellent—but they are no substitute for the banners of union branches and shop stewards' committees, which are still few in numbers on the big demonstrations—fewer, probably, than they used to be on the CND marches.

To win the working class, the Vietnam movement must go beyond a single-minded commitment to Vietnam. A New Society poll showed that 68 per cent of the 100,000 demonstrators on October 27 last year were against the capitalist system as a whole.

## Just as vital

A campaign that restricts itself to Vietnam alone may well find that the leadership are a long way behind the rank and file.

The war in Vietnam may end. The war in Britain, in the factories and estates, continues.

It is a quieter, less dramatic war, but for the future of humanity it is just as vital.

See page one for details of Sunday's Vietnam march.

## Vietnam the spark

In France, Vietnam committees in many places developed into the Action Committees that played a central role in

explosive anti-war protest on and off the campus...it could make the country virtually un-governable.'

tion in the countries by the fact of Vietnam into advanced as well. Facing Nixon mmed up in t of January

of the bom- expansion of gnite a new,

# Under fire —the men who keep our hospitals running

## Press stirs vicious racist campaign against immigrant doctors



by PAUL MULLEN

Junior hospital doctor

A LETTER from a consultant surgeon, Mr Nigel Harris, alleging that some overseas doctors working in Britain were unfit to practise, highlighted in a particularly unpleasant way the problems of immigrant doctors in the National Health Service.

The letter which started the row was sent to a patient who complained about the treatment he had received from a foreign doctor at St Charles' Hospital in London, where Mr Harris also works.

It seems from the subsequent statement by the hospital management committee that Mr Harris published his comments without bothering to check his facts with the doctor concerned or examining the available medical records.

Not deterred by minor concerns about accuracy, sections of the press used the incident as their cue to indulge in a series of slurs against immigrant doctors by generalising from a few specific cases.

It was suggested that both the ability to practise medicine and to communicate in English were lacking in immigrant doctors.

## Heavy reliance

It is well known that the NHS relies heavily on immigrant doctors to staff its hospitals. The latest figures show that of 13,532 junior hospital doctors, 6015 came from overseas.

It is estimated that a further 500 to 600 Commonwealth doctors come to work in Britain every year. The majority are used to fill the kind of vacancies scorned by their British counterparts. Many finish up in geriatrics, casualty departments and the most junior posts in specialities like orthopaedics and ophthalmology.

This process is yet another example of the drain of desperately needed resources—in this case trained manpower—from the third world. Doctors are drawn from the areas of greatest need to fill the gaps in the medical service of an advanced capitalist country.

Indian and Pakistanis form the largest single group of immigrant doctors. More than 4000 work in Britain at the moment.

Most of them come for three or four years and then return home when they have taken their higher exams. Some stay on and settle, but for most of them promotion to higher posts is effectively blocked.

Why do they come? It is partly a legacy of colonialism. Most of the senior consultants in India and Pakistan who have done their post-graduate training in Britain, favour those with similar degrees as themselves when it comes to promotion.

In spite of the efforts of the medical schools and governments of India and Pakistan to popularise the specialist post-graduate degrees issued there, the mystique of qualifications from the old colonising power remains.

## Slum hospitals

There is also a very real feeling among those who come here that they will gain the opportunity of working in a more technically advanced medical environment. This is true for a fortunate few.

But for many, their illusions will be left to wilt in bleak geriatric wards, buried in slum hospitals.

What truth is there in the suggestion that a significant proportion of immigrant doctors lack a command of both English and medical skills?

Medical training for the biggest group, Indian and Pakistani, is conducted in English, though initially they often lack a grasp of English idiom and dialect.

Given goodwill on the part of the patients, this would be a minor problem. But all too often patients confronted with a foreign doctor deliberately make themselves difficult to understand, to the embarrassment of one and the detriment of the other.

General Medical Council, the body responsible for licensing doctors, recognises the degrees issued by Commonwealth universities and has the right to check on the competence of these institutions.

There probably are a few incompetents among the thousands of immigrant doctors in Britain—just as there will be incompetent British doctors. To stigmatise all immigrant doctors by the alleged incompetence of a few is the very essence of racialism.

There is a smaller group of immigrant doctors from countries such as Egypt, Greece and Spain where a very real language difficulty may arise. The medical degrees from these countries are not recognised for practice in Britain but doctors may be issued with temporary registration, which is renewable annually.

Some of these doctors do have difficulty with English. But an Indian doctor has

explained in a letter to The Guardian that in his experience preference is given to white doctors over coloured, whatever their respective medical and linguistic merits.

One solution to the problem would be the provision of courses in common English usage and British medical practice for those entering the country.

At present the only scheme that exists consists of allowing newly-arrived doctors to work without pay in a junior post for a month. They do much the same work as they would with pay and not surprisingly this generous offer is rarely taken up.

The immigrant doctors form a cheap labour system used to make up the medical needs of the country.

Successive governments have failed to provide the facilities to train enough doctors.

The most blatant example of this was the actual reduction in the number of medical students in 1958 following the Willink Committee's suggestion that we were 'overproducing' doctors.

## Resist increases

The medical establishment have also contributed to the shortage on occasions by resisting increases in medical school places on the grounds that standards would be lowered. They ignore the fact that there are dozens of qualified applicants for every available place.

If dockers or car workers had made such a suggestion there would have been uproar in the press about 'restrictive practises'. But when respectable, highly-paid members of an upper class profession speak, the press toes the line.

## Join the International Socialists

- ABERDEEN Pete Drummond 19 High Street Aberdeen
- ACTON Hugh Finn 6 Vaughan Ave Stamford Brook W6
- BARNSELY Joe Kenyon 120 Standhill Crescent
- BECKENHAM Mervyn Smith 9 Alton Gardens Copers Cope Rd 01 658 6552
- BIRMINGHAM Godfrey Webster 128 Yardley Wood Rd B'ham 13
- BRADFORD Bob Komreich Flat 1 7 Oak Avenue Bradford 8
- BRIGHTON Micky Adams Flat 4 85 St Aubyns Hove
- BRISTOL Alan Coe 2 St Michael's Hill Bristol 6
- BOLTON F Canavan 11 Sutton Rd Sutton Estate Deane Bolton
- CAMBRIDGE Peter Smith 65 Glisson Road
- CAMDEN Chris Barker 36 Gliden Road NW5
- CHERTSEY Chris Wickenden Langmead Pirbright Woking Sy Brookwood 3003
- COLCHESTER Ian Noble 12 Coach Rd Arlesford Wivenhoe 272
- COVENTRY Dave Edwards 53 Palmerston Rd Earlsdon
- CRAWLEY Deborah Ward 2 Weddell Rd Tilgate
- CROYDON Jenny Woodhams 26 Braemar Avenue South Croydon
- DURHAM Pam Law 16 Hartfield View
- EAST LONDON Bob Light 2 Oster Tce Southcote Rd E17
- EDINBURGH Jim Smith 25 Pitt St(Leith)Edinburgh 6
- ENFIELD Gill Pressman 34 The Chine London N21
- FULHAM Jackie Taylor 41 Perham Road W14
- FOLKESTONE Dave Cowell c/o 18 Station Rd
- GLASGOW Ian Mooney 4 Dalcross Passage W1
- GRAYS & TILBURY Alf Waters c/o 1 Russell Rd Tilbury Essex
- HARROW Kevin Simms 56 Salisbury Rd
- HAVERING Terry Ward 91 Heath Park Rd Gidea Pk
- HIGHBURY Keith Ellis 8 Archibald Road N7
- HORNSEY Valerie Clark 18 Dickinson Rd N8
- HULL Paul Gerhardt 52 Freehold Street
- ILFORD Lionel Sims 99 Belgrave Rd 01 SEV 6991
- IPSWICH Malcolm Bezant 45 Melbourne Road
- ISLINGTON/ANGEL D Phillips 2 Chapel Mkt Grant St N1 01 BRU 1026
- KILBURN Sean Dunne 18 Lithos Road NW3
- KINGSTON John Owen 4 Sandown Court Esher
- LAMBETH Andy Smith Flat 6 126 Streatham Hill SW2
- LEICESTER Shirley Abrams Flat 3 26 St Albans Road
- LEEDS Vince Hall Flat 3 25 Bagby Road Leeds 2
- LOWESTOFT Paul Welby 173 The Avenue
- MANCHESTER Jack Sutton 11a Rowan Avenue Walley Range M16
- MERSEYSIDE Ross Hill 5 Lother Rd Anfield L'pool 4
- MERTON Fred Milson 119 Wolsey Crescent Morden
- MIDDLESBROUGH Chris Chard 32 Bedford Terr Billingham
- NEWCASTLE Tony Corcoran 26 Lesbury Road
- NORTHAMPTON Alan Druker 21 Ardington Road
- NORWICH Gerald Crompton 220 College Road NOR54F
- OXFORD Dave Peers 21 First Turn
- POTTERIES John Whitfield 5 Grosvenor Road Newcastle U Lyme
- READING Miriam Belsey 22 Redlands Rd Reading
- RICHMOND Peter Glatter 3 Burlington Ave Kew
- RIPLEY & ILKESTON C Burnett 75 Heage Road Ripley Derbys
- SELBY John Charlton 12 Thatch Close Selby Yorks
- SHEFFIELD J Wilkin 15 Raven Rd Sheffield S7 1SB
- SOUTHAMPTON John Fisher 144 Thomhill Park Road
- STEVENAGE Michael Downing 57 Trumper Road Trots Hill
- STOCKPORT Geoff Hodgson 73a Forest Range M/C 19
- STOKE NEWINGTON Mike McGrath 28 Manor Road N16
- SWANSEA Roy Greener 16 Oaklands Tce
- TOTTENHAM Laurie Flynn 374 High Road N17
- WATFORD Paul Russell 61 Carpenders Avenue Carpenders Park
- WIGAN Ray Challinor 34 Whiteside Ave Hindley
- WOLVERHAMPTON Dave Spilsbury 274 Penn Road
- YORK Bob Looker 22 Hobgate
- VICTORIA Tony Dunne 14 Carlisle Mansions Carlisle Place SW1

Please send further details of the meetings and activities of the international socialists to

Name

Address



# floor organisation

and of advanced sections of the working class here, such as the occupations at Ford, Armstrong Patents and the Ivy Bridge site, is to relate electoral activity to the question of control of the means of production in the most concrete manner.

Let's face it—the demolition job has already been done by the Labour-Tory policies of successive governments, culminating in the open attacks of the White Paper on trade unionism. This is shown by the high abstention rate in past by-elections and the failure of the mass of the workers to switch to the Tories—hence their hysterical attempts to buy votes by appealing to the Powellite layer of an ex-imperialist nation.

To meet this new situation, and to progress from it, a new type of electoral activity may be needed: the Electoral Strike.

This could take many forms depending on the local situation. For example during the hustings discussion, meetings could be held in working hours during which workers of all tendencies could soapbox (and perhaps candidates and union officials might be asked to attend!)

for those who live away, or everyone could take the day off to ponder the serious question of whom to support, and so on.

This type of action could bring to the surface, that is consciousness, what all workers experience: that domination at production is what unites all workers despite surface differences of craft, sex, religion, union or colour.

It would also demonstrate the contradiction between parliamentary 'majority rule' and the status of workers—the majority—in class society and simultaneously show where political power derives from. When the workers stop everything stops.

Such action might also uncover the attitude of management and union officials, and perhaps some Leftists, to taking their democracy seriously.

If we are concerned about developing 'Left unity' in action, discussion on our attitude to the next General Election should indeed start now:—PAUL ROBERTSHAW, Canterbury.

Letters for publication must arrive first post Monday. Please type or write on one side of the paper only. The

